

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2746	
GEF Agency project ID		3505	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Promoting Replication of Good Practices for Nutrient Reduction and Joint Collaboration in Central and Eastern Europe	
Country/Countries		Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia& Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Georgia, Estonia, Hungary, I.R. Iran, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Latvia, Lithuania, Moldova, Montenegro, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Turkey, Turkmenistan, Ukraine.	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF-4/ SP 2	
Executing agencies involved		Global Environment & Technology Foundation (GETF)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Co- financing Source	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		05 August 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		29 November 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		31 March 2011	
Actual date of project completion		March 2011	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.03	0.03
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.975	0.975
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.15	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.52	
	Private sector	0.3	
	NGOs/CSOs	0.43	
Total GEF funding		1.0	1.0
Total Co-financing		1.3	U/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.3	U/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2011	
TE submission date		July 2011	
Author of TE		Sean J. Burke, Bernardita Cardenas	
TER completion date			
TER prepared by		Michelle Peña Nelz	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	N/R	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	S	N/R	N/R	L
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/R	S	N/R	MS
Quality of Implementation	S	S	N/R	S
Quality of Execution	N/R	S	N/R	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of this project, as stated in the TE, is to reduce nutrient pollution and prevent de-oxygenated “dead zones” in international waterways and oceans or so called trans-boundary waters (TE, p.13). According to the TE, more than 500 “dead zones” exist worldwide and their negative impacts include harmful levels of algae and aquatic vegetation, increased treatment of cost of drinking water, imbalance of aquatic species, and shifts in the structure of the food chain. Targeted regions are Central and Eastern Europe (CEE), Caucasus and Central Asia. The CEE region is considered to be a leader in the implementation of nutrient reduction best practices.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The overall goal of the project, as stated in the Request for CEO Approval (to be henceforth referred to as the Project Document (PD) in this TE review), is to “accelerate the replication of successful nutrient reduction projects by identifying best nutrient reduction practices, demonstrate successful replication strategies, and to disseminate and promote best practices and replication strategies to practitioners and decision makers” (PD, p.9). The PD defines the following 3 development objectives, by which the project will achieve its stated goal:

1. To consolidate, inventory of and critically review/ assess the achievements/ experiences (in nutrient and multi-country cooperation) of GEF’s action in the CEE and EECCA regions (Black Sea- Danube, Baltic Sea, Caspian Sea) to document the good practices and provide recommendation for their replication and scaling up.
2. To identify and demonstrate successful replication strategies
3. To enhance or “extrapolate” replication of good nutrient reduction practices within the region and beyond (such as the Mediterranean and East Asian Seas), as well as their mainstreaming into multi- and bi-lateral donors’ strategies and programs.

The expected project results corresponding to each of the 3 development objectives above are:

- Clearer understanding of good practices and lessons learned experiences in nutrient reduction projects (enhancing knowledge and communication strategies among practitioners)

- Better understanding of the needs of project practitioners and stakeholders in regards to nutrient reduction expertise needs and means of access to information (enhancing efficiency and effectiveness of knowledge transfer)
- Better understanding of the nature of criteria for and categories of good nutrient reduction experiences (enhancing understanding among practitioners and decision makers)
- Nutrient reduction promotion experiences inform GEF IWC5
- Increased awareness among the region’s population and sectors about the importance and impact of nutrient reduction practices

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

Yes. Some of the activities changed during implementation. During the implementation period the amount of demonstration projects doubled from two to four. The increase in demonstration projects was made to enhance the scope of projects demonstrating nutrient reduction results on the ground, and to promote capacity building and replication in the countries and the region. The TE states that this was a logical change in terms “of the scale of this project and the resources and time available to it [...]” (TE, p.19)

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The Project is highly relevant to GEF and stakeholder countries. Project goals are consistent with GEF-4 Strategic Priority 4, which is calling for a move from a testing and demonstration mode to scaling-up of full operations in support of agreed incremental cost of reforms, investments, and management programs needed to reduce stress on trans- boundary freshwater and marine systems. Furthermore it responds to the identified need to share targeted experiences and learning among the new and existing GEF management tools to capture good practices and accelerated replication of good practices. (PD, p.7)

Additionally it is aligned with existing national and international legislations in a number of countries, who are for example in the EU accession phase. Nutrient Reduction policies especially for the regional focus point are in the consolidation process with the EU and have been planned and partially implemented though coordinated international and national actions by the regional seas conventions and their secretariats. One important international legal agreement in the respective project region is

the Bucharest Convention (1992) in the Black Sea, which has to be seen as primary incentive for the wealth in experiences and knowledge in nutrient reduction practices.¹

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
--------------------------	-----------------------------

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) document and this review assess a satisfactory rating for project effectiveness considering the achievement of set objectives. From the evidence presented, the project has attained all the set outcomes and objectives and only experienced minor shortcomings regarding the selection of pilot project sites and the quality of the online knowledge-sharing database. The project successfully set up a best practice data bank, implemented 4 demonstration projects, and presented the results for this region.

Progress under each of the 3 development objectives is detailed below:

1. *To consolidate, inventory of (or “exact”) and critically review/ assess the achievements/ experiences (in nutrient and multi-country cooperation) of GEF’s action in the CEE and EECCA regions (Black Sea- Danube, Baltic Sea, Caspian Sea) to document the good practices and provide recommendation for their replication and scaling up.*

The project identified successful nutrient reduction relevant projects, which were documented and made available online. The projects are mostly (75%) located in the Danube-Black Sea region, whereas the other regions were underrepresented. TE states that project design was overly ambitious regarding the time and effort required to secure cooperation and feedback from the project managers of completed GEF projects.

Furthermore, the project identified “Best Agricultural Practices” and achieved (according to the TE) an “important milestone in chronicling GEF NR- relevant projects, and distilling best practices and best management practice and making available for third party use.” (TE, p.28)

2. *To identify and demonstrate successful replication strategies*

Part of the strategy was to establish “show cases” in order to prove the replicability of nutrient reduction approaches based on demonstration projects and peer to peer knowledge transfer. Selected sites were in: Albania, Moldova, Serbia and Ukraine. Under this objective all of the expected outputs have been successfully delivered.

As already mentioned, the project managed to double the amount of demonstration projects under the same budgetary resources. The TE states, that each of the demonstration projects completed expected activities. Furthermore, in some cases significant obstacles had to be overcome to secure the results (see ‘Efficiency’ section). Special champions were Moldova and Albania, where local governments showed a strong commitment to the project.

¹ See also Artioli, Y. et al (2008) Nutrient Budgets for European seas: A Measure of the effectiveness of nutrient reduction policies, in: *Marine Pollution Bulletin Vol. 56*, pp. 1609-1617.

On the other hand some shortcomings were noticed in reference to the selection process. As stated in the TE, the decision on where to site demonstration projects was partially based on the geographical closeness to existing (larger) projects sites from either the implementing agency or executing organization.

The peer to peer knowledge exchange was very successful and received strong support (according to the TE) from stakeholders.

3. *To enhance or “extrapolate” replication of good nutrient reduction practices within the region and beyond (such as the Mediterranean and East Asian Seas), as well as their mainstreaming into multi- and bi-lateral donors’ strategies and programs.*

All the planned activities in order to disseminate and promote NR Best practices were achieved during the implementation time. Part of the achievements are the successful establishment of an online database that aims to help practitioners and decision-makers to access best practice examples from GEF projects. The TE states that even though the database is online and complete “The project pages on the IW:LEARN portal are very static and not very enticing to the reader”.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The Terminal Evaluation assesses a satisfactory rating for project efficiency. This TER concurs with this rating, due to following aspects:

All the objectives were achieved without delays. Moreover, the project doubled the number of expected demonstration projects. Regarding the demonstration projects, TE states that some substantial obstacles in form of hostility and suspicion from the local residents were efficiently addressed by project management. It indicates a functioning and well-coordinated effort between all involved agencies, beginning from the executing on the local level to the support from the implementing agency. In this context the TE highlights specifically the good performance in establishing partnerships with relevant stake holders (TE, p. 23). TE reports no issues with financial disbursement, contracting, or procurement, or communication with partners in the field. On the contrary: The PIR reported an efficient budgeting behavior; based on the TE the quality of external consultants was high so that the project could be delivered satisfactorily.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
---------------------------	-----------------------

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) document doesn’t provides a clear rating for sustainability. This review assesses a rating of likely, based on evidence presented in the TE narrative and based on the project’s progress in ensuring that knowledge from Nutrient Reduction (NR) strategies are widely spread in the region. The project was designed to ensure sustainability for nutrient reduction strategies through demonstration and dissemination of best practice examples across the project region. The strategies and objectives were chosen based on a pre- project phase multi-stakeholder consultation. This participatory approach not only ensured a further stakeholder involvement but also enhanced the likelihood of survival.

Most importantly, the project succeeded in generating a databank with NR good practices, housed on IWLEARN, that will be available in perpetuity post project.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further assessed along the following 4 dimensions:

- *Environmental threats - (U/A)*: The TE does not provide any assessment of environmental risks to the sustainability of project outcomes.
- *Financial - (L)*: As the TE states, the mobilization of local stakeholders in the Demonstration Projects (DPs) as well as in the co-financing performance of the DPs, is a promising sign for a future scaling-up effort. While the pilot demonstration projects end with the project phase, sustainability of project outcomes is to a large extent not reliant upon additional funding commitments. The costs of distributing and providing ongoing access to project-generated findings on nutrient reduction management practices (the principle output of the project) is covered by participating institutions. The project website with the databank of goof practice examples for instance is maintained by the GEF and participating stakeholders.
- *Socio-political - (U/A)*: the TE does not provide a clear assessment on this aspect for sustainability. Due to the geo-political closeness to the European Union of some countries in the target region, it is likely that EU standards regarding nutrient reduction will help to keep the governments and the public interested in sustaining project outcomes.
- *Institutional framework and governance - (U/A)*: The TE makes no reference to this aspect for sustainability. Therefore the TER is unable to assess risk on this dimension.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) does not report on the level of realized co-financing or the effect of co-financing on project outcomes or sustainability. The final Project Implementation Review (PIR) states that \$72k USD of additional resources were provided by the demonstration partners.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project did not experience any extension or delays.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

Based on the information of the Terminal evaluation the level of country ownership is not easily assessable, as for this project the involvement of national Ministries was only planned in the four

demonstration project countries. Most of the countries involved have national and international legislation in place regarding Nutrient Reduction. A number of countries are in the EU accession phase, which is also driving policy and legislative development.

On the local level however, the demonstration Projects (DPs) generated (according to the TE) a “significant local ownership within their respective regions, as did the peer to peer exchanges.” Furthermore the TE highlights the very satisfactory level of stakeholder participation, which resulted in respective regions a significant local ownership.

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	--

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) does not provide a rating for M&E Design. This TER assesses a rating of moderately Satisfactory for M&E Design based on the M&E design presented in the PD.

The M&E Design presented in the PD includes guidance calling for the development of a detailed monitoring and evaluation plan during year 1 of the project. Overall roles and responsibilities for M&E are set forth in the PD. PD calls for a Mid-Term review following year 1, quarterly, annual, and terminal evaluation reports, and involvement of the project Steering Committee in project M&E.

PD includes a Project Results Framework with Outcomes, Outputs, and Indicators, along with means of verifications. Weaknesses in the M&E Framework include a general lack of targets and complete lack of baseline information or guidance on how to acquire baseline information during project implementation. Moreover, the indicators are focused on the output level – no indicators are provided for the project’s three Outcomes. While some of the lack of specificity in indicators and targets is reflective of the project’s overall purpose to identifying gaps in the knowledge base of nutrient reduction approaches and thus is intended to provide flexibility during the project implementation phase to develop a tailored M&E plan based on preliminary findings, the M&E plan would have been strengthened by clearer identification of: (1) baseline data or means for acquiring baseline data in all key project areas (including for example, information on nutrient reductions best practices; current practices in nutrient management in targeted areas; awareness of nutrient reduction approaches among key stakeholders); (2) timetables for conducting M&E activities (M&E plan only states when project reviews will take place, but does not state what the content of those reviews will be in so far as specific M&E activities and milestones are concerned); SMART indicators and targets, particularly at the Outcome level and for pilot replication

activities where the indicators provided are especially vague and without targets (eg. “Planning with targeted country officials to implement the replication projects”; or “Identification and engagement of business community, trade associations, individual facilities, and opinion-leader businesses focused within specific industry sectors relevant to nutrient reduction, as well as selected other relevant key stakeholders.”

A dedicated budget component is provided for M&E activities (PD, pg 40).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	--

The Terminal Evaluation (TE) and the last Project Implementation Review (PIR) rated the M&E Implementation as ‘satisfactory’. However, this review assesses a Moderately Satisfactory rating to M&E Implementation, based on moderate shortcomings that are identified in the text of the TE, including an overly optimistic 2010 PIR, and inadequate support provided for training on M&E.

TE states that “the project developed a detailed Monitoring and Evaluation Plan,” although little information is provided on the content of that plan. TE states that the planned Mid-Term evaluation was not carried out, although reasons for this are not discussed. TE also states that the Project Steering committee has “played an important part in the overall monitoring work within the project,” and that they have been “responsive and constructive in their feedback.” (TE, pg 24).

TE does note some shortcomings in M&E implementation. TE states that the 2010 PIR was overly-optimistic in its assessment that all project activities could be finalized by the end of 2010 (at time of TE, finalization of work was still ongoing into Q2 of 2011). It furthermore makes reference to the “impact of short timeframe” (TE, p.38) which contributed to a lack of M&E and “proper follow-up in actions to secure and optimize impact and sustainability.” The evaluators state that technical support for M&E and follow-up activities “should include a project planning phase before the ‘live implementation’ phase. (ibid) The TE however does not provide more detailed examples of these shortcomings.

The TE also notes significant weakness in monitoring due to insufficient rigor with regard to nutrient monitoring in some DPs with the result that their value as demonstration projects was diminished.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

TE rates the quality of Project Implementation as Satisfactory and this TER concurs with that assessment based on following reasons.

TE states that UNDP, through its regional office in Bratislava, played “...a key role in the support and monitoring of the project.” (TE, pg 25). Moreover, TE states that stakeholders perceived UNDP’s efforts as being persistent “...in ensuring that the project met its objectives and that solutions were found to challenges encountered along the way.” (TE, pg 25). Shortcomings include weaknesses in the M&E design noted above, especially regarding the overly ambitious timetables for demonstration projects and the lack of follow-up mechanisms after wards in order to ensure follow-up activities.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Satisfactory
---	-----------------------------

TE rates the quality of Project Implementation as Satisfactory and this TER concurs with that assessment. The quality of the project execution by the Global Environment & Technology Foundation (GETF) was consequently to the implementation satisfactory too. The Terminal Evaluation however highlights several aspects which have to be taken in consideration- in the positive as in the negative.

The TE states that the project’s short timetable contributed to weaknesses in the monitoring of some demonstration projects, in particular in the case of Albania. The TE comes to the conclusion that the short timeframe “has contributed also to a lack of monitoring and proper follow-up in actions to secure or optimise impact and sustainability”. On the other hand, it admits that “short timeframes helped focus minds and contributed to building local mobilisation, along with the pressure/demands of local co-financing.”

As noted above, TE finds that all project activities were successfully executed, including 4 demonstration projects, compared to the PD’s target of 2. TE finds that the effectiveness of Nutrient reduction (NR) strategies could have been further enhanced by a more comprehensive online content and resource repository.

TE finds that execution of the project’s demonstration projects was very effective in mobilizing significant local stakeholder involvement and ownership as visible in the Moldova project, where local stakeholders championed in engaging local population in the project.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate below that this is indeed the case. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented,

sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

TE does not provide any assessment of any changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No assessment possible.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project immanent idea of establishing demonstration projects in different countries, was based on the goal to enhance knowledge about best strategies and prove the replicability in different contexts. It is one of the great merits of this project that they managed to double the amount of demonstrations projects. However, the implementation of them was not possible without the support of local stakeholders, and in some cases with rather drastic consequences. Local demonstration projects like in Albania and Moldova had to experience a strong skepticism from side of the local population, which could only be appeased though active involvement and engagement of governmental actors, who were convinced about the project.

Furthermore, the TE states that the Peer to Peer exchanges proved themselves as a valuable platform to build capacity of local stakeholders and share experience and knowledge with experts from outside the regions.

b) Governance

Major impact on local governance was visible for example in Albania. Despite of a rather unsuccessful project management, some significant obstacles were overcome to secure these results. In this case, hostility and suspicion from local residents required support from the municipal authorities and police intervention, while in the Ukraine a significant communication and buy-in process was required to create sufficient support from local citizens.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts reported.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The whole project design is around disseminating and promoting best practice examples from GEF projects in the Danube region in order to mainstream nutrient reduction strategies in the project countries. Through the peer-to-peer exchange approach and the inclusion of various stakeholder the GEF initiative has been widely replicated and adopted by governments (local and national). The Project Implementation Review (PIR) gives examples for Government participants from Armenia, Azerbaijan and Georgia showed commitment to explore a regional trans-boundary project focusing on an integrated approach to nutrient reduction.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE offers the following key lessons from the project experience:

Inventory Work:

- in order to promote nutrient- reduction (NR) policies and practices the project has emphasised the importance of systems of practices above individual NR practices, and highlights a number of important components or success factors, such as cooperation between farmers and direct dialogue and consultation with farmers or farmer organisations have the trust of their local members.
- Need for increasing monitoring of projects, more systematic data collation and ensuring adequate operations and maintenance
- From a process perspective, it is important that GEF considers how the challenges in collecting data from GEF-funded projects can be addressed by building this requirement into project reporting obligations.

Peer to Peer Exchanges

- The combination of peer to peer exchanges and demonstration projects also appears to have been a promising mechanism for generating interest by other possible 'take-up' actors
- Importance of publicity for raising public awareness and public education regarding the need for nutrient reduction.
- Discussion of pathways to replication deserves further discussion in terms of how different approaches, policy and legislative frameworks, funding sources could be envisaged for different countries or sub-regions.

Demonstration Projects

- Importance of local organisations serving as project champions are a key success factor in any future replication work using demonstration projects
- Creating local expertise is in general a key factor for success.
- Land ownership is a critical consideration to ensuring the outcomes, security & sustainability of projects.
- Technical support will assist projects in more effective monitoring and measuring of outcomes. Follow up also after the project regarding monitoring is necessary to ensure sustainability.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE offers the following recommendations from the project experience

- The established online databases of good practice examples created by the project are an important step in documenting and making the results available for a broader public. Nevertheless it is recommended that a follow-up programme of actions should be designed in order to prepare the data in a more reader- and user-friendly way, also based on the needs and expectations of the target groups. (Development of regional and thematic/sectoral short papers etc.)
- In order to enhance the dissemination and learning experience the development of cost-effective low-level e-learning modules should be explored. Such modules would increase the capacity of different target groups to progress their own NR agenda without relying on direct (and more costly) interventions from a NR project.
- Working on and with the potential of Demonstration Projects in a follow-up Programme, because the DPs have been as important for learning regarding the process as much as the concrete actions. They have shown that significant improvements are possible in nutrient reduction at the local level without spending large amounts of money.
- Introduction of a Small Grants Programme to provide a clear 'Do It Yourself' guide on simpler NR solutions, along with ideas on how to manage and reduce costs, could allow for a small grants programme involving clear leverage criteria for funds disbursement to archive significant benefit as part of a follow-up programme.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE contains clear and structured assessments of the relevant objectives and keeps the structure also while coming to the recommendations.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally very consistent and logically structured in its evidences. However, in some points it seems like the TE is not sure about the rating system and how to relate it to the set objectives.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability is discussed throughout this TE and the reviewers have done a good job in identifying further strategies to make the project sustainable though follow up projects.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are very comprehensive and usefully separated by topics. For example, the general lessons learned from the projects and the ones for the GEF and UNDP are separated in order to readjust the focus of the lesson.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	No. The available version of the TE does not provide any financial reporting.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of the project M&E System only gives a summary overview of the M&E implementation. The TE does not assess M&E Design at entry and does not provide sufficient evidence backing up its rating, or in providing detail on the few shortcomings that are mentioned.	U
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall rating = $(0.3 * (5+4)) + (0.1 * (5+5+1+2)) = 2.7 + 1.3 = 4.0 = MS$

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).