



To Do

Projects

Reports

Administration

Help

Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: GEF Project ID [Select](#)

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

Save Data



Collapse all sections



Project

GEF ID	<input type="text" value="2817"/>
Project Title	<input type="text" value="Tabuleiro State Park: Conservation of Biodiversity and Ecosystem Rehabilitation"/>
Project Type	<input type="text" value="Medium Size Project"/>
Funding Source	<input type="text" value="GEF Trust Fund"/>
Focal Area	<input type="text" value="Biodiversity"/>
Agency	<input type="text" value="World Bank"/>
World Bank ID	<input type="text" value="66537"/>
Country	<input type="text" value="Brazil"/>
Project Status	<input type="text" value="Project Completion"/>
Duration	<input type="text" value="4"/> years
CEO Endorsement	<input type="text" value="07/21/2005"/>
Agency Approval	<input type="text" value="8/4/2005"/>
Project Effectiveness	<input type="text" value="08/22/2005"/>
GEF Agency Execution Partners	<input type="text" value="(Select Execution Partners)"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Civil Society Private Sector Indigenous Community Other
If other, please specify	<input type="text" value="Fundação do Meio Ambiente (FA)"/>



Terminal Evaluation Staff

EO Staff

TE Author	<input type="text" value="Alvaro J. Soler"/>
TE Reviewer	<input type="text" value="pallavinuka@gmail.com"/>

TE Peer Reviewer

 **Completion, Submission & Delays**

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion

Project Actual Completion

Project Completion Difference Months

TE Completion

TE Completion

TE Submission to EO

TE Submission to EO Difference Months

TER Completion

TER Completion

TER Submission to EO

TER Submission to EO Difference Months

Comments on Delays 

 **Funding and Co-Financing**

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="973,734"/>	<input type="text" value="0"/>	<input type="text" value="0.00 %"/>
Cofinance Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="1,354,063"/>	<input type="text" value="2,800,000"/>	<input type="text" value="206.79 %"/>
Total Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="2,327,797"/>	<input type="text" value="2,800,000"/>	<input type="text" value="120.29 %"/>

Comments on Cofinancing 

Since project start-up, the leveraged resources (US\$ 2.8 million) surpass the original estimates. The overall amount by source and its distribution by component are as follows:

- KfW: US\$ 1,030,000 related to outcomes of the GEF Components 1 (\$363,000), 2 (\$413,000) and 4 (\$254,000), including equipment for vigilance and control (Comp 1), studies and workshops to support Park Mgmt Plan (Comp 2) and works/reform of the Park headquarters and main visitors' center (Comp 4)
- Microbacias II (Bank loan): US\$ 1,634,000 related to outcomes of the GEF Components 2 (\$216,000), 3 (\$1,408,000) and 4 (\$10,000), including support to pilot activities on sustainable NRM in the park buffer zone (Comp 3), environmental education and capacity building (Comp 3), construction of two thematic visitors centers (Comp 2) and promotional material (Comp 4).
- SEBRAE: US\$ in-kind contribution (US\$ 30,000) and US\$ 90,000 in cash (to hire the NGO which operates the Park visitors center) and execute part of the Park environmental education activities
- GoSC : in kind contribution (US\$ 70,000) and cash (US\$ 62,000 until CY08, and US\$ 300,000 for CY09 and CY10 from the Fundo Comp. Amb.)

 **Logical Framework**

Quality of Logical Framework

4 - Moderately Satisfactory










Project Objectives -

From the ProDoc log-frame:
 Goal; "To contribute to the conservation of the globally significant biodiversity of the Atlantic Forest. "
 Specific Objectives:
 1. Implementation of "emergency actions in support of increased TSP vigilance and enforcement capacity and control of exotic plant species that threaten the Park's integrity."
 2. Development and support of "the initial implementation of the Park Management Plan, in close collaboration and with strong participation of local stakeholders."
 3. Building [of] a conservation constituency through: (a) the development and implementation of a sustainable development and conservation training program, and (b) the development of demonstrative models for sustainable use of natural resources in the Park buffer zone.
 4. "Increased local capacity to implement and monitor conservation projects, and to disseminate project results and experiences at the local, national and international levels."

Comment on Changes


No changes to project objectives. The logical framework does not include outcomes or outcome indicators, and instead relies on outputs/output indicators. At least two of the objective level indicators are not SMART and are not adequate for measuring attainment of the specific objectives.

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
Support for strengthening vigilance and enforcement capacity in park. Support for controlling invasive species.	Implementation of measures to improve Park vigilance and control exotic plant species in critical areas.	Improved vigilance/enforcement of park rules and regulation. Invasive species brought under control	Increase in number of infractions cited will reduce incidence of adverse behaviors/practices. Control of invasive species will arrest and reverse habitat degradation.	Support, education, incentives about sustainable land use practices.	Stress reduction and reduced presence of invasives. Native species begin to repopulate critical areas.	Native biodiversity preserved in critical areas.	 Edit  Delete
Support to develop a participatory PMP and biodiversity	A well-articulated Park Management	Improved Park management as a result of increased	Administrative and technical capacity of park	Continued stakeholder support.	Community participation in decision making.	Preservation of critical biodiversity.	 Edit  Delete

monitoring system.	Plan (PMP) developed with support from local and other relevant stakeholders represented by key community leaders, state and municipal governments.	community participation and commitment. Monitoring system used in decision making.	management bodies.	Local stakeholders trained in biodiversity conservation and related themes.			
Support for alternative livelihoods. Education/awareness raising	Pilot projects implemented and community members trained.	Greater awareness of sustainable use practices. Pilot projects generate income.	Technical and socio-economic alternatives to existing non-sustainable land use practices are widely availability.	Incentives for households to adopt sustainable use practices.	Improvements in the socio-economic status of community members.	Reduced pressure on park habitats.	 Edit  Delete
 Add New Row...							

 **Project Performance**

[Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFEO Ratings](#) [Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFEO Comments](#)











Overall Project Rating 






Comment







The intended overall outcome of the project was the development and testing of a community-based model of conservation that effectively addresses land use conflicts in and around state and national protected areas. By project closure, the technical tools and agreements (between state government and local government/communities) needed to develop the community-based model were in place; a model of intervention was developed and tested, and it is under continued development given the uncertain environment under which it operates. As said, the Government of the State of Santa Catarina (GoSC) has been active in leveraging resources from other sources and in finding alternative ways to implement core project activities, showing continued commitment to the stated grant objectives and logging progress towards their achievement.
















However, obstacles to disbursement of GEF funds were never overcome. No GEF funds were disbursed and project activities have been limited vis a vis what was originally planned.















Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
	Last PIR:	<input type="text" value="4 - Moderately Satisfactory"/>	Achievement of the grant objective is moderately satisfactory. Given the administrative problems faced earlier, the GoSC has been active in leveraging resources from other sources and in finding alternative ways to implement core project activities, showing continued commitment to the stated grant objectives and logging progress towards their achievement. However, delays in getting the administrative work agreement with SEBRAE fully functional continued, and project activities per se have been little. The new Administration of FATMA has led an effort since early CY09 to revert this situation, and several activities are now ongoing under the watch of an ad hoc committee that includes FATMA and SEBRAE presidents.
	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="4 - Moderately Satisfactory"/>	



Outcomes 			<p>Achievement of the project's objective is rated moderately satisfactory overall, given the satisfactory implementation of one component, and the moderately satisfactory completion of the other three project components. Project design was consistently followed and executed by the Government of the State of Santa Catarina (GoSC), in tandem with the execution of the Santa Catarina Natural Resources Management and Rural Poverty Reduction Project (Microbacias II). Sustainability of the project's efforts will be enhanced by support for similar activities related to ecosystems and corridor management, environmental enforcement, and environmental education under the recently approved Santa Catarina Rural Competitiveness Project. These achievements were attained despite the flawed design for administration of the grant funds that resulted in an inability to channel these grant funds for the support of implementation of the project's components. Faced with this design flaw, the GoSC demonstrated strong commitment to the project's objectives by increasing the contribution of its own funds and leveraged resources from other sources (the Microbacias II Project, KfW, SEBRAE), thereby making available a total of US\$ 2.9 million for project implementation (nearly triple the originally planned amount for co-financing). Major accomplishments financed in this way include extensive training of main stakeholders, including landowners within the Park and its buffer zone, and increased vigilance of the Park, leading to improved compliance with environmental legislation as well as more environmentally sustainable productive and income generation activities, and a decrease in the amount of fines issued over time.</p>
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	While the project did satisfactorily achieve at least one component through co-financing support, the failure to disburse any GEF funds and the slow pace of implementation have adversely affected outcomes.
Relevance 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The project fits with GEF OP's #3 (Forest Ecosystems) and #2 (Coastal Ecosystems), conforms to GEF Strategic Priorities in the Biodiversity focal area. Project objectives are also aligned with national and state-level conservation and PA management goals.
Effectiveness 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.













Efficiency 	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Based on the TE report, the project has largely achieved intended outputs in its four component areas.
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	The achievement of project outputs relied solely on co-financing. No GEF Funds were disbursed for reasons discussed under implementation. The project team requested a three-year extension which was reduced to 1-year by the Bank. The request for a 1-year extension was denied by GEF due to non-disbursement of funds. The slow pace of implementation and inability to access GEF funds has severely hampered achievement of objectives.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability 	Last PIR:	3 - Moderately Likely 	The overall activity risk is rated modest, given the GoSC commitment to implement project activities with the use of outside funding sources, and due to the fact that the preservation of the Park continues to be an important issue for the GoSC. Though the current project's poor design for financial intermediating of grant funds indicates the institutional weakness of the GoSC's relationship with SEBRAE in this sectoral area, the SC Rural Competitiveness Project has avoided this arrangement and used instead those state institutional arrangements which were successful under the Microbacias project. Thus, similarly focused environmental activities as those under the current project will face only a modest level of risk (as noted in the SC Rural Competitiveness project Appraisal Document).
	Terminal Evaluation:	3 - Moderately Likely 	The overall activity risk is rated modest, given the GoSC commitment to implement project activities with the use of outside funding sources, and due to the fact that the preservation of the Park continues to be an important issue for the GoSC. Though the current project's poor design for financial intermediating of grant funds indicates the institutional weakness of the GoSC's relationship with SEBRAE in this sectoral area, the SC Rural Competitiveness Project has avoided this arrangement and used instead those state institutional arrangements which were successful under the Microbacias project. Thus, similarly focused environmental activities as those under the current project will face only a modest level of risk (as noted in the SC Rural Competitiveness project Appraisal Document).
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess.
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated along this dimension.





Financial 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	The state level government is strongly committed to supporting project outcomes.
Socio-political 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	The TE report notes that preservation of the park remains an important issue for the state government.
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated along this dimension.
Institutional and Legal 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess.
Environmental 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess.







Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E 	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	There has been adequate recording of project-supported activities, even if they haven't been implemented through the project. Better and more consistent reporting is required.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	M&E implementation is rated MS.
M&E Design 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	The M&E plan at entry details reporting requirements, parties responsible, and describes methods for impact monitoring/evaluation. The project's log-frame could better reflect the Theory of Change by explicitly defining outcomes, and refining the set of indicators to meet SMART criteria.
M&E Plan Implementation 	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	There has been adequate recording of project-supported activities, even if they haven't been implemented through the project. Better and more consistent reporting is required.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Concur with TE report.
M&E Funding and	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.

Budget Utilization 	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	M&E costs were a line item in the proposed yearly budgets. Since no GEF funds were disbursed for project expenses, M&E activities
--	---------------	---	---












Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	This is based on the average of ratings for quality of implementation and quality of
Quality of Implementation - IA 	Terminal Evaluation:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	While strong technical assistance was provided throughout the process, the Bank erred when assessing the institutional capacity of partners (SERBAE and FATMA) to carry out the financial arrangements of the project, and in not recognizing the need to re-structure these arrangements early-to-mid way through the implementation period.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	Concur with TE.
Quality of Execution - EA 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Despite the lack of a financial management structure that was to be provided by implementing partner SEBRAE and, later on, due to insufficient knowledge by SEBRAE and FATMA teams to adequately implement Bank procurement procedures, the project has managed to partially execute the project. The Gov. of SC (state governments) has maintained a strong focus on achieving project outputs/objectives and adaptively managed the project. Supporting activities planned in components 1 and 3 have been implemented with support from the complementary KfW-financed project, the Bank-financed Microbacias 2 project, and GoSC own resources.

 **Agency Specific Project Criteria**





Criteria	Document	Rating/Verification	Comment
Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority 	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Government Commitment is rated MS, but counterpart funding is rated HS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	6 - Highly Satisfactory 	Based on the TE report, this project has been driven and supported solely by state level government and the park's administrative body. It was well aligned with national and state-level priorities.


Financial Planning 	Terminal Evaluation:	2 - Unsatisfactory <input type="button" value="v"/>	Financial Management: Unsatisfactory. No comment provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory <input type="button" value="v"/>	Adequate funds were allocated to the various project components. However due to administrative difficulties no GEF funds were
Preparation and Readiness 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory <input type="button" value="v"/>	While the project was well designed and objectives were achievable in given timeframe, the selection of project partners was not given sufficient consideration. The Bank's executing partners lacked the capacity to administer project funds/procurement according to Bank and GEF protocols, resulting in non-disbursement of funds.
Stakeholders Involvement 	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory <input type="button" value="v"/>	Public Involvement is rated MS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory <input type="button" value="v"/>	Financing for project activities was provided solely by state level government and other stakeholders. The project has also reached out to local landowners and community groups, resulting in conservation agreements and overall increased awareness of conservation issues.
Need for Follow Up 	Terminal Evaluation:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	No mention of follow-up in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	No need for follow up based on information in TE report.
Gender Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	No mention of gender mainstreaming in PAD or
Effects on Local Population 	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes <input type="button" value="v"/>	Discussed throughout TE report.
	Agency Review:	No <input type="button" value="v"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes <input type="button" value="v"/>	The project has affected the local population through several channels. The development and initial implementation of the Park Management Plan has led to conservation agreements, the Park Management Committee, and informational workshops. Training programs and pilot projects on sustainable use practices and alternative livelihoods have also affected 10 pilot communities.

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
	Terminal	Yes <input type="button" value="v"/>	

Poverty Reduction 	Evaluation:		"Project design was consistently followed and executed by the Government of the State of Santa Catarina (GoSC), in tandem with the execution of the Santa Catarina Natural Resources Management and Rural Poverty Reduction Project (Microbacias II)." The TE report refers to "environmentally sustainable productive and income generation activities" as one of the major accomplishments.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes 	The project carried out some activities to support alternative livelihoods. The TE report refers to "environmentally sustainable productive and income generation activities" as one of the major accomplishments.
Crisis Prevention and Recovery 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	Not a part of project design.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No 	Not a part of project design.
Democratic Governance 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	Park Mgmt Committee not yet established.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No 	The park management committee (an important output) was not yet functional at the time of project closure.

 **Progress to Impact**

Progress to Impact 	Terminal Evaluation:	2 - Moderate Progress 	To date, the technical tools and agreements (between state government and local government/communities) needed to develop the aforementioned community-based model are in place; a model of intervention was developed and tested, and it is under continued development given the volatile environment under which it operates. As said, the GoSC has been active in leveraging resources from other sources and in finding alternative ways to implement core project activities, showing continued commitment to the stated grant objectives and logging progress towards their achievement.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderate Progress 	The project has not achieved all the outputs necessary to lead to impacts.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes 	

Information, Knowledge and Awareness			Knowledge exchange : Rated Modest. "The inability to spend the grant resources planned for knowledge exchange activities reduced exchanges on the rich experience on some of the salient achievements made, like the community organization and participation efforts carried out, or the signing of conservation agreements with park dwellers."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The project has conducted trainings and informational workshops for local communities.
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	Development / strengthening of institutions is rated Modest. "The project promoted strong public involvement in decision-making through the Park Management Committee, leading to the signing of conservation agreements with park dwellers on significant tracts of the park territory. This involvement and budding commitment to conservation should provide the basis for continued progress towards the consolidation of the TSP." 140 conservation agreements (TACs) signed with land owners of the buffer zone
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The conservation agreements with landowners will be critical for enforcement of sustainable use guidelines in the park.
Implementing Structures and Arrangements	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	Client's policy / program implementation : Rated Substantial "Despite poor execution of the grant, project activities were very important to support and give visibility to the State's effort to preserve the TSP."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	Although the participative park management committee is not yet operational, the project has strengthened the capacity of existing management structures.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes	10 pilot microwatersheds in PBZ adopt sustainable use practices (implementation of activities -supported by the Microbasias II Project-, surpassing the planned targets); and pilot activity implemented in two of the three Indigenous Peoples' lands located in the Park area.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes	The project has piloted sustainable use practices and activities.

Criteria / Categorization of	Document	Verification	Comment
------------------------------	----------	--------------	---------

Results / Investment	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	No financial mechanisms were established to promote alternative livelihoods or sustainable use practices.


















Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="Y - Yes"/>	Replicability is rated Likely. "The tools being used to consolidate the park (mainly the signing of conservation agreements) clearly show a way forward for this type of effort in other locations."
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="UA - Unable to assess"/>	The information in the TE report does not provide any evidence of replication during the project's lifetime, but the tools and processes used to consolidate park management can be applied elsewhere.
Upscaling ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Based on the TE report there is no evidence of upscaling efforts or expanding the area affected by project activities.
Mainstreaming ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Again, based on the TE report, there is no evidence that the processes and methods used for this project are being mainstreamed to state-wide or nation-wide park management policies.



















Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document				
Environmental Stress Reduction ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments
		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site		TE report notes a decrease in number of infractions
		N - No	Systemic		No evidence of stress reduction systemwide.
	Add New Row...				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.			
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments

		Y - Yes	Demonstration Site		TE report notes a decrease in number of infractions.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
Environmental Status Change 	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
		N - No			No evidence of evidence of environmental status changes.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
Socioeconomic Status Change 	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
		N - No			No measurement of socioeconomic changes due to project activities.	Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				
Arrangements for Impact M&E 	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	Visibility	Comments			
		Y - Yes	Public-access management information monitoring system established.			Edit Delete
		Add New Row...				

TE Report Quality

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	
	Agency	NA - Not Applicable	




Outcome Assessment 	Review:	No agency review.	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Outcome assessment is brief and does not refer to the project goal as stated in the ProDoc Log
Consistency 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess.
Sustainability Assessment 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	No assessment of sustainability along various dimensions.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Lessons and recommendations are based on the evidence about the project's implementation experience.
Clear Financial Assessment 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Since no GEF funds were disbursed, only the co-financing contributions are detailed.
M&E Assessment 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	The report does not assess M&E design and includes only a brief assessment of how M&E activities were implemented.

Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	At the outcome level the TE report does not compare results to indicators. However at the output level, actual outputs are compared to planned outputs.
Consultation with Stakeholders 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess.
Compliance with Guidances 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information in the TE report to assess.
Compliance with UNEG Norms 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not applicable for a WB MSP.
Addressing of ToR requests 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No ToR was issued.
Independence of Report 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	Report prepared by Task Team Leader.




Review:

 **Lessons & Recommendations**



Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Capacity Building		The need for a good ex-ante institutional capacity assessment cannot be emphasized enough. Good previous performance of a proposed implementing agency does not directly translate into good future performance; institutional capacity must be re-assessed under each new set of circumstances.	 Edit  Delete
 Add New Row...			



Type of Recommendation	If other type, please specify	Recommendations	
Stakeholder Involvement		For those really interested in the conservation of the TSP for the enjoyment and pride of the SC population, continue to persevere and be active in the participatory management of the TSP; it is the only way forward. Voice your concerns and be attentive to commercial interests that may attempt to derail efforts to consolidate the conservation of the TSP.	 Edit  Delete
 Add New Row...			

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

A product of the Global Environment Facility