

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2899	
GEF Agency project ID		3658	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP and UNDP	
Project name		Country Support Program for GEF Focal Points	
Country/Countries		128 Countries	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Multi Focal Area	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Capacity Building	
Executing agencies involved		UNEP and UNDP	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		2/27/2006	
Effectiveness date / project start		6/1/2006	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2010	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2010	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		11.9	U/A
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.27	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		11.86	U/A
Total Co-financing		0.27	U/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		12.13	U/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2010	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Hugo Navajas	
TER completion date			
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
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	N/A	N/R	N/R	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	S
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/R	N/R	N/A
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	N/A		N/R	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the Global Environmental Objectives of the project is to strengthen the capacity of the GEF focal points to effectively carry out their mandates for supporting global environmental programs in their countries and constituencies, including the improvement of overall national and constituency coordination of global environmental issues (PD, 3).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the immediate objectives of the project is to *'build the capacity of focal points to better prioritize, design, implement, coordinate and monitor global environmental projects. Specifically, the project will provide direct funding to support activities within the areas mentioned above, develop a country and constituency knowledge management framework and deliver targeted capacity building activities through sub-regional information exchange and training workshops'* (PD, 3).

Activities under the project were designed around the following three components:

Component 1: Country-Specific Assistance based on National Work Plans

These activities will contribute to building the capacity of countries to develop global environmental projects in a more strategic manner, and develop a capacity to coordinate and monitor global environmental activities. Specific outputs under this component included:

- Implementation Structures and Processes developed and established
- Strategic national work plans developed and implemented
- Financial Reports prepared and reviewed.

Component 2: Development of a GEF Country and Constituency Knowledge Management Framework

A GEF knowledge management framework will be developed, during the second half of 2006, to support GEF focal points to carry out their duties to enhance national participation in GEF activities. Specific outputs under this component included:

- Country Support Program Unit strengthened
- GEF focal points' needs for capacity, guidance and training materials and tools compiled

- Capacity, guidance and training materials and tools developed
- Existing IA and GEF knowledge management frameworks surveyed
- GEF focal point knowledge management framework built and maintained containing information exchange forums, guidance documents, information and data.

Component3: Targeted capacity building activities provided to support GEF focal points to carry out their activities based on their expressed needs.

Building upon the knowledge management framework, this component was to provide targeted information exchange and training workshops at the sub-regional level for GEF focal points based on their expressed needs, beginning in early 2007. Specific outputs under this component included:

- GEF focal points’ priorities for capacity building activities compiled
- Information exchange and targeted capacity building materials, methodologies and tools, as outlined in Output 2.3 adapted to support sub-regional specific contexts in response to expressed needs
- Sub-regional information exchange and training workshops conducted for GEF focal point – a total of up to 9 sub-regional workshops per year beginning in 2007

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

No.

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 program was relevant to country needs as it was built on the requests from the GEF Focal Points of recipient countries for capacity building and financial support to strengthen their ability to carry out their coordination role. The program was also developed in response to the evaluation of the first focal point support program, and the recommendation of the three GEF Overall Performance Studies as well as the 3rd Replenishment of the GEF Trust Funds. These performance studies and evaluations highlighted the importance of strengthening the national capacities to develop manage and mainstream GAFF projects. These studies identified limitations in the information and tools available to GEF Focal Points, as well as unclear mandates, weak inter-agency coordination and low civil society engagement in GEF programming. They recommended making Focal Points more effective advocates for GEF programs and

global environmental issues through better coordination, information dissemination and understanding of GEF policies and practices.

The demand for more systematic support led to pilot initiatives such as *Strengthening National Focal points and Enhancing Constituency Coordination in GEF Recipient Countries* and the *GEF Council Member and Focal Point Support Program*, which were followed by the *Country Dialogue Workshops (CDWs)* and *National Dialogue Initiative (NDI)*. The experiences and lessons drawn from these initiatives were fed into the design of the Country Support Program. In this respect, the Country Support Program was part of an evolving and increasingly comprehensive approach to capacity building by GEF. This program for Focal Points operationalizes GEF/C.25/9, *Elements for Strengthening National Focal points and Enhancing Constituency Coordination in GEF Recipient Countries*, taking into consideration previous and current efforts by the GEF to address country needs and empower focal points. It is consistent with the GEF Operational Strategy for capacity building and its strategic priority 2.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for Effectiveness, but states that “(e)ffectiveness is the CSP’s most outstanding quality...” (TE, pg 31). Based on the evidence in the TE, this TER assesses effectiveness of the project as ‘satisfactory’.

The most important contributions of the project were in terms of (i) better understanding and application of GEF policies and procedures, (ii) more effective communications with GEF partners (GEF Secretariat and GEF agencies), and (iii) enhanced peer-to-peer learning and exchange between Focal Points. Funding support for countries, while modest, has enhanced the articulation of national priorities for GEF support, expanded stakeholder involvement, built databases and strengthened institutional memory. The project has had, however, less effect on improving in-country project design and monitoring practices.

Details of the achievement of project outputs under three components of the project are given below:

Component 1: Country-Specific Assistance based on National Work Plans

Work plans were prepared and direct funding support was provided to 89 countries out of target of 128, representing 69.5% of eligible countries. Although in-country monitoring was not conducted to verify implementation and use of funds but focal point surveys carried out under the TE indicate improvements in the assessment^[1] and articulation of national environmental^[1] priorities for GEF support. This was followed by^[1] expanded/improved stakeholder involvement (a^[1] key aspect of the consultative process) and improvements in the institutional memory. In addition, financial support for 65 Constituency meetings indirectly helped multi-country coordination and development of policy positions. The web-based financial tracking and reporting system was developed, but TE notes this system to be underutilized and as a weak component of the project. According to the TE, ‘*Component 1 has had less effect in improving the financial tracking and monitoring of GEF projects, or in raising the quantity and quality of project proposals*’ (TE16, 17).

Component 2: Development of a GEF Country and Constituency Knowledge Management Framework

Most of the activities under this component revolved around the Country Support Program (CSP) Knowledge Facility (KF) website launched to provide quick access of information and knowledge materials to GEF Focal Points (FPs) as well as provide them the opportunity to organize discussion forums with other FPs. According to the TE, The KF website was designed in accordance to the user needs, through consultations with GEF Evaluation office and partner agencies, and review of the existing GEF website. It offered a variety of products and services in three languages. Specific areas where knowledge management framework contributed to strengthening the ability of FP includes improved understanding of GEF policies/procedures, better access to information /experiences of other countries and stronger capacities for developing, coordinating and monitoring GEF projects. These aspects were specifically relevant in closing gaps caused by Focal Point turnover, and in guiding the development of proposal for GEF funding. However, there was little interest and use of KF discussion forum and constituency pages. As TE notes, several Focal Points were reluctant to initiate on-line discussions and were more inclined on joining ongoing forum.

The KF website is well maintained and adjusted on the basis of user surveys, except that some country pages were not regularly updated by FPs (TE, 21), which lowered the website's potential utility. According to the surveys conducted during the TE, overall, the KF website had medium/high usefulness to the needs of FPs. In terms of number of FPs using website at a particular point of time, the responses given to the evaluation survey reveal that almost three-quarters of GEF Focal Points had used the website between 2007 and 2008, with almost 30% using it on a monthly basis or more often. However, a similar percentage - 27% - claim to "never" use the website. TE notes that website use may not necessarily follow a linear pattern and vary according to the stage of the country's GEF cycle, changes in GEF guidelines, turnover of Focal Points and other factors.

Component3: Targeted capacity building activities provided to support GEF focal points to carry out their activities based on their expressed needs.

As per the planned outputs under this component, FP capacity building needs were initially assessed through sub-regional consultations under the National Dialogue Initiative (NDI) and online surveys that formed the basis for Sub-regional information exchange and training workshops.

According to the survey conducted by the evaluation, Sub-regional Workshops (SRWs) formed the most 'visible and highly valued' aspect of the project (TE, 24). A total of 26 workshops (as planned) were organized till June 2010 with over 1200 participants, including 665 Operational and Political Focal Points representing over 120 countries. Focal Point survey responses provide examples of knowledge benefits, yet the scale or percentage cannot be quantified with the available information. Almost three-quarters of surveyed Focal Points apply capacities acquired at SRWs to a high /very high degree.

These Sub-regional workshops enabled direct communication and helped building rapport between the GEF partners and Focal points as well as provided opportunity for face-to-face meetings between Focal Points from the same country. Project lacks systematic documentation of example of FP capabilities strengthened due to SRWs. But assessments from the TE indicate that the SRWs have, in particular, improved Focal Point understanding of GEF policies and procedures to a high/very high degree. Other SRW contributions include: Learning from exchanges with Focal Points, improved coordination with GEF Partners and GEFSec in particular, improved interaction with the GEF Evaluation Office, exposure to successful projects and "best practices", and enhanced opportunities for peer to peer learning. According to the assessments by the TE, SRWs also helped operationalizing the 4th GEF programming cycle, and contributed to the formulation of GEF 5 policies and procedures.

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

The TE didn't assign a rating to project efficiency. Based on the evidence in the TE, this TER assigns a rating of 'moderately satisfactory' to project efficiency.

Overall, as per assessments in the TE, the project was implemented in a cost-effective manner despite its global scale and travel intensive costs that increased over time. There were no significant budget shortfalls or gaps, and financial savings were re-allocated to hire staff and extend some project activities. Some of the measures adopted during project helped efficient use of the funds. For Instance, the merging of managerial posts with those of the National Dialogue Initiative (NDI) generated savings that supported additional full time specialist. Also, design of the components of the knowledge Facility website using existing project team expertise, saved additional funds that were channeled to support Sub-regional workshops. As TE notes, the overall performance of the implementing agencies was well worth the 7% service fees as implementation of the project involved considerable work and high transaction costs, especially related to processing of annual expenditure statements and progress reports for up to 89 countries that proved to be quite labor intensive for UNEP, which, according to the TE, had put more work into the component than reflected in the fees received.

However, as per assessments under the TE, annual reporting and processing requirements for the direct funding support module (component 1) were excessively complex. Focal Points were discouraged in using funds for small expenditures due to the strict bidding requirements. These factors, combined with the small grant size, discouraged a number of eligible countries from participating – contributing to a significant unspent balance under component 1. These combined factors lower the cost effectiveness of key component (1) of the project. TE opines that approval of larger allocation and/or more intermittent reporting would have lowered project's transaction costs and raised cost effectiveness (TE, 36).

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

The TE didn't assign a rating to the sustainability aspect of the project. Based on the evidence in the TE narrative, this TER assesses the sustainability of project outcomes to be 'moderately likely'. Sustainability is further assessed along four dimensions as detailed below:

Financial resources: Moderately Likely

The TE didn't assign a rating on this aspect. This project was mainly related to capacity building of the Focal Points and as the project document also recognizes, training of Focal Points is, by definition, an ongoing activity and would need continued support. The TE also notes that 'the clearest manifestation of sustainability at this stage is the GEF Council's decision to extend CSP beyond 2010' (TE, 17). Given the likelihood of GEF council extending the CSP program, this TER assesses the availability of financial resources to sustain main outcomes under the project as 'moderately likely'.

Socio political: Not applicable

Institutional framework and governance: Moderately Likely

The TE didn't assign a rating to this aspect. Based on the expected outcomes mentioned in the PD and evidence in the TE narrative, this TER assesses the rating to be 'moderately likely'.

Overall, initiatives taken under the project enhanced the capacity of the Focal Points (FPs) to coordinate GEF projects and activities amongst various stakeholders at the national level. On-line knowledge services enhanced understanding amongst FPs of GEF policies/procedures and strengthened their capacities for developing, coordinating and monitoring GEF projects. The TE notes that the direct communication between Focal Points and GEF secretariat facilitated through the project led to *'the development of their sustained relations beyond the immediate scope of the program'* (TE, 41). Similarly, sub regional workshops organized through the program also enhanced coordination and rapport between Focal Points and GEF partners that is going to continue beyond the project.

However, the stated aim of the project was also to establish sustainable mechanisms for national coordination, and institutionalize knowledge at the country level. In this context the project was to encourage countries to'institutionalize' the functions of the GEF focal points within the relevant government office, rather than vesting them in an 'individual' (PD, 13). As TE notes, while these were reasonable expectations for a country-based project, the analysis needs to consider the project's scale and implementation approach. As a global initiative with responsibilities to 128 countries, the project had limited opportunities (or resources) to engage consistently with national stakeholders. The level of support provided in many cases was insufficient to establish sustainable national coordination mechanisms or institutionalize GEF functions at the country level. The TE states that project neither had in country presence nor the resources to offer support needed to overcome 'internal' factors that undermine sustainability in many countries. In this respect, TE states that a higher profile at the country level is essential to consolidate advances and enhance conditions for post-project sustainability.

Environmental: Not applicable

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 TE doesn't provide any details on project co-financing.

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 was implemented as per schedule.

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:

TE didn't provide comments on the country level ownership of the project.

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 TE didn't assign a rating to M&E design at entry. Based on the review of M&E plan given in the project document and evidence in the TE, this TER assesses M&E design at entry as 'moderately satisfactory'.

The project had provision for UNEP and UNDP monitoring and evaluation procedures including procedures for Annual Project Report (APR), the Tripartite Review (TPR), final evaluation review, and participation in the annual GEF Project Implementation Review. The project Logical Framework included detailed SMART performance indicators for all the components of the project. The project budget supported collecting baselines in terms of compiling needs for GEF focal point capacity, guidance and training materials. However, it was unclear from the project document if the project assigned responsibilities and had a plan for monitoring some of the impact indicators including 'specific examples of how information learned/exchanged through workshops has contributed to strengthening the ability of focal points to carry out their work'. The project logframe indicates 'interviews with Focal Points' as 'source of verification' for such indicators but it's not clear whether this information was to be collected through online surveys or case studies/ personal interviews. In the absence of this information, the TE mission conducted an online survey (covered all 660 FPs who participated in the CSP since its beginning) and designed questionnaire around results/impact based indicators contained in the project document. The TE suggested that provision of a thematic evaluation of GEF capacity development initiatives conducted in a sample of countries, to determine the impact and the extent to which capacity improvements are sustained, would have been more useful, but was not addressed at the time of design of M&E system.

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

The TE didn't assign a rating to the M&E implementation. But as per evidence in the TE, this TER assigns it a rating of 'moderately satisfactory'. According to the TE, the project complied with the monitoring and reporting guidelines required by GEF and the implementing agencies. Annual Project Reports (APRs) and Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) were prepared each year and financial expenditures were tracked. The meetings of the Inter- agency Steering Committee served the function of Tripartite Reviews

(TPRs) by monitoring progress and discussing project issues.

The program team closely monitored implementation of the project. The second and third components were periodically evaluated via user surveys and workshop evaluations, the results of which were fed into planning of the subsequent events. The Knowledge Facility website was also evaluated through user survey and web tracking survey, although consolidated data covering the full project was not present at the time of the evaluation. Overall, TE notes that various reports and documents generated by project management team supported the project’s adaptive management, monitoring and evaluation need.

However, as highlighted by the TE, monitoring of the project was largely event-driven and concerned with output delivery and quality –i.e. workshops and website products – with little attention to the outcomes or effects resulting from the combined program components. This was also perhaps impractical with project spread over 128 countries, with low-level of in country activity and staffing/resource constraints. The logframe in the project document includes results/impact-based indicators, however, it seems project didn’t have a plan to collect and analyze the required information. In this context, as TE highlights, a thematic evaluation of GEF capacity development initiatives conducted in a sample of countries, to determine the impact and the extent to which capacity improvements are sustained, would have been more useful (TE, 38).

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
--	-----------------------------

The TE didn’t assign a rating to the quality of project execution. Based the evidence in the TE, this TER assessed the quality of project implementation/execution as ‘satisfactory’.

This project was designed around three components - Component 1 was implemented by UNEP and Component 2 and 3 were implemented by UNDP. There were no executing agency intermediaries used in this project. According to the TE, the project delivered its outputs on schedule with commendable levels of responsiveness to user needs and quality, reflecting on the performance of the program team (hosted by UNDP) and UNEP staff responsible for the first Component. The TE notes that the project components generated significant workload demands for the UNEP and UNDP/UNOPS staff who responded effectively to the challenges of implementing a global –level initiative. UNEP was involved in reviewing expenditure reports, processed and disbursed direct support funding to up to 89 countries each year, entailing tremendous amount of work. The program team also got tremendous support from UNDP’s country office network in meeting the demands of organizing eight sub-regional workshops every year that required considerable lead-time to organize and significant staff resources and oversight to conduct.

The TE notes that *‘the program team demonstrated strong adaptive management capabilities. In particular, the program team has shown high levels of responsiveness in adapting work plans and implementing changes in program execution, based on Focal Point and GEF partner feedback’*. Except that the project would have benefitted from a more robust M&E design, in terms of spelling out a clear strategy for tracking some of the impact indicators as indicated in Section 6.1 above, overall, the performance of the program team can be considered satisfactory.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Not Applicable
----------------------------------	------------------------

See above.

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.

Not relevant

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.

Not relevant

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

b) Governance

The project's knowledge management and exchange components were designed to equip focal points as catalysts for strengthening national capacities to program GEF resources, expand stakeholder coordination and institutionalize knowledge. According to the TE, impact of such initiatives taken under the project has not been documented on a systematic basis. Anecdotal examples provided to the evaluation team include: countries have developed database of GEF projects and related issues, and expanded stakeholder consultation on environmental priorities for GEF funding.

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.

None.

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.

This aspect is not relevant for a project of this nature.

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 provides the following key lessons:

1. The availability of administrative and logistical support at the country level has been key for the CSP in general and Sub-regional Workshops in particular.
2. There are methodological challenges in evaluating the capacity effects of a global initiative such as the CSP. A more comprehensive evaluation effort - encompassing a combination of GEF capacity building initiatives - is needed to better understand the aggregate effect of these initiatives on Focal Point performance and GEF programming. A thematic evaluation of GEF's capacity building efforts would provide an interesting option in this respect.
3. Inclusiveness and responsiveness to user needs in global scale capacity building programs is critical for success, provided it does not overwhelm the absorptive capacity of target clients.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations:

1. GEFSec needs to ensure that the capacity benefits of the CSP and Sub- Regional Workshops in particular do not diminish, as the scale of participants (and expectations) expand during the next project phase.
2. The Sub-regional Workshops and Knowledge Facility website offer long- term mechanisms for interaction with country Focal Points, and should be used more intensively by the GEF Secretariat and implementing agencies.
3. Direct funding support for countries (Component 1) should be more closely coordinated with National Dialogues during the next phase of the CSP.
4. During the next phase, consideration should be given to incorporating the Knowledge Facility website (or selected tools) into the GEF web page.
5. The continued participation of GEF Agencies is important for practical and political reasons.
6. A gradual transfer of project functions and responsibilities is recommended to sustain momentum and effectiveness between program phases.

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 provides a detailed assessment of achievements of the objectives. The TE was constrained by the lack of in-country monitoring and evaluation of impact indicators, which is further linked to methodological challenges in assessing impact of capacity effects of global initiative of this nature.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE didn't provide any ratings and it may be possible that ratings were not required at the time of the evaluation. Report is largely consistent and evidence presented convincing.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE doesn't provide a rating on sustainability but broadly gives an assessment of sustainability of a project of this nature.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE provides a comprehensive list of lessons learned which are supported by the evidence presented in different relevant sections of the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	TE doesn't provide any information on the actual project costs and co financing used.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE adequately covers and highlights some of the main issues concerning project's M&E system.	S
Overall TE Rating = S		S

$$0.3 \times (5+5) + 0.1 \times (5+5+2+5) = 3 + 1.7 = 4.7$$

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