

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3028	
GEF Agency project ID		3371	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		SFM Safeguarding and Restoring Lebanon's Woodland Resources	
Country/Countries		Lebanon	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		15-Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management LD-3-Investing in innovative approaches in SLM	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment of the Government of Lebanon	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Through consultation in project steering committees	
Private sector involvement		Private Nurseries and Land Owners: Partners in providing land needed for project trials and in replicating project activities	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		12/16/2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		12/16/2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 31, 2012	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.98	0.98
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.83	1.33
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.45	12.08
	Private sector		0.03
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		0.98	0.98
Total Co-financing		1.28	13.43
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.26	14.41
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2014	
Author of TE		Philip Tortell	
TER completion date		2/27/2016	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Caroline Laroche	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	NA	NR	NR	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		NR	NR	MU
M&E Design*		S	NR	MU
M&E Implementation**		MS	NR	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	NR	MS
Quality of Execution		S	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	NR	S

*M&E Design, Plan and Budget

**Use of LogFrame and Adaptive Management

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objective was "the generation of multiple and interconnected global environmental benefits by assisting the Government of Lebanon to make its efforts towards combating land degradation more sustainable, an assurance that biodiversity values are conserved, and a contribution to the stabilization of climate and regional ground water systems." (Project Document p.6) Forests in Lebanon protect an important groundwater aquifer, which supports life for millions of people. Conversion from animal husbandry, agriculture, housing, industry, infrastructure and other activities has damaged Lebanon's vegetation cover, leading to soil erosion and threatening ecosystem integrity. This project will address this problem by mainstreaming SLM principles into national policies and frameworks, using the forestry sector as a vehicle.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective is "to develop a strategy for safeguarding and rehabilitating Lebanon's woodland resources and assist its implementation through capacity building and execution of appropriate SLM [Sustainable Land Management] policies and practices." (Project doc p.5) The project's long term goal is "to create an enabling environment and capacity for sustainable land management as a contribution to greater ecosystem stability, enhanced food security and improved rural livelihoods." (Project document p.5)

The project will achieve this objective through three outcomes:

- 1: an appropriate management framework and management capacities for the safeguarding and restoration of degraded forest areas.
- 2: A set of innovative technologies and instruments for the rehabilitation of forests and woodlands, and their subsequent sustainable management, has been designed and validated in pilot areas.
- 3: Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management.

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

No changes in the project’s Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities were noted.

4. GEF IEO 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 TE rates relevance as ‘relevant’. This TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as Satisfactory. The project is relevant to the government of Lebanon, which has made combating land degradation a priority. To fulfill its obligation under the UNCCD, Lebanon has prepared a National Action Programme (NAP). This project builds on efforts initiated by the Lebanese government in the preparation of the National Action Programme, which identified the degradation of forests and woodlands as one of the main factors for desertification. This project is thus in line with government efforts, as the Government of Lebanon has initiated several projects, including a large-scale reforestation programme. (Project Document p.7)

The project is also relevant to GEF priorities under Operational Program #15: “Sustainable Land Management” as it addresses issues of inappropriate land uses, specifically deforestation and forest degradation. It is also relevant to GEF’s Strategic Priority 1 “Targeted Capacity Building” and Priority 2 of “Implementation of Innovative and Indigenous Sustainable Land Management Practices” (SLM-2). (Project document p.7) Other areas of the GEF Operational Strategy supported by the project include the promotion of the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in arid and semi-arid zone ecosystems (OP-1), and forest ecosystems (OP-3), as well as integrated ecosystem management (OP-12). (Project Document p.8)

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

The TE does not provide an overall effectiveness rating. This TER rates project effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory. The project has largely achieved its objective of developing a strategy for safeguarding and restoring Lebanon’s woodland resources developed and under implementation through capacity building and execution of appropriate SLM policies and practices. The Project

Management Unit reports that the strategy developed is being implemented by the Government. The project has built capacity at various levels, and appropriate sustainable land management policies have been partly developed. However, the TE notes that at an outcome level the project had varied success, largely due to a flawed project design that contained both outputs and outcomes which were outside of the control of the project team.

The project's achievements under its three main outcomes are described below:

1: An appropriate management framework and management capacities for the safeguarding and restoration of degraded forest areas. The TE rates attainment of this outcome as Moderately Unsatisfactory. The TE notes that the clear results sought in this outcome of a management framework for safeguarding and restoration of degraded forest areas were beyond the direct influence of the project, which should have been foreseen at the project design stage. A management framework was developed by the Ministry of Agriculture, which had developed a huge reforestation project called "the 40 million trees project", and this project is part of the steering committee for the 40 million trees project. Only one of the five main outputs under this outcome can be assessed as having been achieved, that of human capacities for design, implementation and monitoring of forest restoration measures being strengthened. Training of representatives of 63 municipalities on implementation, maintenance and monitoring of newly planted forests was carried out. The others outputs: elaboration of amendments to legal instruments, design of the institutional structure of a government organization which reflects the cross-sectoral nature of land degradation, mainstreaming of cross-sectoral integrated land use planning in the field of land degradation in woodland areas, and establishment of a funding strategy for the country's National Reforestation Plan, were not achieved, although some progress was made. For instance, necessary funds for the launching of the third phase of the National Reforestation Plan were secured, as the project secured 12.08 Million USD from USAID for the implementation of related activities. The project guided and advised the US Forest Service on the launching of the USAID funded project on reforestation, the Lebanon Reforestation Initiative (LRI). (TE p.35) This significant achievement, in the view of the TE, still does not constitute a funding strategy as the output originally calls for.

2: A set of innovative technologies and instruments for the rehabilitation of forests and woodlands, and their subsequent sustainable management, has been designed and validated in pilot areas. The TE rates the attainment of this outcome as satisfactory. Three sets of innovative technologies and instruments for the rehabilitation of forests and woodlands were implemented. 18 different low-cost methods were tested, 9 of which were proven successful and less expensive than current methods. Some techniques, such as rechargeable and non-rechargeable solid waters, and direct sowing of seeds were first introduced to the country by the project. (TE p.37) Of the six outputs planned under this outcome, four have been achieved, while one is outside the scope of the project, and for another attainment is unclear. The project created economic incentives to conduct woodland rehabilitation and management for local communities and private persons; it implemented afforestation and ecosystem restoration measures on public land using participatory approaches; it delegated responsibilities and duties for forests to a communal level, strengthening local stewardship, and finally the project contracted municipalities for enforcement of regulations regarding protection of forests. One output on

which attainment is unclear was strengthening the role of the private sector as provider of services and goods strengthened, as the evidence provided by the project focused on training and capacity building in innovative seedling production, rather than the target output. This outcome’s final output, good practice for woodland areas integrated into the National Reforestation Plan, was outside the control of the project, however the project did offer good practices for incorporation into the National Reforestation Plan.

3: Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management. The TE rates attainment of this outcome as Moderately Satisfactory. The TE judges that this outcome is not a true outcome, as it focuses on “a collection of disparate actions rather than a result.” The project’s performance was monitored and evaluated by UNDP through quarterly meetings, the Ministry of Environment through quarterly meetings with the minister, the Project Steering Committee, annual PIR reports and a midterm evaluation. However, these are functions of management rather than project outputs. The baseline situation of Land Degradation was carried out through a partner organization, FAO, thus this achievement cannot be attributed to the project. In order to meet the output that project results and lessons learnt are disseminated for replication, a project technical report was planned to be produced and disseminated in December 2014. The two other planned outputs under this outcome- “project understood by the government as a national cross-sectoral effort” and “awareness of decision makers and the concerned communities for the importance of forest ecosystems for sustainable livelihood increased” - are vague and poorly defined, thus it is not possible to discern whether they have been achieved or not based on the evidence presented.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for efficiency, although the TE rates financial planning and management as Satisfactory. This TER rates efficiency as satisfactory. The TE notes that budget management, and especially co-financing, was well done. Actual expenditure was generally in line with planned expenditure, though project administration and management was about 20% over original budget and monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and management about 25% over original budget, while the first two outcomes were both under budget. (TE p.27) Overall the project was slightly under budget. The project successfully leveraged much higher than expected levels of co-financing, as USD 13.43 million was realized compared to an expected 1.23 million. The project was originally planned to be implemented for five years but was extended to six. (TE p.17)

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not present an overall rating for sustainability, but does rate the four dimensions of socio-political, institutional, financial, and environmental sustainability separately. This TER concludes that there are sufficient risks to rate sustainability of project outcomes as Moderately Unlikely, due to an unstable socio-political situation and a lack of research and analytical work on the forests created by the project as ecosystems.

Financial sustainability: The TE rates financial sustainability as Moderately Unlikely (TE) as, due to the current political situation in Lebanon, support for the techniques and methods promoted by the projects

are not supported universally within the central government. However, noting the success of the project in securing co-financing and funding from other multilaterals such as USAID for follow on projects, it seems that continued external aid funding is likely. Thus this TER upgrades financial sustainability to Moderately Likely.

Socio-political sustainability: The TE rates socio-political sustainability as Moderately Unlikely, and this TER agrees with that rating. There is instability within the country and region, and the Syrian refugee crisis is currently putting pressure on land and natural resources, as well as on infrastructure and social support systems. (TE p.43) This instability is a threat to sustainability of project outcomes, as it leads to changes in government at both the national and local level, jeopardizing commitments made to the project's objectives. Additionally, the final PIR notes that one of the seven project pilot sites was grazed by local shepherds who disputed their rights in the lands in question, thus a socio-political risk appears to exist in terms of land disputes. (PIR2014 p.4)

Institutional sustainability: The TE rates institutional sustainability as Moderately Likely, and this TER agrees with that rating. (TE p.43) The project has been successful in building institutional capacity, and has built a strong sense of ownership in country. Threats in institutional sustainability come from the split in mandates between the Ministry of Agriculture, which has both the expertise and legal mandate for forests, but lacks financial resources, and the Ministry of Environment, which was given responsibility and resources for reforestation by a government decision, but which is lacking technical expertise and human capacity to carry this mandate out. Lack of effective cooperation between the Ministries of Agriculture and Environmental is an institutional threat at the central government level. However, the Ministry of Environmental has proposed that the Ministry of Agricultural take the lead role for reforestation activities, with a steering advisory committee facilitating coordination between all relevant actors. Though this collaboration has not yet taken place as proposed, this is still a positive development for institutional sustainability. (TE p.44)

Environmental sustainability: The TE rates environmental sustainability as moderately unlikely, and this TER agrees with that rating. The main threat to sustainability of environmental outcomes of the project has been the lack of active management and monitoring of the woodland created or restored through the project. The TE notes that it does not appear that consideration of the forests being planted as ecosystems has taken place sufficiently. For example, "seedlings have been planted on land which may or may not have been forested in the past, without any recognition of existing ecosystem services, species at risk or other ecological values." (TE p.44) Additionally, the final PIR notes that there is a risk of forest fires to environmental sustainability of project sites. (PIF 2014 p.4)

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 project was quite successful in mobilizing co-financing, which ultimately represented 93% of the project's budget. The budget from co-financing was crucial to achievement of project goals and supported in particular capacity building exercises, as well as the contracts issued to municipalities for reforestation of degraded lands. (TE p.28)

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?

Project documents and the TE are somewhat inconsistent on the length of project extension. The final PIR notes that the project was extended by 6 months, however the project document indicates the project was originally meant to cover five years, and the TE states that the project ultimately covered 6 years. According to the Final PIR the project extension to December 2014 was necessary to allow the project management to deliver additional activities which were not initially planned per the project document, related to follow up operations. (PIR 2014, p.3) The TE notes that the project experienced delays but does not explain their nature.

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:

The TE rates stakeholder participation, ownership and partnership arrangements as Satisfactory. The project was executed through the Ministry of Environment. The TE notes that "the project worked through existing government and non-governmental institutions to ensure ownership and the integration of project activities into the mainstream of district development plans, community plans and aspirations." (TE p.44)

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 Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE rates M&E Design, Plan and Budget as Satisfactory, however this TER downgrades that rating to Moderately Unsatisfactory due to the poor quality of the project’s logical framework and indicators. The organization setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation provided in the project documents are good and sufficient. The total M&E budget provided in the project document is USD \$165,275. The M&E plan includes an inception report, baseline assessment, midterm and final evaluation, as well as other activities related to project monitoring at pilot sites. Complete baseline information was provided. (TE p.29)

However the project’s logical framework is flawed. One project outcome, Monitoring, learning, adaptive feedback and management, does not truly qualify as a project outcome, as it is part of project management. Additionally, as mentioned in the effectiveness section, various outputs are outside of the project’s control. Finally, most of what are labeled in the logical framework as “indicators” are very vague and often read more like results, for example, indicators for Outcome 2, (A set of innovative technologies and instruments for the rehabilitation of forests and woodlands, and their subsequent sustainable management, has been designed and validated in pilot areas) are “innovative technologies” and “participatory approach.” (PD p. Annex A)

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

The TE does not rate M&E Implementation, but gives a rating of Moderately Satisfactory for “Use of Log Frame and Adaptive Management.”(TE p.8) This TER rates M&E implementation as Moderately Satisfactory. The TE notes that the project did carry out some M&E activities. The project accepted and followed up on all key mid-term evaluation recommendations, an indication of adaptive management. (There is also a note in the TE that the project disputed the findings of the Mid-term Evaluation, in that “the Project Management made comments that have not been addressed and there was an overall feeling that the evaluator did not give the project a fair evaluation.”(TE p.32) However, the TE also notes that neither of the primary tools for monitoring, namely PSC meetings and PIRs, were used effectively. (TE p.7) The Project Steering Committee had met only twice at the time of the TE, as well as one meeting of the Project Board. The PIRs do report on indicator data.

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: Moderately Satisfactory
--	---------------------------------

The project’s implementing agency was UNDP. The TER rated quality of Project Implementation as Satisfactory, and project governance as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER downgrades that rating slightly to Moderately Satisfactory because, based on the evidence provided, although UNDP was effective in its supervisory role, the poor project design hampered effectiveness. According to the TE the Project Steering Committee was ineffective, only having met twice when the terminal evaluation was carried out. Despite this, UNDP seems to have provided adequate technical support to the project management unit. (TE p.33)

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

The project’s Executing Agency was the Ministry of Environment (MoE). The TE rates executing performance as Satisfactory, and rates project administration and management as Satisfactory. The MoE’s role was “to facilitate project implementation and ensure that internal monitoring and review systems were in place.” Of project administration and management, the TE notes that “management style was low key and democratic, consultative, effective, with good leadership,” and that the project had developed excellent rapport with stakeholders, facilitating interaction among relevant public organizations, research institutions and private organizations. (TE p.8)

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 in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. 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.

The project has piloted and demonstrated techniques for the propagation, seeding, planting and managing of native forest species in pursuit of reforestation. As a result of the project 191.45 hectares of degraded lands were restored in degraded areas through 48 contracts issued by the Ministry of Environment to different municipalities. (TE p.37)

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.

The TE does not note any socioeconomic changes resulting from the project.

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 worked successfully on building capacity under its second outcome, and the TE notes that this work has led to a number of intermediate impacts, namely stronger capacity, heightened awareness, demonstrations, tools and methods for reforestations. The project trained representatives of 63 municipalities on the implementation, maintenance and monitoring of newly planted forests. The impact of this training is evident in the positive results at project sites and the readiness of partners to replicate project methods. (TE p.36)

b) Governance

There have been developments in governance over the course of the project but they are not directly attributable to the project. The Ministry of Agriculture developed a management framework for the safeguarding and restoration of degraded forest areas, as well as a reforestation project to which this project served as advisors on the Project Steering Committee. The TE stresses that the split in responsibility between the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture remains.

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.

A potential unintended noted in the TE is that “without further research and analysis and without active management and monitoring, the resulting woodland may turn out to be a less resilient and robust ecosystem and maybe less valuable (from the human perspective) than the one it has replaced.” P.45 Though the TE is not stating that this has occurred, it is a potential impact of the project resulting from insufficient active management and monitoring of woodlands created by the project, as well as a lack of research and analytical work in planning the forests as ecosystems. (TE p.44)

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 project facilitated securing USD12 million from USAID for reforestation activities under the LRI (Lebanon Reforestation Initiative). The project guided the US Forest Service in the restoration of 475 ha of degraded land in the country, and ensures that work was aligned with the National Reforestation Plan. (TE p.42)

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 best time for a Terminal Evaluation to take place is between four and two months before project closure, preferably when the Project Terminal Report is available and the PMU is still functioning. The TE should be timed to allow the evaluator to present Preliminary Findings at the end of the mission to the last meeting of the PSC.

A project which, through flawed design, has unattainable outcomes, must be allowed adequate flexibility during the formulation phase (PPG) to strengthen or replace outcomes.

(TE p.49-50)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The PMU, with the endorsement of both MoE and UNDP, should organize a Sustainability/Exit Workshop inviting all known stakeholders and others who may have an interest in the project's products, services and other benefits. At the Workshop, the PMU will outline the gains made by the project and seek an expression of interest from specific stakeholders for taking over and sustaining each gain. Ideally, this should be followed by an official exchange of letters handing over, and accepting, the responsibility.

It is recommended that the PMU should identify an organization that is to inherit its data, information and knowledge. This cache must be well organized and handed over together with the associated hardware and software. An undertaking must be obtained from the project's successor that the cache will be made accessible to all who require it for the better management of reforestation activities and forest ecosystems in general.

It is recommended that the Ministry of Environment, with the support of UNDP, and in cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture and relevant NGOs, collaborate to formulate a joint proposal for a project which will research and monitor the comparative ecological benefits of various land use practices. The investigations should also cover the comparative effectiveness of planted forests and those allowed to regenerate naturally through effective protection. UNDP could advise on an appropriate source of funding support.

(TE p.50)

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 IEO 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 report contains a detailed assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	There are slight inconsistencies, such as over the length of project extension, however for the most part evidence is complete and convincing, and ratings are substantiated.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides a detailed assessment of the four dimensions of sustainability.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned section is quite brief, and cannot be described as comprehensive.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project provides total costs and costs per outcome, as well as detailed information on project co-financing and the outcomes attributed to, going into more detail than usual.	HS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Ratings for the project's M&E system seem inflated, although the quality of the content of the TE's evaluation of M&E is adequate. One shortcoming is that the TE It does not discuss adaptive management in detail.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

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

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.