

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3134	
GEF Agency project ID		3690	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Implementing Pilot Climate Change Adaptation Measures in Coastal Areas of Uruguay	
Country/Countries		Uruguay	
Region		Latin America	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Strategic Priorities for Adaptation	
Executing agencies involved		National Environment Directorate and Costal Departments	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		One NGO was contracted to develop educational programs	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		January 9, 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 25, 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 24, 2012	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.03	0.03
	Co-financing	0.01	0.01
GEF Project Grant		0.98	0.98
Co-financing	IA own	0.17	0.17
	Government	2.73	3.12
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.02	0.02
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1.00	1.00
Total Co-financing		2.93	3.32
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3.93	4.32
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2015	
Author of TE		Sandra Cesilini	
TER completion date		February 11, 2016	
TER prepared by		Matteo Borzoni	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	N/R	N/R	N/R	Satisfactory
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	N/R	N/R	Likely
M&E Design	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Satisfactory
M&E Implementation	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of Implementation	N/R	Highly satisfactory	N/R	Satisfactory
Quality of Execution	N/R	N/R	N/R	Moderately unsatisfactory
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	Unsatisfactory

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The coastal departments of Uruguay generates 77.6% of the GDP, which are home to domestic and international tourism, real estate development, industrial and small-scale fisheries, navigation, and port services. From an ecological point of view, Uruguay's marine domain is a complex mosaic of interacting ecosystems in the La Plata River estuary and adjoining maritime front. Coastal assets are consequently considered crucial to national development. Most of the policies, projects, and programs implemented to date have focused on addressing problems within a framework that essentially assumes "unchanging" climatic conditions, even though Uruguay has considerable exposure to climatic risks.

This project's global environmental objective is the reduction of Uruguay's coastal ecosystems vulnerability to climate change (Project document, p.22).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective was to put in place adaptive coastal management and land use planning policies and practices to enhance the resilience of Uruguay's coastal ecosystems to climate change.

The project had three expected outcomes which are formulated as follows:

- Outcome 1: the incorporation of climate change risks into national level policies and regulatory frameworks governing coastal area management strengthens Uruguay's systemic capacity for adaptation.
- Outcome 2: Pilot demonstration adaptation measures for ecosystems at risk under predicted climate change are implemented at local level.
- Outcome 3: Knowledge management and evaluation systems facilitate the uptake and replication of climate risk management and adaptation experiences for the coastal areas of Uruguay (project document, p. 7)

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

There were no changes in the project’s global environmental objectives or development objectives. According to the project proposal pilot adaptation measures were supposed to take place in the departments of Canelones and Rocha. During the project implementation, dune recovery interventions (i.e. one form of pilot adaptation measure) were conducted in the departments of Colonia, San José, and Maldonado in addition to the departments of Canelones and Rocha (TE, p. 40 and Project document, p. 26).

Interventions in the fishery sector did not take place because the partner in charge of aquatic resources (i.e. DINARA) did not actively participate in the project. (TE, p.30 and p. 47)

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. (TE p.46) The project objectives are consistent with the needs of the country. Interventions at national and departmental level were designed to build capacity in policy implementation. These included training activities, recruitment of national and international experts and the preparation of technical inputs for policy dialogue.

The outcomes envisaged by the projects are related to the assessments of vulnerability and adaptation to climate change that were carried out under the framework of national studies and Uruguay’s National Communications to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). They are also included in the comprehensive Program of General Measures for Mitigation and Adaptation to Climate Change (PMEGEMA) of Uruguay and incorporated in Uruguay’s Second National Communication (SNC) to the UNFCCC.

During recent stages of the UNFCCC negotiations guidelines to design National Action Plans (NAP) have been developed. Information and data generated by the project are supposed to inform the design of the Uruguay NAP.

The project is also relevant to GEF’S Strategic Priorities for Adaptation output “(a) climate change adaptive capacities have been built and vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change has been reduced.”

The project was supposed to generate global environmental benefits in the GEF biodiversity focal area while implementing measures that strengthen long term adaptive capacity of ecosystems to climate change. It focuses its pilot demonstrations on interventions in the estuarine (mixohaline or fluvio -marine) environment, where freshwater and salt water meet and mix, and the Atlantic Coast environment at the mouth of the La Plata River estuary and along the Atlantic coastal platform where the aquatic environment is saline. These areas have been selected in light of their vulnerability to climate change and their biodiversity value. In particular the estuarine environment has important feeding, nursery and growths area for estuarine and marine fish species and the Atlantic Coast environment has coastal wetlands of international importance.

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

The TE rates effectiveness as Highly Satisfactory. This TER rates effectiveness as Satisfactory. This is because all outcomes can be considered somehow achieved, however for Outcome 2 the project delivered less pilot adaptation measures than expected.

The first outcome deals with adaptive coastal management and land use planning policies and practices. As a result of the project activities municipal development plans in Colonia, Canelones, Montevideo, San Jose, Maldonado and Rocha have been updated to incorporate the implementation of coastal adaptation actions. In addition, the project trained various government level staff (and some civil organization leaders), monitored beach profiles (and consequently sea level and coastal retreat) and set-up an online monitoring system through the Environmental Information System managed by DINAMA (i.e. the executing agency).

The second outcome is about pilot demonstration adaptation measures. Information in the project documents is contradictory regarding the measures that that project was supposed to implement. The last PIR mentions 15 measures to be implemented during the whole project life, while the TER mentions 20. The actual number of adaptation measures implemented was 11, which is much lower than the targets mentioned in all sources. The most probable reason for this were the underestimated costs of adaptation measures at design level.

The third outcome is about knowledge management and it is considered achieved. Vulnerability reduction assessments (VRAs) were implemented in pilot sites in San José, Colonia and the Maldonado Ecoparque (wetland and stream area). Numerous dissemination and information activities were carried out for the general public and practitioners.

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

The TE rates efficiency as Highly Satisfactory. This TER downgrades that rating to Moderately Satisfactory because of several no-cost extensions. Reasons included difficulties in managing a project with different government and administrative levels and a low commitment from one of the partners.

Resources have been properly managed, however financial data included in the TE show that five months before the project end the quantity of resources used for the second outcome amounted to 119% of the original budget. As explained above this is probably due to an underestimation of the pilot adaptation measures at the design stage rather than to an inefficient management of resources.

DINAMA (i.e. the executing agency) has slightly higher project management expenses than originally planned. Actual management expenses amounted to 111% of what was originally budgeted.

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

The TE does not provide an overall rating for Sustainability. This TE rates sustainability as likely. This is because the socio-political context, the institutional framework, the financial aspects and the environmental component all suggest that the benefits delivered by the projects will continue after the end of the intervention.

The TE rates financial sustainability as Likely. This TER also rates financial sustainability as likely. According to the TE it is likely that in the coming years climate change activities will receive at least basic funding from national and subnational level. (TE, p.4) In addition, the outputs delivered by the project do not imply financial dependency.

The TE rates Sociopolitical sustainability as Likely. This TER also rates Sociopolitical sustainability as Likely. Human capacities to sustain the benefits of the project were created at various administrative and government levels (see Section 8 of this TER on capacities).

The TE rates sustainability of institutional framework and governance as Likely. This TER rates sustainability of institutional framework and governance as moderately likely. Recently a National System of Response to Climate Change unit (SNRCC from the Spanish acronyms) has been created by presidential decree. This is an inter-ministerial agency under the direct responsibility of the prime minister. The effect of the creation of SNRCC for the sustainability of the project is unclear. On one hand it clearly identifies clear institutional responsibilities to address climate change issues, on the other hand it risks to undermine the institutional memory of this project since the final responsibility for the continuation of the benefits of the project will be transferred to a unit that did not participate in the implementation of the project (TE, p. 29 and 5).

The TE rates environmental sustainability as likely. This TER also rates environmental sustainability as likely. There is no evidence that the project provoked environmental damages. Various dune ecosystems

have been recovered in coastal departments and a management plan was developed for an important protected area. (TE, p. 40)

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?

According to the project proposal co-financing amounted to 75% of the total budget, however at the end of the project co-financing amounted to 77% of the final allocation. This increase is due to a greater in-kind co-financing from the government. Of the total allocated co-financing value 63% is in kind. Of the cash component the great majority of allocated co-financing comes from the Municipality of Montevideo and it amounts to one million USD (i.e. 70% of all cash co-financing) (calculations based on data reported on page 27 of the TE).

On the basis of the information provided it is not possible to provide conclusions on the effect of co-financing on outcomes and sustainability.

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 suffered important delays. The expected duration was four years, however the actual duration was almost double. There were several no-cost extensions, and the project completion date was ultimately three years later than expected. However, delays do not seem to have affected the sustainability and outcomes of the projects. The main reasons for delays were:

- Lengthy procedures to spend resources from the executing agency
- Lack of political will from one of the partners (i.e. DINARA)
- Lengthy coordination among many involved parties
- Introduction of the National Action Plan (NAP), which required contributions from the project (see above)

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 has rated national ownership as Moderately Satisfactory, however the section of the TE covering national ownership contains little evidence to support this rating. (TE p.23)

Various local authorities have benefited from the project through the implementation of various pilot adaptation measures (municipalities of Colonia, San José, Canellones, Montevideo, Rocha, Maldonado)

but only one of them co-financed the project, that is, the municipality of Montevideo. Moreover, the majority of adaptation measures were not implemented in the municipality of Montevideo. This casts doubts on the ownership of the project by local authorities.

One partner (the National Directorate of Aquatic Resources, i.e. DINARA) showed no real interest in taking part in the project activities, consequently an envisaged pilot action in the fishery sector did not take place. This action was substituted by the organization of a workshop presenting a conceptual model on water dynamics of the pilot sites (TE, p. 30 and p.47).

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: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	----------------------

The TE rated M&E Design at entry as Satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. The design of the M&E system at entry is of good quality. The majority of the logical framework indicators are SMART and present a clear baseline and target values. Some of the indicators were not actually used during monitoring and evaluation exercises thus suggesting that some aspects of the original M&E system could not be operationalized.

Responsibilities for the implementation of the M&E system were clearly defined. A M&E plan and a corresponding budget was developed. The M&E plan included an inception workshop and inception report, RIPS, annual project reports (APR), tripartite reviews of the APR, a steering committee, a mid-term evaluation field visits, and audit.

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

The TE rates M&E execution as Satisfactory, and this TER downgrades that rating to Moderately satisfactory, because some aspects of M&E were not implemented or their implementation was of poor quality.

More specifically the M&E implementation is rated as moderately satisfactory rather than satisfactory for the following reasons:

- Some important indicators of the logical framework were not operationalized since they involved the use of surveys that were not delivered. These indicators are about understanding of climate change coastal risks and costs and perceived ability to respond to future changes in coastal risks.
- The mid-term evaluation was planned in the project proposal (with its relevant budget) however it was not conducted.
The quality of the TE is poor. The great majority of considerations and conclusions are reported without a clear evidence. Moreover, the evidence reported seems to contradict many statements. The report is full of very general enthusiastic statements on the quality of project, which are not explained in concrete terms. The content of many section of the report is not relevant to the title of the same section, and considerations related to different evaluation criteria are mixed together.

Monitoring activities were conducted by the project management unit (PMU). The indicators of the logical framework formed the basis for the monitoring system. A matrix of monitoring activities was elaborated each year to assess the progress in the achievement of products. These were included in each Annual Work Plan (AWP). Each report accounted for targets, indicators, means of verification and the status of implementation of activities.

The number of Project Implementation Reports (PIRS) made available of this TER (i.e. four) is much lower than then number of years this project lasted (i.e. eight). This may be due to a loss of files during or after the project life or to the fact that a PIRs were not developed every year. In general terms of the quality of the PIRs is rather good, however the last available PIR’s description of results contained only narrative and did not clearly pinpoint achieved and missing targets.

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 project implementing agency was UNDP. The TE rates the quality of performance of UNDP as Highly Satisfactory. This TER downgrades that rating to Satisfactory because of some deficiencies in the design of the project.

The quality of the project design was quite positive. The project clearly defined the context and the problem to be addressed. It presented a coherent intervention logic and it mentioned risks and assumptions. However, it did not properly identify pilot adaptation measures and it underestimated their costs. The low involvement of one of the government partner during the implementation also suggests that this partner was not actively involved at the design stage.

The main problem regarding implementation and execution was the excessive duration of the project (with respect to the original expected time). There is no indication in the documents provided that UNDP was responsible for this. The TE specifies communication between the executing agency and UNDP was good and that funds were made available from UNDP (however the TE does not specify whether they have been made available on time). (TE, p.33)

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The project’s executing agency was the Ministry of Housing, Land Use Planning, and Environment (MVOTMA), through the Climate Change Division of the National Directorate of Environment (DINAMA). The TE did not rate quality of project execution. The actual execution time was double the original planned time. This this the main reason why the quality of the project execution is here rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

Main activities have been executed. Not all planned implementation measures have been implemented. Only 11 pilot adaptive measures have been actually implemented out of a much higher planned number (15 according to 2014 RIP and 20 according to the TE). The TE does not include information on the reason for this shortcoming but the most probable reason is an underestimation of the implementation costs of pilot adaptation measures at the design stage.

DINAMA (i.e. the executing agency) has slightly higher project management expenses than originally planned. Actual management expenses amounted to 111% of what was originally budgeted.

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 section of the TE covering impacts does not report any concrete information about environmental changes caused by the project. It only mentions that the impact of the project was a sustained improvement in costal ecosystems and in the conservation of biodiversity in key areas. The project contributed to environmental conservation by implementing recovery measures of dune ecosystems in the costal departments (Page 40 of the TE) and by supporting the development of a management plan for the Laguna de Rocha protected area (page 40 of the TE and page 5 of the 2014 PIR).

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.

Neither the TE nor other provided documents suggest that the project caused any socio-economic change. The only possible socio-economic effect caused by the project could have been in the fishery sector (by setting no-fishing zones). However, the relevant authority for aquatic resources (i.e. DINARA) did not actively take part in the project. This also suggests that the project cause no socio-economic impact.

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 contributed to developing capacities by developing climate forecasting scenarios on sea level with the help of the Faculty of Science of Montevideo, by contributing to studies on the cost estimates of the impact of and adaptation to climate change and by developing scientific papers. In addition, a series of training events on climate change were organized involving numerous civil servants from municipalities, ministries, and teachers. Also, an educational program was developed for students with the help of a local NGO. A book for children on climate change was prepared and a web site on climate change in coastal zones was developed and maintained.

Representatives of the national naval prefectures were trained for measuring beach profiles along with rangers of the Laguna de Rocha protected area, lifeguards and technicians from municipalities. 25 beach profiles were monitored and information are available on line through the environmental information system of DINAMA. Technical documents (including videos) on dune recovery and climate change were developed. Zoning maps on costal vulnerability were developed to be used for future adaptation

measures. A coastal vulnerability index was calculated for the whole project area and the results are now included in the environmental information system of DINAMA (table 8 of the TE, page 34).

b) Governance

The project improved governance in the following way: by providing advice to update the National Biodiversity Strategy, by promoting participatory assessments of vulnerability reductions (AVR), by promoting the update of land-use plans of Colonia, Canelones, Montevideo, San José, Maldonado and Rocha, by developing guidelines for an early warning protocol about the presence of coliform bacteria and cyanobacteria in the waters of the beaches of Montevideo, and by contributing to the design of management plans of protected areas (table 8 of the TE, page 34).

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

No unintended impact resulting from the project is identified in the TE.

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.

According to the TE the project contributed to the development of a National Adaptation Plan, however it does not explain how this contribution took place.

The Project has also contributed to mainstream climate change adaptation concepts into the public debate through the great number of dissemination activities promoted.

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.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Most important recommendations are:

- The government and the UN should mobilize technical and financial resources to continue and broad training programs at departmental and national levels.

- The team that worked at the national level should be employed under the new budgetary framework (which will be issued in December 2015) as technical advisors on climate change.
- CC issues should be addressed in regional development plans.
- Pilot experiences conducted in small towns should be replicated to larger urban centers.
- The results of the vulnerability analysis should have been replicated outside the pilot areas of the project.
- New communication opportunities from the *Ministry of Housing, Land and Environment* (and from DINAMA in particular) should be organized. They should include major events such as a closing workshop to encourage stakeholders to think about the achievements of the project. Stakeholders to be invited should include multilateral agencies that might be interested in supporting further project actions.
- Measurement of beach profiles should continue. A frequency measurement of 15-20 days is suitable. If there is an extreme event (wind, tide, rain) additional measurements should be taken. Measurements should be conducted throughout the Uruguayan coast, with a focus on hot spots characterized by great vulnerability.

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?	Impacts are not explained. The indicators do not reflect their relevant outcomes. A concrete description of the achievements of the objectives is not provided.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Evidence is partial and incomplete. The internal consistency is very poor since very good ratings are provided along with important weaknesses that can easily be spotted. The TE includes very good ratings along with enthusiastic statements, which are not substantiated by concrete evidence.	HU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	There are no considerations on the financial capacity of the beneficiaries to sustain the benefits of the project after the end of the intervention. The exit strategy issue is completely ignored.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are written in a very poor English. Their meaning can only be guessed. They are not justified by a description of the context of the key issue they are supposed to address. They are too general to have any learning value.	HU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	There is a table reporting actual costs per outcome but not per activity. Co-financing is reported only for total values.	MS

Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The analysis of the quality of the M&E at the design stage was correct, however the TE did not note crucial drawbacks of the implemented M&E system. In fact some important indicators of the logical framework have not been operationalized and some indicators actually used by the PMU did not reflect the relevant result/outcome.	MU
Overall TE Rating		U

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