



To Do

Projects

Reports

Administration

Help

Logout

**Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form**

Quick Select:   [Select](#)

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)



**Collapse all sections**



**Project**

GEF ID	<input type="text" value="3361"/>
Project Title	<input type="text" value="Assessment and Recommendations on Improving Access of Indigenous Peoples to Conservation Funding"/>
Project Type	<input type="text" value="Medium Size Project"/>
Funding Source	<input type="text" value="GEF Trust Fund"/>
Focal Area	<input type="text" value="Biodiversity"/>
Agency	<input type="text" value="World Bank"/>
World Bank ID	<input type="text"/>
Country	<input type="text" value="Global"/>
Add Country	<input type="text" value="(Select country to add)"/>
Country List	<input type="text"/>
Project Status	<input type="text" value="Project Completion"/>
Duration	<input type="text" value="2"/> years
CEO Endorsement	<input type="text" value="09/17/2007"/>
Agency Approval	<input type="text"/>
Project Effectiveness	<input type="text"/>
GEF Agency Execution Partners	<input type="text" value="(Select Execution Partners)"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Community</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Other</li> </ul>
If other, please specify	<input type="text" value="First Peoples Worldwide"/>



**Terminal Evaluation Staff**

**EO Staff**

TE Author

TE Reviewer

TE Peer Reviewer

 **Completion, Submission & Delays**

**Project Completion**

Project Expected Completion

Project Actual Completion

Project Completion Difference  Months

**TE Completion**

TE Completion

TE Submission to EO

TE Submission to EO Difference  Months

**TER Completion**

TER Completion

TER Submission to EO

TER Submission to EO Difference  Months

**Comments on Delays** 

No information in the TE report on the causes for the delay in project implementation.

 **Funding and Co-Financing**

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="250,000"/>	<input type="text" value="235,765"/>	<input type="text" value="94.31 %"/>
Cofinance Amount (US\$)	<input type="text" value="360,000"/>	<input type="text" value="82,500"/>	<input type="text" value="22.92 %"/>
<b>Total Amount (US\$)</b>	<input type="text" value="610,000"/>	<input type="text" value="318,265"/>	<input type="text" value="52.17 %"/>

**Comments on Cofinancing** 

The executing agency, First Peoples Worldwide (FPW), is reported to have contributed USD 82,500 for "Empowerment Grants." No information in the TE report on other co-financing amounts. The actual co-financing might be higher if in-kind support (i.e. time, personnel, and resources expended by workshop participants) is considered.

 **Logical Framework**

Quality of Logical Framework

3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory



Project Objectives -

From the ProDoc results framework:

GDO: "increase access to conservation funding available to Indigenous Peoples for effectively manage their Indigenous conservation areas"

GEO: "The outcome of this project will be preserving biodiversity and reducing land degradation by increasing the capacity of Indigenous Peoples to conserve their homelands, which are rich in biodiversity and are among the conservation priorities of this century."

Specific Objectives:

1. To expand and strengthen the relationship between bio conservation funders and Indigenous Peoples.
2. To strengthen an expanded knowledge base of IPs best practices in Stewardship programs.
3. To build better capacity to promote Indigenous peoples conservation-based programs.


Comment on Changes

No changes to to project objectives/components. The Results Framework Matrix (Annex 1) confounds outcomes and outputs. The specific outcomes are really outputs of the components. Most of the indicators are output indicators not outcome indicators. Indicators largely do not meet SMART criteria. Also, the level of consistency between the log-frame and the project components as described in the text could be improved.

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
Research into funding opportunities for indigenous peoples. Consultations with indigenous peoples and public/private donors.	A list of concrete recommendations for improving Indigenous access to international conservation funding. A list of equivalent requirements for conservation funding application process, reporting, and key indicators of program progress. An active network of Indigenous Practitioners who participate in First Peoples Discussion groups on Indigenous Stewardship. List of on-the ground Indigenous resources that can be mobilized to deliver conservation funding-related training to other indigenous communities	Expanded and strengthened relationship between conservation funders and Indigenous Peoples. Strengthened knowledge base of indigenous peoples' best practices in Stewardship programs. Strengthened capacity to promote Indigenous peoples conservation-based programs.	Suggestions adopted by funders. Funder-grantee relationships formed through the regional consultations. Indigenous Peoples have the capacity to meet conservation funding accounting and reporting requirements. Internet/telecomm accessible to indigenous peoples. Various outputs translated into native languages and disseminated widely.	Funding bodies incorporate recommendations/outputs into proposal design and review processes. Increase in number of funding proposals submitted by indigenous peoples' groups/NGOs.	Increase in funds flowing to indigenous peoples for conservation activities.	Reduced pressure on natural resources, habitat restoration, expanded conservation areas.	Edit  Delete
Add New Row...							


Project Performance










Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFEO Ratings      Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFEO Comments







Overall Project Rating      5 - Satisfactory      
















Comment









The project successfully achieved intended outputs and carried out consultations with indigenous peoples and donors. Guidelines for both grantees and grantors have been developed. Dissemination of these guidelines and adoption by donors remain barriers to achievement of outcomes.









Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
<b>Outcomes</b> 	Last PIR:	NA - Not Applicable	No PIR available.
	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory	The project as achieved its objective. The first objective was to expand and strengthen the relationship between bioconservation funders and indigenous peoples. Through successful interactions with donors, that also participated in the round tables, IPs gained better trust with donors, and established partnerships that will be essential for sustainable conservation of biodiversity. The second objective was to promote knowledge on indigenous peoples best practices in stewardship programs. Through the four workshop held, practitioners and Indigenous peoples were able to meet, network and establish communities of proactice. First Peoples Worldwide ended each roundtable with an Empowerment Funding project. Roundtable participants were granted anywhere from \$15,000-\$25,000 and given the decision-making power to distribute the funds amongst themselves for activities related to improving access to donor funding. Most of the participants decided to split the funds evenly, allowing them to build relationships and trust for future collaboration. The third objective was to build capacity at the local level to advance indigenous people's conservation programs. IPs that participated in the workshops gained knowledge on how to improve grant applications which will increase their chances of applying and receiving grants. This will lower the costs of biodiversity conservation, as IPs are documented to conserve better and are more cost-effective than other outsider NGOS.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	The overall rating is based on the average of the ratings for effectiveness and efficiency.
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	













Relevance 			As a global project this was relevant to GEF goals and priorities in the biodiversity focal area. Although the project is not directly linked to strategic programs or results framework indicators, the project addresses the need to improve priorities and programs by promoting a more bottom-up approach to biodiversity conservation. The project is also linked to the World Bank's revised Indigenous Peoples Policy (OP. 4.10, July 2006) which is in effect in every country where the Bank makes investments. This project targeted Indigenous Peoples by including them in a consultation process to increase their capacity to access funding for biodiversity conservation.
Effectiveness 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Achieved outputs were in accordance with intended outputs. The project conducted 4 workshops in 4 different regions, bringing together indigenous groups and donors. The project also developed guidelines for donors to use in working with indigenous groups as well as several databases which should prove useful to those indigenous groups applying for funding. It's unclear if the project activities have actually expanded capacities among indigenous peoples as there was no monitoring or follow-up. The outcome with respect to donors is also unclear. The TE report does not assess the extent to which donors have assimilated the funding guidelines developed by this project.
Efficiency 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	The project achieved it's results using the amount originally allocated for activities. The TE report notes that project objectives have been achieved. However, due to the 14-month delay in project completion efficiency is rated MS.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability 	Last PIR:	NA - Not Applicable 	No PIR available.
	Terminal Evaluation:	2 - Moderately Unlikely 	This project is a small grant and is about consultation with indigenous groups. It was not classified for its rating. Therefore, the rating is negligible.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderately Unlikely 	Sustainability is rated Moderately Unlikely (2) because the project has not secured funding (based on the information in the TE report) to support continuation of some project results (i.e. website, on-line network, dissemination of funding handbook, etc.).
	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated along this dimension.





























Financial 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderately Unlikely 	Continued funding to support activities has not been secured and poses a significant risk to sustainability. The TE report does not mention any continued funding for sustaining project achievements through maintenance of website and disseminating reports to indigenous peoples groups. There is also no guaranteed assistance for indigenous peoples in accessing funding opportunities and writing grants.
Socio-political 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	Donor interest in working with indigenous peoples remains strong.
Institutional and Legal 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely 	Donor agencies need to incorporate the recommendations for how to promote participation by indigenous groups into proposal review and funding processes. While donor interest in this area remains strong, this is likely to occur. However, the project did not develop a clear plan for institutionalizing the guidelines it developed.
Environmental 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not rated along this dimension.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	Environmental risks are not applicable to this project.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	"The client delivered a report that made reference to the original indicators and explained the results based on these indicators."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	There is insufficient information in the TE report to assess the implementation of M&E activities.
M&E Design 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided on M&E design.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	The Results Framework Matrix (Annex 1) confounds outcomes and outputs. The specific outcomes are really outputs of the components. Most of the indicators are output indicators not outcome indicators. Indicators largely do not meet SMART criteria. Consistency between the log-frame and the project components as described in the text could be improved.
	Terminal		

M&E Plan Implementation 	Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	"The client delivered a report that made reference to the original indicators and explained the results based on these indicators."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	There is insufficient information in the TE report to assess the implementation of M&E activities.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided on M&E funding and budget utilization.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Insufficient information to assess.

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
<b>Quality of Implementation and Execution</b> 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	Project Management is rated HS and Financial Management is rated S. "Project carried out the main activities planned and client conducted research, completed four roundtables in Africa, Latin America, Pacific and Southeast Asia and Asia & delivered final report with guidelines"
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The project was implemented as planned in accordance with WB project management guidelines.
Quality of Implementation - IA 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided for Bank Performance.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Based on the information in the TE report, oversight of the project was adequate. Project Management is rated HS. Financial Management is rated S. The project design could have been improved to better focus on outcomes and include indicators to measure progress towards outcomes.
Quality of Execution - EA 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided for EA performance.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The EA carried out activities as planned, given the evidence in the TE report. For Project Management, the TE notes: "The project carried out the main activities planned and client conducted research, completed four roundtables in Africa, Latin America, Pacific and Southeast Asia and Asia & delivered final report with guidelines." For Counterpart Funding, the TE report notes: "The client made a serious effort to raise and provide counterpart funding. The report mentions that FWP provided \$ 82,500 for the Empowerment grants." The TE also notes that there were no issues with procurement.

 **Agency Specific Project Criteria**

Criteria	Document	Rating/Verification	Comment
<b>Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results</b>			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not applicable to this project.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not applicable to this project.
Financial Planning 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	Financial Management is rated Satisfactory.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The budget allocated for the project appears to have been more than adequate for carrying out the planned activities.
Preparation and Readiness 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	No rating provided.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	This project grew out the Bank's efforts to actively engage with indigenous groups in conservation projects. The Bank revised its Indigenous Peoples Policy (OP. 4.10) in July 2006. The project objectives were clear and achievable within the original timeframe. The executing agency selected possessed the capacity and appropriate experience in working with indigenous peoples' groups.
Stakeholders Involvement 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	Public involvement is rated Highly Satisfactory.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	The project extensively engaged with indigenous peoples and donors.
Need for Follow Up 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No 	Nothing in the TE report indicates a need for follow-up
Gender Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	No 	This is not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No 	This was not part of the project design and based on the TE report, no efforts were made to explicitly include/encourage participation of women in the project sponsored consultations.
Effects on Local Population 	Terminal Evaluation:	Yes 	Discussed throughout the TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Yes 	



Four roundtable workshops were held in four different locales with representatives of indigenous peoples worldwide. The TE report notes that "Through the four workshop held, practitioners and Indigenous peoples were able to meet, network and establish communities of practice."

Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction	Terminal Evaluation:	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Not part of the project design.
Crisis Prevention and Recovery	Terminal Evaluation:	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Not part of the project design.
Democratic Governance	Terminal Evaluation:	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Not mentioned in TE report.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	No <input type="checkbox"/>	Not part of the project design.

**Progress to Impact**

<b>Progress to Impact</b>	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to Assess <input type="checkbox"/>	No rating provided. The TE does note that "The project raised awareness and capacity of IPs to participate in conservation planning and access..."
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderate Progress <input type="checkbox"/>	The project has raised awareness among both indigenous peoples and donors. The capacity of indigenous peoples' groups to access international funding for environmental projects is still limited. The achievement of impacts will depend strongly on whether the project guidelines and recommendations are widely disseminated and adopted by international donors.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness	Terminal Evaluation:	Y - Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	The TE does refer throughout to increased awareness and information regarding international conservation funding.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Project activities have contributed to expanded knowledge and awareness among IPs about access to international funding opportunities.
	Terminal		

Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks ⓘ	Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	No new frameworks were established.
Implementing Structures and Arrangements ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Project activities did not affect implementing structures or arrangements.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	The project was not a pilot or demonstration project.



















Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	No financial mechanisms were established.

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	The project was not designed for replication.

Upscaling ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	As project results are disseminated, it is likely that more indigenous people will join the networks of practice established through this project. The TE report did not include any
















Mainstreaming ⓘ	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	Not mentioned in the TE report.
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="N - No"/>	

The TE report notes that the project developed "a set of practical guidelines" to assist multilateral and bilateral foundations, and NGOs, particularly from developing countries, in funding indigenous peoples and to ensure their participation in the design of conservation programs. However, there is no evidence that the guidelines have been adopted by donors and mainstreamed into funding policies.

Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document					
Environmental Stress Reduction 	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	<b>Visibility</b>	<b>Boundary</b>	<b>Intent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	
		N - No			No evidence of environmental stress reduction.	 Edit  Delete
	 Add New Row...					
Environmental Status Change 	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	<b>Visibility</b>	<b>Boundary</b>	<b>Intent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	
		N - No			No evidence of an environmental status change.	 Edit  Delete
	 Add New Row...					
Socioeconomic Status Change 	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click -->  Add New Row... <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	<b>Visibility</b>	<b>Boundary</b>	<b>Intent</b>	<b>Comments</b>	
		UA - Unable to assess	Demonstration Site	Unintended	The project may have led to socio-economic status change at the individual level. The project disbursed grants to individuals participating in the consultation workshops. However without any monitoring or follow-up it's not possible to gauge and document the impacts from the grants.	 Edit  Delete
	 Add					




		<a href="#">New Row...</a>				
<b>Arrangements for Impact M&amp;E</b>	Terminal Evaluation	No data entered yet. Click --> <a href="#">Add New Row...</a> <-- to add new row.				
	Agency Review	No data entered yet. Click --> <a href="#">Add New Row...</a> <-- to add new row.				
	GEFEO Review	<b>Visibility</b>	<b>Comments</b>			
		UA - Unable to assess		<a href="#">Edit</a> <a href="#">Delete</a>		
		<a href="#">Add New Row...</a>				

<b>TE Report Quality</b>			
Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
<b>TE Quality</b>	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	
Outcome Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	The TE report assesses achievement of project outputs relative to intended outputs. The outcome assessment could be improved by considering the outcome indicators (performance indicators) outlined in the ProDoc's Results Framework Matrix.
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	Unable to assess based on information in the TE report.
Sustainability Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	Sustainability of project outputs or outcomes is not assessed.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	No lessons or recommendations are provided.
Clear Financial Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Full co-financing information is not provided.
M&E Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	No assessment of the M&E design at entry.
Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	Indicators are not used for outcome assessment, however actual outputs are compared to planned outputs.


Consultation with Stakeholders 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Unable to assess based on information in the TE report.
Compliance with Guidances 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Unable to assess based on information in the TE report.
Compliance with UNEG Norms 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	N/A for WB MSPs.
Addressing of ToR requests 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No ToR for this TE.
Independence of Report 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	No agency review.
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	Unable to assess based on information in the TE report.

 **Lessons & Recommendations**



Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Other		No lessons learned or recommendations included in the TE report.	 Edit  Delete
 <a href="#">Add New Row...</a>			



No data entered yet. Click -->  [Add New Row...](#) <-- to add new Recommendation.

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

A product of the Global Environment Facility