

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3363	
GEF Agency project ID		Not given	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Integrated Ecological Planning and Sustainable Land Management in Coastal Ecosystems in the Comoros (in the three islands of Grand Comore, Anjouan and Moheli)	
Country/Countries		Comoros	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation and Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LD: SP1; BD: SP4 and SP2	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment	
NGOs/CBOs involvement			
Private sector involvement			
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		4/18/2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		10/29/2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		January 2013	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	NA	NA
	Co-financing	NA	NA
GEF Project Grant		1	NA
Co-financing ¹	IA own	1.4	NA
	Government	.09	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	.39	NA
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		1	.95
Total Co-financing		1.88	1.57
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.88	2.52
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		9/30/2014	
Author of TE		Not given	
TER completion date		12/9/2015	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	

¹ The TE does not provide detailed co-financing information. Co-financing at endorsement is taken from the final Request for CEO Endorsement. There is no breakdown available for co-financing at completion.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environment Objectives of the project were “(i) to reduce and possibly reverse current trends in land degradation through supporting sustainable land management (SLM) policies and practices that generate global environmental benefits; and (ii) the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity and the maintenance of the ecosystem goods and services that biodiversity provides to society” (PD pg. 5).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was “to support community-led ecological planning and the subsequent identification and implementation of field and related enabling activities designed to address priority natural resource use conflicts affecting ecosystem ‘health’ and the provision of environmental ‘goods and services’ contributing to losses in economic productivity and human well-being” (2014 PIRS pg. 3).

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

Outcome 2.2, *Increased sustainability of Comoros’ national protected area system through the strengthening of existing protected areas and/or reducing pressure on candidate sites currently being considered for future designated protective area status*, was suspended in 2013 at the recommendation of an IFAD supervision mission. UNDP was launching a new project with a similar outcome, and therefore, the supervision mission recommended that resources be reallocated to other project components, particularly the implementation of sub-projects (TE pg. 17).

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 provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project relevance. This TER, which uses a different scale, adjusts this rating to **Satisfactory**.

The project was consistent with the Comoros' strategies for addressing environmental degradation and biodiversity, including: The National Environmental Action Plan (1994), environmental legislation (1995), and the following ratified international conventions: UNCBD (1994), UNFCCC (1994), and UNCCD (1998) (TE pg. 6). Furthermore, the Comoros approved a national Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategy which included provisions for promoting a healthy environment in support of sustainable development. The following priority programs were identified: natural resource conservation, soil restoration and sustainable forestry management, and integrated management of the coastal zone (PD pg. 10).

The project was consistent with GEF-4's Land Degradation (LD) and Biodiversity (BD) focal areas (FA). The project fit fully under the LD FA, including Strategic Objective 1: Creation of an enabling environment that will place Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the mainstream of development policy and planning; and Strategic Objective 2: Generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods through the upscaling of SLM benefits. The project was also consistent with two of the long-term objectives under the BD FA: Strategic Objective 1: To catalyze sustainability of protected area systems; and Strategic Objective 2: To mainstream biodiversity in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors (PD pg. 11).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-------------------	-------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for project effectiveness, and a separate rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for "achievement of outputs and activities." This TER downgrades this rating to **Unsatisfactory**. The actual outcomes of the project were substantially lower than expected. Community-lead Integrated Ecosystem Management plans were developed and implemented to a

limited degree, and there was likely some increased public awareness on the importance of protecting and restoring the country's ecosystems. However, there was no improvement to policy and planning frameworks, or increase in the sustainability of Comoros' national protected area system, or evidence of increased capacity to organize sustainable land management or implement integrated ecosystem management.

The achievements of the project, by component and outcome, are summarized below. Outcomes under Component 4, *Project Management, M&E and Information Dissemination*, are not assessed as they are not programmatic results.

Component 1: Environmental Policy and Planning

- **Outcome 1.1:** *Improved policy and planning frameworks in support of SLM through an IEM approach designed to restore/protect biodiversity in production landscapes*

Expected results under this outcomes included (1) a new policy in the agricultural sector that incorporates sustainable land management principles, (2) rural spatial planning frameworks that incorporate an eco-system-based approach in the planning process, and (3) community-led integrated ecosystem management plans (IEMs) in coastal ecosystems (PD pgs. 12-14). Project activities and outputs under this outcome (public events and dialogues with senior policy officials; and a series of policy studies) did not lead to changes in policy or the development of spatial planning frameworks (TE pg. 12). However, the five anticipated community-led Integrated Ecosystem Management plans were developed in Anjouan (2), Grande Comore (2) and Moheli (1) (2012 PIRS pg. 12).

Component 2: Integrated Ecosystem Management Plan Implementation

- **Outcome 2.1:** *A proven approach that fully integrates ecosystem principles into a diverse range of production landscapes.*

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) sub-projects implemented in support of the Integrated Ecosystem Management plans, and (2) degraded land put under sustainable management (PD pg. 29). The TE notes that that mixed results were achieved under this outcome. Some reforestation sub-projects were more successful than others. At some sites common forest species and threatened endemic species were successfully replanted, whereas at other sites efforts focused on tree-planting rather than natural forest enrichment and reestablishment. The TE does note that the sustainable land management practice of *embocagement* was largely adopted, reaching 11,070 farmers managing 3,668 plots (out of the 4,470 targeted) (TE pgs. 4-5). Overall, 1,047 hectares (out of the targeted 1660 hectares) in 43 villages was put under sustainable land management (TE pg. 12).

- **Outcome 2.2:** *Increased sustainability of Comoros' national protected area system through the strengthening of existing protected areas and/or reducing pressure on candidate sites currently being considered for future designated protective area status.*

Expected results under this outcome included (1) legal declaration of new PAs, (2) preparation of or updating of existing management plans, and (3) boundary demarcation (PD pg. 15). In support of this outcome, the project completed five phyto-ecological baseline studies, inventoried potential ecotourism sites, identified flora, and zoned four potential protected areas (TE pg. 13). Despite initial progress, the TE reports that this outcome was abandoned at the advice of an IFAD supervision mission before key results were achieved (TE pg. 5).

Component 3:

- **Outcome 3.1:** *Improved capacity at the local and sub-national (island) levels to incorporate an ecosystem based approach into SLM programs.*

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) increased awareness of ecosystem processes and functions, (2) increased participation of communities in local management decisions affecting their natural resources and environment, and (3) improved capacity to work across disciplinary lines among NGO and public officers responsible for rural development planning and implementation (PD pg. 17). The TE reports that 2,300 people attended workshops, short-courses, and cross-site visits on sustainable land management practices, integrated ecosystem management approaches, and community-based approaches for protected area management. However, the TE did not find evidence that these activities resulted in improved capacity to organize sustainable land management or implement integrated ecosystem management (TE pg. 5; 14).

- **Outcome 3.2:** *Increased public awareness and support for the protection and restoration of the country's ecosystems.*

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) increased acceptance of more environmentally-sustainable practices in the rural space, and (2) greater public awareness of the ecological, economic and social significance of the Comoros islands' environment (PD pg. 17). Numerous awareness-raising activities were held, including workshops and trainings on the importance of PAs and protection of natural resources, and the distribution of leaflets and extension documents (TE pg. 14). The TE notes that "the training and awareness building actions were perhaps the most successful part of the programme," however it does not offer any evidence to support this claim (TE pg. 23).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unsatisfactory
----------------	-------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Unsatisfactory**. The project was designed to be "blended" into the IFAD-supported National Sustainable Human Development Programme (NSHDP) due to close linkages between the two initiatives. The PD notes that "blending" the projects was intended to be cost-effective, with benefits from (1) a single management structure, (2) common procurement procedures and operations, (3) an integrated M&E program, and (4) complementary project interventions with little risk of duplication or

overlap due to sharing a common IEM plan at each project site (PD pg. 18; 25). In practice, the TE found this arrangement to be problematic, as GEF resources were mostly used to implement IFAD loan core activities at the expense of the project’s biodiversity management objectives (TE pgs. 6-7).

In addition, the project experienced procurement, managerial, and logistical difficulties at the central level and in the island offices, which delayed implementation. For example, all procurement was frozen for 8 months due to an incident of misappropriation. In addition, there was high staff turnover particularly in the project management implementation unit which prevented timely and consistent decision-making, affecting the project implementation timeline (TE pg. 7).

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

The TE does not provide an overall rating for project sustainability. This TER provides a rating of **Unlikely**, as there appears to be significant risks to the sustainability, especially risks to financial resources and institutional framework and governance.

Financial Resources

The TE does not directly assess risks to financial resources. However, there is no indication in the TE that there are any financial resources available for follow-up projects or activities. The project support staff was scheduled to be let go by the completion date (TE pg. 8).

Sociopolitical

The TE assesses sociopolitical sustainability as **Moderately Unlikely**. The TE notes that the Comoros is a fragile state, and significant drivers of political instability exist, such as inter-island disputes, high unemployment, and frequent shortages of food and basic services (TE pg. 9). At the local level, the TE found that villagers were more likely to choose income and production enhancement activities over those providing long-term ecological services (TE pg. 10). Moreover, there may not be sufficient awareness to support the long-term objectives of the project.

Institutional Framework and Governance

The TE assesses institutional sustainability as **Moderately Unlikely**. The TE notes that there has not been any change of legislation or policy commitment to support incorporation of sustainable land management or Integrated Ecosystem Management, which is a significant obstacle to the project’s sustainability (TE pg. 7). In addition, the government is unable to enforce infractions against the IEM plans in the target areas, including fires, illegal sawing and logging, and unsustainable and illegal fishing practices (TE pg. 9).

Environmental

The TE assesses environmental sustainability as **Moderately Unlikely**, noting that bush fires and poorly controlled logging remain threats.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE does not assess the materialization of co-financing. It appears that co-financing was lower than expected (\$1.57 million rather than the expected \$1.88 million), however there is no indication in the TE whether this directly affected the project's outcomes or sustainability. Overall, the TE noted that the project's budget was not sufficient to address the root causes of biodiversity loss and environmental degradation (TE pg. 14).

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 experienced significant delays in project implementation due to procurement, managerial, and logistical difficulties at the central level and in the island offices (TE pg. 7). The project's completion date was extended from January 2013 to December 2014. It is likely that these delays affected the project's outcomes and sustainability, however the TE does not provide any evidence of this.

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 provides a rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory for Country Ownership, although it does not provide sufficient evidence to support this rating. This TER found there to be a moderate level of country ownership over this project. The project was relevant to the country's strategies for addressing land degradation and biodiversity, and the executing agency for this project was the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment. Policymakers were also the intended beneficiaries of some initiatives, participating in workshops on ecosystems and integrated ecosystem management approaches (TE pg. 11; 14). Community members also played a role in developing integrated ecosystem management plans and implementing sub-projects. However it isn't clear whether there is sufficient awareness, motivation, or resources at the national or local level to support the long-term objectives of the project.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E Design at entry. Although there were moderate shortcomings, the M&E design was largely practical and sufficient for this project. The TE notes that the logical framework was well-structured and included some indicators that could provide a framework for M&E. Other indicators, while relevant to the project, were not specific or measurable, such as “increase in economic productivity and well-being,” and “10% increase in the value of selected environmental ‘goods and services’” (TE pg. 16).

As with the project's management structure, M&E activities were designed to be integrated into the existing National Sustainable Human Development Programme (NSHDP) M&E structure. The PD provides a detailed outline of NSHDP's M&E structure, including M&E staff and responsibilities; sources of information; work plan and budget; and reporting. In addition, the PD outlines plans for establishing environmental baseline values at the community sites which could be monitored by the villagers over the life of the project (PD pgs. 82-85). Overall, the M&E plan presented provides a viable framework for an M&E system.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E Implementation. It does appear that there was an M&E system operating throughout the life of the project, however the TE found that it was only partially effective in tracking progress toward project objectives. The M&E units at the island level operated with little supervision from the national M&E specialist. The TE notes that the island M&E units and representatives from the participating communities tasked with data collection had “limited capacity or incentive to undertake checks on the quality of the data,” and as a result, when the data was aggregated at the national level it was of variable quality (TE pg. 16). In addition, although the system tracked basic output indicators, there was no meaningful data collected for higher level results. Therefore, it was difficult to assess the quality and impact of the intervention, such as changes in attitudes or the quality of the environment (TE pg. 17). Moreover, the data that was collected was not used to improve or adapt project performance (TE pg. 16).

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: Unsatisfactory
--	-------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for “IFAD supervision and Backstopping,” while this TER downgrades the rating to **Unsatisfactory** for Quality of Project Implementation. The TE found the project design to be overly ambitious given the budget, the severity of the root causes underlying biodiversity loss and environmental degradation, and the overall lack of capacity (TE pg. 14). Furthermore, the decision to blend this project into the IFAD-supported NSHDP did not yield the expected benefits.

Additionally, while IFAD monitored the project’s progress through reports and regular supervisory visits to the project sites, high staff turnover at IFAD contributed to inconsistent direction and support (TE pg. 17). The TE was also highly critical of the IFAD supervisory mission in June 2013 which recommended suspending efforts to establish and promote PAs (Outcome 2.2). The funds were redirected to reinforce National Sustainable Human Development Programme’s project activities which the TE found to have little value added in respect to biodiversity conservation (TE pg. vii).

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

The TE does not directly assess the role of the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Environment as executing agency for the project. This TE provides a rating of **Unsatisfactory** for the Quality of Project Execution. The project was managed by a Program Coordination Unit (PMU), which reported to the Minister of Production and Environment. A National Steering Committee (CNP) made up of representatives from each island and civil society was in place. Regional Units for Technical Support (URAT) executed activities in the field which were overseen by the three islands’ ministries of production. The TE does not assess how effectively this project management structure operated. However, it is clear that the project experienced significant delays in project implementation,

misappropriation of program funds, and high staff turnover at the executing agency, which provide the basis for this rating.

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 changes in environmental stress and status were very limited by the end of the project. The TE notes that the project has “temporarily checked current trends in land degradation” which “may result in some global benefit,” however provides no evidence to support this claim (TE pg. vi). The TE does note generally that there was some success in mangrove reestablishment and pilot initiatives in waste management at the pilot sites (TE pg. viii). 458 hectares at the reforestation sites were planted with both common and indigenous forestry species (TE pg. 4), and 469 hectares were treated with anti-erosion structures (TE pg. 12).

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 provides little evidence of socioeconomic change by the end of the project. The TE does note that 4,847 households reported to have improved food security (67% of the initial target) (TE pg. 5).

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 TE provides little evidence of changes in capacities by the end of project. The TE reports that 2,300 people attended workshops, short-courses, and cross-site visits on SLM practices, IEM approaches, and community-based approaches for PA management. However, the TE specifically notes that the project cannot claim changes in behavior or capacity to organize sustainable land management or implement Integrated Ecosystem Management (TE pg. 5; 14). Additionally, the TE notes that the capability of project staff to plan and implement an ecosystem-based approach has been enhanced (TE vii). However, the project staff have not been retained past the end of the project.

b) Governance

The TE does not cite any notable changes in governance.

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.

The TE does not provide any evidence of unintended impacts.

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 TE does not provide any evidence of initiatives that have been mainstreamed, replicated, or scaled-up by project end.

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 project expectations were over ambitious and these were built on an IFAD project that had of itself a large number and different crop and livestock activities in a complex environment covering different ecosystems. In addition, the project design did not consider the logistical complexity to supervise and coordinate interventions across three islands.
- Lines of communication were affected by constant project staff changes. It is important for the project implementation unit and GEF implementing agency (IFAD head office staff) to foster close professional working relations. In addition, coherent and continuous backstopping from the GEF implementing agency would have ensured a better understanding of the added value of GEF resources in terms of contribution to the achievement of the GEB. The biodiversity conservation outcomes were compromised by the use of financial resources to enhance agricultural production, promote SLM and income generating activities. The participative planning approach applied in villages where critical subsistence objectives are a priority, can result in the focus on interventions to increase income rather than pursue biodiversity conservation benefits.
- The project needed to be quicker and more flexible in responding to issues with regard to incentives, including technical backstopping or provision of essential materials and input. At an early stage (2009-2010) the project encountered delays in the implementation of the reforestation activities because the project proposed a price for seedlings that was lower than the price paid by other development actors. Delays in addressing the issue, affected achievement of results. Therefore, flexibility in project implementation procedure requires responsive and committed management.
- A timely MTR can be critical to a project capitalizing on its successes and achieving project outcomes. Late MTR has less potential to influence achievement of intended outcomes.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not provide recommendations.

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 does not provide an adequate assessment of the outcomes and impacts; it does not assess many of the expected outcomes or impacts (potential or actual).	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Many of the ratings are inflated and inconsistent with the evidence (or lack thereof) presented. For example, project efficiency is rated as moderately unsatisfactory, but no mitigating evidence is provided to support that rating.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does not properly assess financial or environmental sustainability.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are not comprehensive and no recommendations are provided.	U
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not provide detailed co-financing information. It provides overall figures but does not provide a breakdown by co-financer or by activity.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report adequately assesses the project's M&E system, although more detail could have been provided	MS
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).

Request for CEO Endorsement