

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3381	
GEF Agency project ID		3225	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP - Niger	
Project name		Oasis micro-basin sand invasion control in the Gouré and Maïné-Soroa provinces	
Country/Countries		Niger	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Operational Programme 15: Sustainable Land Management (SLM)	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Hydraulics and the Environment (MHE), General Directorate of Environment, Water and Forests and Ministry of Environment, Urban Health and Sustainable Development	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Project stakeholder	
Private sector involvement		None involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 29, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		June 26, 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		January 1, 2015	
Actual date of project completion		June 26, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.35	0.35
	Co-financing	0.07	-
GEF Project Grant		2.02	2.02
Co-financing	IA own	0.5	1.65
	Government	7.7	0.59
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	3.88	-
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	1.2	1.0
Total GEF funding		2.37	2.37

<b>Total Co-financing</b>	13.35	3.24
<b>Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)</b>	15.37	5.26
<b>Terminal evaluation/review information</b>		
<b>TE completion date</b>	December 2015	
<b>Author of TE</b>	Dr Syaka Sadio and Pierre Nignon	
<b>TER completion date</b>	February 14, 2017	
<b>TER prepared by</b>	Spandana Battula	
<b>TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)</b>	Molly Watts	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environment Objective of the project was to “ensure sustainable and improved management of land and water resources in order to improve the livelihoods and incomes of rural populations in Niger's sahelian zones” (PD pg 16).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s Development Objective was to “protect the integrity of, and to improve the agro-sylvopastoral productivity of the micro-basin ecosystems in the Gouré and Maïné-Soroa provinces” (PD pg 16). The project aimed to achieve its objective through three components (PD pg 16):

Component 1: Local practices for dune, land and ecosystem management;

Component 2: Local capacities and institutions for SLM; and

Component 3: Monitoring system on sand dunes and land degradation.

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

There were no changes to the objectives or activities during project implementation.

## 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.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The project was relevant to GEF’s Operational Programme 15 on Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and was aligned to the Strategic Investment Programme for SLM, specifically, the Programme 10 on Environmental Sustainability and Programme 13 on Land Restoration and Reforestation (PD pg 12). The project was part of the TerrAfrica program, a collaboration of UNDP, World Bank and IFAD, to scale up work on desertification and land degradation. It addressed the country’s “need for sustainable local development, decentralized natural resource management policy, and empowerment of grassroots communities, with regard to gender and vulnerable persons” (TE pg 11). It was also aligned to Niger’s National Plan for Environmentally Sustainable Development and was part of the operational response to implement the National Action Plan for Desertification Control and Natural Resources Management to restore degraded lands, and fight against dune formation (PD pg 12). In addition, it was consistent with Niger’s commitments to UN Convention for Combating Desertification (UNCCD), Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD), and UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (PD pg 12).

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE gave a Satisfactory rating to the overall results of the project which included effectiveness. Although the project achieved all the three outcomes, some of them only partially met the targets. The project had significant achievements in Components 1 and 3 where it developed multi-year communal operational plans, developed action plans, established a partnership network, and created a system to monitor sand dunes. However, it was only able to develop action plans in 62 sites against the target of 90 planned sites. In component 2, there were some successes but also many shortcomings. The project created natural resource management committees and local land commissions, however they needed to be improved for them to be fully operational. Considering both achievements and significant shortcomings, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to effectiveness of the project.

Achievements as per components are listed below:

Component 1: Improve local land management and ecosystem management practices:

The component aimed to implement activities related to sustainable dune, land, and ecosystem management covering approximately 7,510 hectares of land. Overall, the component managed to achieve seven of the eight outputs. Firstly, the project assessed the extent of sand invasion by conducting a diagnosis of sanded-up areas using GIS mapping. For participatory development of local action plans on land management, the project trained managers from departmental agencies, and developed action plans in 62 sites out of 90 intended sites (TE pg 10). It also developed multi-year communal operational plans to prevent sand dune formation by performing technical diagnosis at several sites, and gathering data from communes. Further, the project established a network amongst partners to disseminate information on land degradation. This helped in building actors' capacities, create regional and departmental sustainable land management (SLM) committees, and achieve publication of technical and methodological documents (TE pg 11). To support producers in identifying SLM compatible practices, the project created nine SLM best practices demonstration sites including three natural regeneration sites, and three water management support sites. However, the project was unable to rehabilitate older sites and the TE observed that the plots "were either not planted after mechanical stabilization or that showed low rates of seedling recruitment (<80%), caused by drought or the pressure of livestock wandering in village lands" (TE pg 11).

#### Component 2: Strengthen the SLM capacities of institutions and local communities:

The component partially achieved seven outcomes, which were aimed to strengthen technical and managerial capacity of local stakeholders in dune, land and ecosystem management in 35 micro-basins. For the outcome to support the existing SLM structures to encourage collaboration, the project established SLM bodies, developed a range of technical and training documents, created natural resource management committees (COGERNATs) and local land commissions (COFOBs), built capacity for regional and village institutions, and trained more than 30 farmers on assisted natural regeneration and market garden production. However, the TE noted that the operation of COGERNATs and COFOBs still needed to be improved (TE pg 15). In regard to conducting a participatory evaluation to determine community level knowledge base, the project prepared a guide to develop action plans and built 24 local action plans for the strategic sites, however, there was "very limited participation by the populations because the activities involved only the studies" (TE pgs 13 &16). As part of the outcome to build capacity in land management and conflict resolution, the project created 10 local land commissions and 14 geo-referenced strategic sites. The sites were registered on the rural registry which meant that the protected sites could not be used or developed and thus, ensuring sustainability of the regenerated lands. However, the TE noted the impact of this provision would adversely "prohibit the populations that created the plots and have usufruct rights from making any use of the resources" (TE pg 16). Lastly, the project developed an adapted information, education, and communications (IEC) programme, however, it was not implemented as expected because of lack of an IEC expert to pilot awareness raising and outreach activities (TE pgs 5 & 13).

#### Component 3: Sand dune and land degradation monitoring system:

This component fully achieved two of three outcomes. The main aim of the component was to establish a system to monitor sand dunes and land degradation at national level and standardized with the

SIP/TerrAfrica at the regional level. To this end, the project installed equipment to strengthen monitoring of dunes and land degradation, created a station supplied with an automatic system to measure climate data, disseminated plant cover change maps, monitored and evaluated wind erosion and sand invasion of land and micro-basins, developed national multi-annual action plan on ecological monitoring, and created sand invasion and land degradation observation stations (TE pg 21). However, the early warning system on desertification and land degradation was not yet operational and standardized (TE pg 19).

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
-----------------------	----------------------

There were some delays related to financial disbursements. As per the PIR 2014, due to a new annual work plan there was a delay in disbursements of funds for the first quarter in 2014 (PIR 2014 pg 24). Also, the delay in setting up financial resources and food for work led to slowing down of efforts by the people (TE pg 5). However, the project did not take any extensions to finish the implementation. In addition, the project’s actual co-financing was much lower than the expected amount, but even then the project was able to achieve many of its targets as elaborated in the effectiveness section. The TE noted that the project coordination unit used a local approach for implementation of activities which “made a very efficient contribution to meeting the poverty reduction and improved food security objectives and to strengthening their skills” (TE pg 29).

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: UA
---------------------------	------------

The TE gave a Moderately Likely rating to sustainability of the project due to moderate risks involved, however, the TE did not provide an assessment of the risks. The TER is only able to assess the criteria of institutional framework and governance as information on financial resources, sociopolitical and environmental risks were not provided in project documents.

Financial resources: As there is no information of financial risks involved in the TE, the TER is unable to assess the financial sustainability criteria.

Sociopolitical: The TER is not able to assess the sociopolitical sustainability due to lack of information in the TE.

Institutional framework and governance: To have long-term benefits of the SLM achievements, the TE noted that the ministry in charge of the environment, the DGEEF, and the partners’ specialized institutions need to integrate SLM best practices “into all environmental protection policies and strategies and, more specifically, into future initiatives to control desertification, soil erosion, and sand invasion” (TE pg 40). The government institutions should design mechanisms to consolidate “protected plots through local multisectoral and multilateral cooperation agreement” (TE pg 40). In addition, a long-

term programme should build capacities to update knowledge and expand the stabilized land areas (TE pg 40).

Environmental: The TE did not give information on any environmental risks, and thus, the TER is unable to assess the environmental sustainability.

## **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 actual co-financing amount of \$3,244,186 was much lesser than the expected amount of \$13,345,000. Only UNDP, government and World Food Programme gave financing in the end compared to initial commitments by eight beneficiaries. UNDP and WFP's co-financing amounts were critical because "they enabled the project to address the financial gap noted in the initial budget, implement all of its field programme's activities, and achieve satisfactory outcomes" (TE pg 26).

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 PIR 2014 noted that there was a delay in disbursing of funds for the first quarter in 2014 because of new UNDP annual work plan (PIR 2014 pg 24). There was a delay in setting up financial resources and issues with work for food which led to people slowing down their efforts (TE pg 5). However, the project did not take any extensions.

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 country ownership was satisfactory as there was adequate financial and management support from the government. The government provided financial support through co-financing, administrative and implementation support by assisting in execution of the project. The project also received participation from stakeholders in consultation and dialogue process (TE pg 11).

## **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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE did not give an assessment or individual rating for the M&E design at entry. The TER finds the M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory because of shortcomings in the logical framework and indicators. The project document provided an M&E plan and budget which included baseline situation, initiation of project inception workshop, annual project report, project implementation reviews, quarterly progress reports, mid-term review and terminal evaluation. It estimated the total M&E budget to be US\$ 130,000 (PD pgs 28-31). However, the TE noted that the log frame matrix did not present the outcomes as detailed in components and the objective indicators were defined in terms of activities in the log frame. Also, some of the targets were confused with indicators, which hampered monitoring of progress of targets. In other cases, the targets were too ambitious, for example in component 2, “the target was to increase practical knowledge of SLM within at least 50% of the rural populations in the 35 priority micros-basins...this would be difficult to achieve given that the micro-basins protected represent only a tiny number of the many inventoried in the two project zones” (TE pg 1).

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE gave an overall Moderately Satisfactory rating to the M&E system but did not provide evidence for M&E implementation. According to the TE, the project’s M&E was in compliance with GEF/UNDP procedures based on the logical framework and performance indicators. It periodically conducted M&E with support from UNDP and DGEEF (TE pg 30). As the National Centre for Ecological and Environmental Monitoring was not fully prepared, “the repository and the mechanism for performing the monitoring-evaluation of sand invasion were not as efficient as hoped” (TE pg 30). The project conducted and submitted annual progress reports, project implementation reviews, and mid-term review, however, the preparation of MTR was slightly delayed (PIR 2014 pg 21). The monitoring process also involved tripartite review of the implementation and development of periodic technical and financial progress reports (TE pg 30).

### **7. Assessment of project implementation and execution**

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE gave a Highly Satisfactory rating to UNDP’s implementation of the project. UNDP provided co-financing and supervised execution of funds by approving budget revisions and organizing financial audits. It monitored project implementation and “encouraged experience-sharing with other GEF projects and creating necessary synergies within the UNDAF, GEF, and other international projects” (TE pg 30). It also hired contract staff, in collaboration with MHE and DGEEF, and mobilized experts and consultants. It participated in the Project Steering Committee and reviewed and approved expenditures for interventions. It regularly conducted M&E of outcomes and completed required reporting such as PIR and APR. It approved the terms of reference and final versions of reports (TE pg 30). In regard to project design and logical framework, the TE noted that the objective indicators were vague and some targets were confused with indicators in the log frame. This hampered M&E and tracking progress against indicators. It also stated that there were weaknesses in the some of the activities that did not match the aim of the components (TE pgs 16 & 1). Although UNDP provided advisory and financial support to project implementation, due to the shortcomings in the project design the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating.

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

The execution was done by Ministry of Hydraulics and the Environment (MHE) along with Ministry of Environment, Urban Health and Sustainable Development and General Directorate of Environment, Water and Forests (DGEEF). As per the TE, MHE and DGEEF “provided administrative control and technical supervision of the PLECO and the SLM institutional component, performing those tasks rigorously and in accordance with Government and UNDP-GEF procedures” (TE pg 29). With the departmental office teams, the coordination unit developed work plan and budget at the start of each year which served as reference for activities. It also produced technical and financial reports periodically and submitted them to UNDP and government for approval (TE pg 25).

## 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 TE stated the dune fixation during the project had clear achievements in ecosystem rehabilitation and reconstitution of agro-sylvo-pastoral resources and biodiversity. It stabilized 5,373 hectares of sand dunes in the certain provinces, and restored ecological environment for 40,000 village residents living around 62 oasis micro-basins which improved the living conditions. It also reduced erosive processes of winds and decreased the advance of dune faces in the stabilized zones. The dune fixation helped in slowing down sand invasion of land and economic infrastructure. The project reconstituted plant cover by regeneration of pastoral resources and planting. There was an improved plant biodiversity because of regrowth of natural vegetation and return of small fauna and micro-fauna in the protected areas (TE pg 32).

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 noted significant socio-economic impact of the project. The project interventions helped in creation of farmer organizations due to establishment of Natural Resource Management Committees. The community work and establishment of consultation mechanism helped in improved social cohesion amongst communities. The activities related to restoration of vegetation and reduction in wind-blown sand particles had an impact in improving living conditions at 62 sites (TE pg 32). The Food for Work programme mobilized 311,085 people/day, created 2,604 temporary jobs, and eased food insecurity. This generated income “from compensation in cash and foodstuffs for labour for mechanical work, and FCFA 275,735,500 from the sale of plants produced in the village nurseries by women, and by the agricultural development of the protected micro-basins” (TE pg 33). The women earned significantly more due to their involvement in plant production, dune fixation and micro-basin development. In terms of infrastructure impact, the TE noted that dune fixation along roadways improved traffic safety and allowed the population to remain in the current areas (TE pg 33).

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 trained managers from agencies such as livestock production, agriculture, and hydraulics to use a planning tool essential to carrying out local development. It also created a training program for staff on information and communication as well as land degradation (TE pg 11). The TE stated that the stakeholders improved their technical and operational capacities on issues such as dune fixation, community planning for development, and strategizing through active participation in the project (TE pg 33).

b) Governance: The project established networks and mechanisms to help in consultations and experience sharing on issues of environmental degradation (TE pg 34). The project supported the development and adoption of National Strategic Investment Framework for Sustainable Land Management (TE pg 31). To prevent sand invasion, the project developed an observatory system in certain provinces, implemented a multi-annual priority action plan, created a system to collect environmental and socioeconomic data, and set up a committee to disseminate the data and information collected (TE pg 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.

The TE does not report any 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.

There was no significant adoption of GEF initiatives.

## **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.

Lessons learnt are (TE pgs 36-40):

- a) Objectives and project implementation: The project's monitoring and evaluation should have emphasized on the quality of outcomes rather than promoting quantitative aspects. During the project, UNDP and General Directorate of Environment, Water and Forests carried out SLM capacity building and worked to control sand invasion. They also provided a framework for the institutional, operational, and technical aspects. "The complementarity of these actions made it possible to identify convergent priority actions and combine the efforts of both aspects in developing a Long-Term Sustainable Land Management Investment Strategy" (TE pg 37).
- b) Project approach: The participatory approach between the project and its partners and "the experience-sharing through the consultation networks helped to build the partners' institutional, operational, and technical capacities" (TE pg 38). The project had encouraged people to participate in the activities by incentivizing with cash and food for work programs.

Although this may temporarily resolve food deficits, “this approach cannot mobilize the populations or ensure their long-term ownership of the biophysical achievements” (TE pg 38).

- c) Financial management: The project should have decentralized management of resources from project coordination unit to officer’s team leaders. “This would have granted them greater autonomy and facilitated operations, while increasing their efficiency in implementing the field programme” (TE pg 38).
- d) Environmental achievements: The project should have provided transportation to carry materials needed for mechanical dune fixation as the long distance required to travel discouraged people, especially women, to participate. Also, as protection of treated sites can create conflicts with livestock producers, the project should make the protection for temporary period. The period should ultimately be decided by land commissions and commune officials (TE pg 39).
- e) Capacity building: The project should strengthen institutional capacities within the government “to promote and manage the SLM networks and organize local communities” (TE pg 39). However, the project managed to establish a data management system within the National Centre for Ecological and Environmental Monitoring. It also established a virtual library that is accessible everywhere (TE pg 40).
- f) Sustainability and capitalization of the achievements and impacts: To consolidate protected plots, the institutions should design appropriate mechanisms through local multi-sectoral and multilateral cooperation agreements. There should also be a long-term programme “to build the institutions’ and actors’ capacities to update knowledge on a continuing basis and expand the stabilized land areas” (TE pg 40).

## 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Recommendations given by the TE are (TE pgs 40-44):

- a) There should be efforts to control sand invasion as part of long-term actions “to guarantee the survival of the populations in the regions concerned” (TE pg 41). This should be done through creation of permanent structure financed by government, technical partners and cooperation agencies;
- b) For continuation of project benefits, there should be identification of solutions for actions initiated by the project to continue. The TE proposed two phases for priority actions: (i) a two-year transition, preparatory phase (2016-2017) and (ii) a subsequent long-term phase to implement the strategic programme (2018-2032).
- c) Phase I should focus on extending the actions taken by the project during 2011-2015 and rehabilitate older plots stabilized by prior projects; and
- d) Phase II should focus on long-term strategic programme (2018-2032) implementation to “combat sand invasion of land and socioeconomic infrastructure and promote the development of the oasis microbasins” (TE pg 44).

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains detailed assessment of outcomes and impacts, however, the ratings for effectiveness and efficiency of outcomes are not appropriately provided.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report has minor inconsistencies and it lacked evidence for most sections like sustainability, and quality of execution.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does not provide any information on sustainability, although it gives a rating. The TER was unable to assess any of the sustainability criteria. However, the report provides strategy to continue the benefits of the project by implementing a strategy in two phases.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learnt are well supported by evidence, however the information provided is too broad.	<b>MS</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provided co-financing amounts and costs per component, however it does not give costs per activity.	<b>MS</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E system:	The evaluation of M&E system was poorly done as the assessment of M&E implementation was very brief and no information was given on M&E design.	<b>U</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

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

The TER did not use any additional documents.