

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		357	
GEF Agency project ID		339	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP, FAO	
Project name		Institutional Support for the Protection of East African Biodiversity	
Country/Countries		Kenya, Tanzania, Uganda	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP3 Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Executing agency: FAO. Government cooperating agencies: Kenya's National Environment Secretariat, Ministry of Environment and Forests. Tanzania's National Environmental Management Council, Ministry of Natural Resources, Environment, and Tourism. Uganda's Ministry of Water, Energy, minerals, and Environmental Protection	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		October 1, 1992 (Date shown is UNDP date of approval)	
Effectiveness date / project start		October 1, 1992	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		September 1, 1996	
Actual date of project completion		January 31, 1996	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		10	10
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		10	10
Total Co-financing			
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		10	10
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		November 1996	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Roy Hagen et al	
TER completion date		September 2014	
TER prepared by		Daniel Nogueira-Budny	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
M&E Design	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MU
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	S

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environmental Objective, as described in the Project Document (PD), is to enhance the capacity of existing government and NGOs to conserve forest and wetland biodiversity in East Africa. This project is globally significant because East Africa is a high priority for biodiversity conservation, particularly since the region is losing significant amounts of its flora and fauna at an alarming rate. In particular, the project looks to redress the current imbalance of international funding for biodiversity in the region: while large mammalian populations have generally attracted most biodiversity-allocated funds in the region, the plight of East Africa's forests and wetlands have been largely ignored. This loss of biodiversity represents a decrease in the global resources essential for a functional and productive human environment.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the PD, the project's Development Objective is to create the institutional awareness and capability within the relevant governmental agencies and NGOs of East Africa, so as to ensure adequate protection of the biological resources (biodiversity) of the region. The immediate objectives, as summarized in the Terminal Evaluation (TE), are the following:

- Establish a (or support the existing) biodiversity unit within government environmental agencies in each country
- Increase the quantity and quality of training in all aspects of biodiversity and to improve levels of awareness of biodiversity in government
- Upgrade the institutional capability to collect, analyze, and disseminate information on biodiversity so as to further conservation
- Undertake management and planning activity to enhance existing conservation capability in a demonstrative and integrated way

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

There were **no** changes to the GEO or DOs throughout implementation. Following the project's 1993 Tripartite Review, a small number of outputs were added to the PD, including awareness-raising in

government to account better for slight changes to project during implementation period; however, overall objectives remained intact.

#### 4. GEF EO 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project was relevant both to GEF and National priorities at time of approval. Consistent with OP3 – Forest Ecosystems, the project aims to improve the capacity of regional governments to implement conservation programs and/or to integrate conservation within development programs. This is relevant to the region because the globally significant biodiversity of the three countries is being depleted at an alarming rate and existing government agencies responsible for biodiversity conservation are unable to function adequately in large part due to a lack of trained staff and resources (cf. TE, p 10). Furthermore, existing education programs to improve training and awareness on the subject are likewise inadequate and in need of improvement. In terms of GEF priorities, two important GEF criteria were taken into account in developing this project: focus on globally significant biodiversity that is not attracting major government or bilateral investment (forests and wetlands), and strengthening of institutional capacity of government and NGOs (national environmental associations and conservation-related local NGOs). Furthermore, the project contributes to the conservation of ecosystems, species, and habitats widely considered to be of global significance.

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

Overall, the project was considered effective, particularly in developing regional networks and technical collaboration, as well as in conducting regional training exercises and workshops. The ICR categorizes what the PD describes as two objectives, plus a few addenda, into four immediate objectives, discussed in detail below. Two of these immediate objectives were deemed successful and the other two had limited success. As such, the overall effectiveness of the project was rated moderately satisfactory.

1. *Establish a (or support the existing) biodiversity unit within government environmental agencies in each country – **Unsatisfactory**.* This overly ambitious objective was largely unachieved for a variety of reasons. Existing environmental agencies lacked clarity of mandate and political clout, leading to role confusion and overlapping authority with other national institutions; the establishment of new ones led to institutional conflict with pre-existing environmental agencies. Newly appointed biodiversity officers still had their former responsibilities to work on full-time, so little effective changes took place in terms of prioritizing conservation within national governments (TE, pp 31-34).
2. *Increase the quantity and quality of training in all aspects of biodiversity and to improve levels of awareness of biodiversity in government – **Satisfactory**.* Training activities were wide ranging, appropriate, and highly appreciated. Regional networks and linkages were expanded thanks to training’s regional nature. Levels of awareness have been raised substantially as well, particularly at secondary schools through wildlife clubs, and moderately so at universities and with mid-level government employees. The one area in which awareness raising was least successful was within the policy and decision making communities. (ICR, pp 34-40). It should be noted that, while the immediate objective specifically stipulated training and awareness-raising *in government*, the project (as well as the TE) interpreted this liberally to include broader society as well.
3. *Upgrade the institutional capability to collect, analyze, and disseminate information on biodiversity so as to further conservation – **Satisfactory**.* Project successfully assisted in the creation and development of government and NGO databases. Project supported and expanded pre-existing, informal regional forum for coordination of database and biodiversity inventory standards. One of the project’s major successes was increasing regional collaboration on biodiversity conversation (TE, pp 40-43).
4. *Undertake management and planning activity to enhance existing conservation capability in a demonstrative and integrated way – **Unsatisfactory**.* In practice, this vague objective was interpreted as the realization of field activities. Pilot projects intending to develop, test, and demonstrate innovative approaches for biodiversity conservation and use were, overall, only of very limited success. With the partial exception of Tanzania, where local NGOs had been more involved, it appears that project’s pilot projects did not result in practical conservation measures. TE mentions numerous times that one of the biggest pitfalls of such activities was that socio-economic and –political aspects were not taken into account and, as such, wealthy and powerful stakeholders were not taken into account, limiting the effectiveness of approaches and interventions tested (TE, pp 44-45).

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

The project’s efficiency was rated moderately satisfactory; all activities were completed within budget and in a timely manner. Substantial delays did occur in the beginning of the project, due in large part to

bureaucratic inefficiencies, such as lack of adequate staffing and available work space. Project’s training activities were noted for their quality and their exceptionally efficient use of limited resources; on a similar line, a number of the project’s trainings and workshops ended up being co-financed by other multilateral organization engaging in similar activities in the region.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Unlikely</b>
--------------------	------------------------------------

According to the ICR, the project did not place a great deal of emphasis on sustainability. Sustainability is rated as moderately unlikely, as there are significant risks to the overall sustainability of project outcomes. Sustainability is assessed along the following four dimensions:

- a) *Environmental sustainability – (U/A)* ICR provides insufficient information to provide a rating on environmental risks to sustainability.
- b) *Financial sustainability – (MU)* ICR provides minimal information on issue of financial sustainability. It does mention that, given the vast number of institutions tapped to participate in the project, it appears that that no single institution was burdened with vast new budgetary demands that would be difficult to sustain through their own resources after project completion. However, biodiversity inventories are almost completely dependent on donor funding and TE notes that no funds have been allocated by institutions themselves for monitoring and updating of inventories. Furthermore, unfinished pilot field activities will not be continued after project ends, unless further donor support is found.
- c) *Institutional sustainability – (L)* One of the strongest points of the project is its focus on capacity-building of pre-existing institutions, helping guarantee that a significant portion of its accomplishments and increased capacity will be sustained. ICR expressed optimism about continued regional collaboration, not only at the national governmental level, but also among universities and NGOs. It is assumed that databases will be sustained relatively well in NGOs, universities, and institutes and that those trained in workshops will hold onto their newly acquired skill sets. However, ICR fears that many of the vehicles purchased with project funds (16 percent of project budget was spent on equipment, the greater portion of which was for vehicle purchase) will be grounded upon project completion, due to lack of necessary maintenance and running costs.
- d) *Socio-Political sustainability – (L)* Support for the project is strong at the national level, although important stake-holders do have an interest in preserving the status quo and could potentially undermine efforts down the line. While competing and overlapping roles and authorities have complicated the effectiveness of national environmental agencies (NEAs), it appears that there is a growing alignment of interests among government agencies, universities, research universities, and NGOs at the national and regional level of the need to conserve biodiversity and engage in similar interventions in the future, particularly ones with a greater emphasis on field-based activities.

## 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?

No co-financing was expected or provided for this project. As a means of making optimal use of scarce resources and avoiding duplication of activities, the project did end up co-sponsoring workshops with other donors, including the European Union and FAO.

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?

Significant delays were experienced in the beginning of the project due to insufficient staff and physical office space. The PD stipulated that all three national governments would provide counterpart staff, office accommodation, and administrative support (cf. Section E: Inputs). However, such provisions were not foreseen as a prior obligation or prerequisite to the start-up of the project. According to the ICR, staffing and infrastructure constraints caused delays in project implementation and posed problems for the sustainability of certain project activities (cf. p 28).

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:

ICR implied that individual country ownership for this regional project was strong. Project succeeded in bringing together a wide range of national institutions to collaborate on joint training and biodiversity conservation. Government agencies, universities and regional institutions cooperated closely at field level in data collection, as well as in the analysis of the data collected and information-sharing.

## 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: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

Project called for two principal mechanisms to oversee and monitor project implementation: the National Project Steering Committees (PSCs) and the Tripartite Review process (UNDP, FAO, and

national PSCs). Also, at FAO Headquarters a multidisciplinary Project Task Force was established to monitor project implementation and provide technical oversight to the Chief Technical Advisor (CTA). PSCs were held responsible for the monitoring and evaluation of all project components for their country. The PSC's Project Performance Evaluation Reports would be written twice yearly, while Tripartite Reviews (TPRs) would be held in each country on a yearly base (they later became regional); provision for these reviews was made in the budget. PD contains a detailed list of outputs (cf. pp 19-29) that includes brief albeit clear achievement indicators with which one could use to gauge whether or not the project was on track to achieve its intended objectives.

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

ICR quotes the Mid-Term Evaluation's criticism of the PSCs, particularly in Kenya and Tanzania, for their tardiness in being established, the infrequency of their meetings, and their emphasis on administrative rather than technical issues. PSCs, it continues, were not fulfilling their monitoring duties. Following the Evaluation and the application of mitigating efforts, such as establishing sub-committees to relieve the overburdened Committees, the PSCs began to fulfill their roles better and became a more effective mechanism for monitoring project implementation (TE, p 29). TE notes that one reason for the partial ineffectiveness of the PSCs, as well as the Tripartite Reviews, even after changes were made, was that Output 1.4, the development of benchmarks and criteria for evaluating and monitoring progress, was never achieved.

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
--	--

ICR rates project design as weak owing, in part, to its highly complex nature: there are 37 components to the project. While the objectives, outputs, and budget for each of these components are well described in the PD annexes, it is quite difficult to relate each of them back to the outputs and activities described in the body text of the PD. Furthermore, the concept and design would have benefited from a wider range of expertise: PD does not mention reasons behind the depletion of biodiversity (poverty, population growth, agriculture, etc). A more balanced statement could have helped lead to a more

problem-oriented approach. Additionally, design heavily emphasized government environmental agencies, but largely ignored ministries and agencies with control over natural resources. Furthermore, project was not designed to have any significant impact on local resource users, a problem since they are the ones most affected by conservation efforts. Nonetheless, the Quality of Project Implementation was rated moderately satisfactory since supervision and assistance were stronger than design. In particular, the CTA’s personality, breadth of knowledge, and competence ensured that the project was smoothly executed, despite the inadequacy of the project design.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
---	--

The effectiveness of the project’s executing agency in performing its roles and responsibilities was deemed moderately satisfactory. FAO’s management was deemed good; FAO was, in particular, quite effective at handling procurement. Its project management skills were positive, particularly after it made positive staffing and administrative changes once it was realized (early on) that the CTA was overburdened with administrative concerns and needed more administrative and technical support. Project’s Contractual Services Agreements (CSAs) were regarded as innovative and effective in managing and disbursing funds. The biggest issue with project execution was the FAO’s untimeliness in providing budget information to the implementing agencies.

## 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.

Given the long-term time frame of biodiversity conservation, the project was never intended to produce immediate results and so no changes in environmental stress or status occurred by the end of the project. According to the TE, “there has probably been almost no direct impact of this project on the loss of biodiversity in East Africa” (p 57). Rather, the project successfully built the capacity to conserve biodiversity better in the long run. It should be noted that one important, albeit minor, environmental change has been the reported end of the dynamiting of reefs thanks to villager interventions, the result of a pilot project involving local community empowerment in Zanzibar (TE, p xv).

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.

ICR did not mention any socioeconomic changes that occurred by the end of the project.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

- a) Capacities – According to the TE, there was a significant enhancement of local universities’ capacity to analyze and help conserve biodiversity, including, in particular, the improved joint training capacity on the part of universities alongside local NGOs and governmental agencies (p xiv). The vast majority of project resources went into capacity building of NEAs in the form of training, purchases of vehicles and equipment, and development of inventory and databases. Regarding the latter, database development (Specific Objective 3) has successfully led to the development of the institutional capacity to collect, analyze, and disseminate information needed for biodiversity conservation (TE, p 43). Field activities related to Specific Objective 4 were instrumental in developing capacities in survey and inventory techniques, data analysis, and GIS (TE, pp 44).
- b) Governance – There has been no identifiable impact on national development plans and policies, according to the TE (cf. p 57). Furthermore, the enhanced capacity of NEAs is quite tenuous (TE, p xii). The three countries’ NEAs continue to be beset by institutional constraints that prevent them from effectively taking the lead on conservation issues. “One of the key problems of the NEAs in all three countries has been their lack of clarity of mandate, leading to confusion in responsibilities, duplication of activities, and intense competition between rival environmental agencies within the three countries” (TE, p 18).

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 project did not have any unintended impacts, according to the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been

established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

Inter-ministerial sub-committees have been established in Kenya and Uganda; a proposal for the creation of a sub-committee on biodiversity was under review in Tanzania at time of TE writing. Thanks in large part to this, by project end, increased awareness and consideration of biodiversity concerns have made their way into various sectors and levels of government, as well as by local-level stakeholders.

## **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.

1. Clarity of mandate and political clout within government institutions are needed to build effective government coordination; institutional capacity cannot be built when organization is politically weak, poorly funded, has insufficient staff, enjoys a low acceptance level, or has no enforcement capabilities
2. Lack of donor coordination results in serious problems, as witnessed in the support of NEAs, NEAPs, and other planning/strategy documents
3. One must take into account the ability of those with power/political clout and the ability of hierarchical and bureaucratic procedures to constrain the role of government agencies, like the NEAs.
4. Need to balance biological priorities with analysis and prioritization of the threats to biodiversity and their causes
5. Importance of collecting and analysis socio-economic data, as well as stakeholder participation, in order to develop effective strategies and solutions for conservation and management of biological resources; need to spatially define the exact pressures on biological resources, who are exerting them, and why they are exerting such pressures.
6. PD should lay out clear specifics regarding prerequisites and government commitments
7. Need to allocate enough staff / staff time for administrative and financial matters, such that experts can focus their attention on more technical issues
8. Need for greater donor coordination to ensure that donors, who otherwise would champion and help create their own, parallel environmental agencies, do not end up undermining the authority of the lead environmental agency
9. Importance of involvement in wide range of technical experts in design and implementation stages
10. Four years is too short a period to show significant results for a project promoting capacity-building, which is a far longer-term process

11. Need for uncommitted resources and contingency funds, given inflexibility of GEF budget and fact that UNDP budget does not allow for contingencies to absorb shocks (such as currency appreciations, increase in professional and general staff costs, etc.)
12. Need for better understanding of biodiversity; much of the project was a learning process, understanding what biodiversity is and is not
13. UNEP is not set to handle procurement; the agency should not be relied upon for this function

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

#### *Future Priority Areas for Intervention*

1. Future similar projects should consolidate and/or build upon this project's results and strengths: its capacity to collect and analyze data on biological resources; multi-sectoral, GIS-based database; human resources; cross-sectoral national and regional networks and linkages; biodiversity awareness; and newfound desire to apply these new skills to real field situations
2. Future projects should focus on recognized priority sites that have already been identified
3. Community-based participation should be a key element of field activities
4. Engage the political will of the government authorities in order to ensure the integration of biodiversity concerns into national planning and policies
5. Support for national wetlands policy development is needed for Tanzania and Kenya; for Uganda (and, later, for Tanzania and Kenya, as well), need for focus on policy implementation and field-level wetlands conservation and management, with close involvement of local communities
6. Must justify continued use of public funds for the conservation of biodiversity; awareness has already been raised on economics of natural resources, but this needs to continue
7. Assistance needed to develop national capabilities to implement the Convention on International Trade of Endangered Species (CITES): training of customs officials and preparation of a manual on endangered/protected species for use by customs

#### *Institutional and Policy Development*

8. Governments must resolve issue of overlapping mandates of national institutions charged with coordinating biodiversity issues; such institutions need strong, legal foundations
9. Need for country-specific mix of interventions – institutional capacity-building, field activities, institutional and policy reforms, an appropriate legal framework – for long-term biodiversity conservation to work; need for three countries to develop quickly national biodiversity conservation strategies

#### *Regionalism*

10. Future efforts should continue to build and strengthen regional linkages and collaboration between national institutions, but not create new, regional institutions; there are major advantages to a regional approach, particularly following the switch to field activities, given the fact that areas of concern cross international boundaries

11. Certain national institutions should be supported to develop into centers of excellence: e.g., National Museums of Kenya, Wildlife Clubs of Kenya, Wetlands Program in Uganda, Forestry Department at Tanzania's Sokoine University of Agriculture

#### *Training*

12. Training should be assessed systematically and be a function of national biodiversity conservation strategies, the institutions involved in their implementation, and the targeted roles and responsibilities of these institutions and their staff in relation to their present capacity
13. Countries would benefit from a greater diversity of location of external training fellows, in addition to a greater diversity of sources of international consultants

#### *Enhance Project Implementation*

14. Professionally facilitated, team-building workshops should be employed on future projects involving a multiplicity of outputs, components, and implementing agencies
15. Contractual Service Agreements (CSAs) were an innovative and effective mechanism for disbursement of resources and endowment of national institutions and NGOs with responsibility and accountability for providing services and producing specified project outputs; modalities for drawing up CSAs could be made more efficient

#### *Donor Coordination*

16. Greater donor collaboration is needed; must avoid wasting scarce human and financial resources by supporting or creating rival national institutions, which invariably serve to weaken the authority of the lead environmental institution

## 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 EO 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?	ICR contains a thorough assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of project, as well as achievement of objectives.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Report is internally consistent and assertions are backed by convincing evidence. Ratings, however, are qualitative and incomplete.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	ICR does not properly assess project sustainability. Review of sustainability is too brief and undeveloped.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are supported by ample evidence. Furthermore, lessons are comprehensive and well-developed.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not mention the actual project costs and co-financing.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	ICR adequately evaluates the project's M&E systems.	S
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

Overall TE rating:  $0.3 * (6+4) + 0.1 * (3+6+1+5) = 4.5$

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