

**1. Project Data**

Summary project data			
<b>GEF project ID</b>		3635	
<b>GEF Agency project ID</b>		4136	
<b>GEF Replenishment Phase</b>		GEF-4	
<b>Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)</b>		UNDP	
<b>Project name</b>		SFM: Strengthening Sustainable Forest Management and the Development of Bio-energy Markets to Promote Environmental Sustainability and to Reduce Green House Gas Emissions in Cambodia	
<b>Country/Countries</b>		Cambodia	
<b>Region</b>		Asia	
<b>Focal area</b>		Biodiversity; Land Degradation; and Climate change.	
<b>Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives</b>		SO2 – Mainstreaming of Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors; and SO1 - Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level.	
<b>Executing agencies involved</b>		Forestry Administration, Royal Government of Cambodia.	
<b>NGOs/CBOs involvement</b>		The Center for People and Forests (RECOFTC) and Group for Environment, Renewable Energy and Solidarity (GERES) involved as service providers and co-financers	
<b>Private sector involvement</b>		None involved	
<b>CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)</b>		May 27 <sup>th</sup> , 2010	
<b>Effectiveness date / project start</b>		March 18, 2011	
<b>Expected date of project completion (at start)</b>		February 28, 2015	
<b>Actual date of project completion</b>		December 12, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
<b>Project Preparation Grant</b>	GEF funding	-	-
	Co-financing	0.14	-
<b>GEF Project Grant</b>		2.36	2.36

<b>Co-financing</b>	IA own	3.2	2.38
	Government	0.6	0.6
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	3.0	3.75
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	0.8	1.10
<b>Total GEF funding</b>		2.36	2.36
<b>Total Co-financing</b>		7.74	7.84
<b>Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)</b>		10.10	10.20
<b>Terminal evaluation/review information</b>			
<b>TE completion date</b>		December 2015	
<b>Author of TE</b>		Michael J.B. Green & Sovith Sin	
<b>TER completion date</b>		January 30, 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	S	-	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	-	ML
M&E Design		MS	-	MS
M&E Implementation		MS	-	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	-	MS
Quality of Execution		S	-	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's Global Environmental Objective is to conserve biodiversity and respond to climate change by strengthening national and local authorities as well as communities (PD pgs 47-48).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objective is "to strengthen national SFM policy, integrate community-based sustainable forest management into policy, planning and investment frameworks and create markets for sustainable bio-energy technologies that reduce CO2 emissions" (PD pg 47). It plans to achieve its objective through three outcomes and they are (PD pgs 48-59):

Outcome 1: National capacities and tools exist to facilitate the widespread implementation of sustainable community-based forest management and technologies that reduce demand for fuel wood;  
Outcome 2: Community-based sustainable forest management is being implemented effectively within a context of cantonment, province, district and commune level planning delivering concrete benefits to local communities; and  
Outcome 3: Strengthened demand and supply chain for energy efficient cook stoves and end fuels.

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

There were no changes in objectives or activities during 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-4 Sustainable Forest Management Strategy by aiming to reduce threats to sustainable management of Cambodia's forests. Under the Biodiversity focal area, it was aligned to “Strategic Objective 2 on Mainstreaming of Biodiversity in Production Landscapes/Seascapes and Sectors and its Strategic Programme 4 on Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity (BD SO2/SP4)” (PD pg 42). It will also contribute to the strategy on Sustainable Financing of Protected Area Systems at the National Level by piloting revenue generation measures. In the land degradation focal area, the project was consistent with Strategic Objectives 1 “to develop an enabling environment that will place Sustainable Land Management in the mainstream of development policy and practices at the regional, national and local levels”, and Strategic Objective 2 “to upscale SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods” (PD pg 42). Lastly, it is relevant to the climate change Strategic Priority 1 of Promoting Energy Efficiency in Residential and Commercial Buildings and Strategic Programme 4 on Promoting Sustainable Energy Production from Biomass. (PD pg 42).

In terms of country relevance, the project was aligned to Cambodia’s National Strategic Development Plan (2006-2010) and the Rectangular Strategy II (2008) which aim for “forest sector reform, improved sustainable forest management and preservation of forest cover” (PD pg 40). The project’s objectives were in conformity with the National Forest Programme, 2009 to manage and conserve forests (PD pg 41).

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

The TE gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to the project’s effectiveness and the TE considers the rating to be appropriate. The project had three outcomes which it achieved in a moderately satisfactory manner. The project developed intended business and management plans, linked sustainable forest management approaches to local government institutions and disbursed energy efficient products. However, many of the plans needed approval and the project fell short of creating a legal or policy framework for sustainable forest management. Due to delays in implementation the project did not have time to implement some of the community forest management plans. The achievements of the

outcomes are elaborated below, but the TER notes that design of the project had a major flaw in listing indicators as outputs and thus, many of the achievements are compared to indicators rather than expected outputs.

Outcome 1: National capacities, policies and regulations exist to facilitate the widespread implementation of SFM, integrating energy efficiency, biodiversity, sustainable land management and livelihood considerations:

This outcome had two outputs which planned to create a supportive legal framework for sustainable forest management (SFM), implement a national Wood Energy Strategy and build capacity to integrate landscape-based approach into commune land use planning. The project was successful in linking conservation approaches in land use planning, such as integrating community forests and community protected areas in Commune Land Use Planning (TE pg 39). It drafted Alternative Community Forest Modalities concept notes and Community Forest business plans and presented to the Forestry Administration. It also developed a draft National Wood Energy Strategy and recommended the Forestry Administration to amend the Community Forest guidance, however, actual approvals and amendments to legislation have not taken place (TE pg 93). The project was also not able to develop any financing strategies to sustain SFM nor generate financing activities because the business development plans were well behind schedule (TE pg 40).

Outcome 2: Community-based sustainable forest management is being implemented effectively within a context of cantonment, province, district and commune level planning delivering concrete benefits to local communities:

This outcome aimed to develop business and management plans, and integrate SFM into local government institutions. The project drafted community protection management plans in 11 sites, community forest management plans in 30 sites and 4 alternative community forest modalities and most of them were likely to be approved by end of project timeline. The drafting of these tools was possible due to establishment and cooperation of multi-agency platforms within each province and technical guidance from the service providers. For example, four Forestry Administration Cantonments worked with development partners and NGOs to establish community forest management plans (TE pg 40). The project also finalized four Commune Land Use Plans with integration of community forests and community protection areas (TE pg 96). However, the TE notes there were challenges to implementing the plans “when existing coordination mechanisms, technical support and financial support end. It is further exacerbated by the degraded condition of many of the target CFs, which will require 3-5 years for restoration measures to begin to take effect” (TE pg 40). Despite implementation challenges, the project managed to increase annual income from forest enterprises such as in Kampong Chhnang province, the income increased from US\$ 213 in 2012 to US\$ 283 in 2014 (TE pg 96). As per the TE, 29% of households benefitted from activities based on forest resources, such as fuel wood, bamboo, mushrooms, wild vegetables, red ants and traditional medicines (TE pg 96). However, one of the shortcomings was decrease of income from US \$67 to \$11 per month amongst female headed households compared to increase from US \$74 to \$95 for non-female headed households (TE pg 41).

Outcome 3: Strengthened demand and supply chain for energy efficient cook stoves and end fuels:

This outcome intended to reduce threats to forest resources and improving livelihoods through fuel wood efficient interventions, which was satisfactorily achieved. The project sold 143,575 improved cook stoves in total and constructed 17 efficient charcoal kilns. As per the TE, the increase of market shares for improved cook stoves “resulted in an estimated reduction in GHG emissions of 29,949 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per year by 2015” (TE pg 41). Further, the operationalization of energy efficient charcoal kilns had reduced GHG emissions of 945 tCO<sub>2</sub>e per year by 2015 (TE pg 41). However, the project faced challenges in expanding the market in rural areas and monitoring quality control of products (TE pg 41).

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

The TE gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to the efficiency of the project while noting that “cost effectiveness of delivery of results diluted by significant delays in project implementation that has undermined extent of achievement of project objective and outcomes” (TE pg 44). The project had significant delays in procurement of service providers and engaging the Ministry of Environment as an implementing partners. There were also institutional issues in the field such as conflicting land claims with the Economic Land Commissions (TE pgs 36 & 40). In terms of cost effectiveness, the actual and planned co-financing was relatively close which indicates efficient management of project funds (TE pg 35). The annual disbursement of finances was spread “evenly across the life of the project, following an underspend in 2011 and then tailing off in the last year” (TE pg 35).

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

The TE considered the sustainability of the project benefits as Moderately Likely but noted that it was dependent on support from commune leaders, and implementing partners at provincial levels. The TER gives the same rating as the financial, institutional and sociopolitical risks were low. The overall assessment is based on the assessment of financial resources, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental criteria.

Financial resources: The project had failed to develop any financial strategies in Ministry of Environment to support community-based forestry (TE pg 44). However, the project created livelihood opportunities through fuel wood efficient interventions by initiating the improved cook stoves. This employed 180 local people and increased the monthly income from US \$40 to \$87. The project also made progress with income generation through sustainable forest management. About 29% benefitted from forest based activities and in some sites like Kampong Chhnang the baseline income rose significantly (TE pgs 40-41). These local level income generation activities could help to sustain financial benefits from the project.

Sociopolitical: As stated above, the project helped to create alternative income generating opportunities which raised the income level of local community members (TE pgs 40-41). The project also had good political support from national and provincial government, and there was stakeholder consultation and analysis throughout the project (TE pg 47). These factors could help in maintaining sociopolitical sustainability.

Institutional framework and governance: The project strengthened institutional capacities of local governments by developing guidance notes and SFM approaches for forest governance. It also integrated community forest management “into provincial forest management plans and CPA management plans into the respective sustainable use zones of protected areas under the authority of MoE, including the management plans of Sam Kos and Aural Wildlife Sanctuaries” (TE pg 48). Additionally, it also integrated SFM into Cambodia Wood and Biomass Strategy and Action Plan (TE pg 48). All these plans are useful in creating the regulatory framework for sustainable forest management.

Environmental: There were no environmental risks that could pose a threat to environmental sustainability. In fact, by initiating energy efficient products, the project helped in reducing GHG emissions that could have long-term environmental impact (TE pgs 41 & 45).

## **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 \$7,837,277 was slightly more than expected co-financing of \$7,738,000. The TE indicated that co-financing from UNDP’s contributed to activities for the three outcomes and M&E implementation, however, there was no information on how the other co-financing was used (TE pg 34).

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 had a significant delay of 18 months to start operations and in hiring service providers for technical assistance. There was an additional one-year delay in bringing Ministry of Environment on board (TE pg 19). Due to these delays, the project was given a 10-month no-cost extension until end of 2015 to complete the implementation (TE pg 6).

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 noted that there was high country ownership of the project. Many of the stakeholders, such as government ministries and agencies, were substantially involved in consultations, design and implementation of the project. During the design phase “problem analysis was accompanied by thorough stakeholder consultation and analysis” (TE pg 47). The project hired two international NGO service providers for building capacity at community levels, which was well received at grassroots levels (TE pg 47). The ownership was reflected in the fact that the Forestry Administration along with Ministry of Environment, Ministry of Land Management and other government agencies were thoroughly involved in executing the project by facilitating activities and co-financing the funds.

## **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 gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to M&E design at entry and the TER gives the same. The project document had provision for M&E activities such as timely inception workshop and report, quarterly and annual project reviews, mid-term and final evaluations, and M&E work plan and budget. It also provided a baseline analysis. However, the baseline indicators were flawed in design. The MTR noted that there was a need for “consolidation and rationalization of several of the Indicators. Some refer to different measures of the same Outcome indicator, while some indicators in Outcome 1 are not appropriate in that Outcome area and are duplicated in Outcome 2 or Outcome 3” (MTR pg 75). The TE also reported that the indicators jeopardised monitoring of progress because they were “poorly defined, many proving to be outputs and others insufficiently SMART” (TE pg 43). In addition, the results framework listed the indicators as outputs causing more inconsistency and confusion (TE pg 43, MTR 75).

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

The TE rated M&E implementation as Moderately Satisfactory and noted that the project timely submitted the quarterly and annual progress reports, project implementation reviews as well as



conducted Project Board meetings. The project also had a GEF tracking tool for biodiversity reporting which was useful for assessing biodiversity conservation in landscapes. However, there was a need for better communication and feedback between UNDP and project team on the language for reporting progress (MTR pg 42). The project faced issues in monitoring due to absence of baselines for many of the indicators but after the MTR there were improvements made to the indicators. Another shortcoming was lack of coherent outputs for the outcomes which posed a “challenge to track a given set of activities from the onset to the end of implementation” (TE pg 36).

## 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: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rated UNDP’s implementation of the project as Satisfactory. It worked closely with the executing agency throughout the implementation and provided technical, administrative and consultant support to the project management unit (PMU). The PMU worked closely with the two services providers, GERES and RECOFTC. The service providers collaborated “with the provincial agencies, engage(d) effectively and in a very participatory manner with the local communities” (TE pg 37). The TE stated that there was strong commitment and support from the PMU and service providers, however, there was heavy reliance on service providers on technical support as this should have been the role of the PMU (TE pg 37). Also, as the TE noted, the implementing agency shared responsibility over one-year delay of implementation which impacted the sustainability of the project (TE pg 44).

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

The Forestry Administration was the executing agency under the National Implementation Modality. The TE rated quality of execution as satisfactory, while this TER rates it as moderately satisfactory. It coordinated inputs from ministries such as for environment, mines and energy, and land management. The establishment of multi-agency platforms helped in providing technical support at provincial levels, and to build capacity amongst local communities. However, the project faced delays and coordination difficulties between the Forestry Administration and the Administration of Nature Conservation & Protection which left insufficient time for implementing business plans (TE pgs 37, 32 & 44).

## 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 project had impact on environmental stress reduction and status improvement. By introducing SFM into community forestry and community protection areas that reversed “forest loss and land degradation, such as establishment of 7 woodlots covering 1,781 ha to supply firewood for charcoal production and 4,902 ha of woodlots to harvest fuel wood” (TE pg 45). The introduction of energy efficient stoves reduced emissions by 29,949 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year and charcoal production helped in decreasing emissions by 945 tCO<sub>2</sub>e/year. In terms of deforestation, the TE noted there was a “change in deforestation rate from 0.5% per year to -0.46% per year in project target sites across 4 provinces, compared with 0.71% annual deforestation rate in target provinces” (TE pg 45).

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 project’s income generating activities had socioeconomic impact on local communities. Through forest enterprises, in Kampong Chhnang province, the income increased from US\$ 213 in 2012 to US\$ 283 in 2014 (TE pg 96). Income generating activities based on forest resources, such as fuel wood, bamboo, and mushrooms benefitted around 29% of households. It also created bioenergy efficient cook stoves and charcoal kilns, thereby contributing “in less tangible ways to human health at household and community levels from the reduced wood smoke” (TE pg 45).

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 strengthened capacity of local institutions by developing guidance and concept notes and management plans using SFM approaches (TE pg 39).

b) Governance: the project developed Wood & Biomass Energy Strategy for wood management, and drafted community forest business plans. It also integrated community forests and protected areas in community land use plans (TE pgs 40 & 93).

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

No unintended impacts were reported.

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.

No broad adoption of GEF initiatives were reported.

## **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.

Key lessons learned are (TE pgs 52-53):

- a) Ensure the strategic results framework is designed well at project inception stage. Any changes made at the inception and MTR stage should be reflected in the framework and progress towards targets should be reviewed annually;
- b) The project sufficiently demonstrated multi-sector cooperation, an important component of natural resource management;
- c) To secure niche market place, quality control of cooking stoves through certification is important. Also products from income generating activities should be thoroughly researched to identify the niche markets;

- d) Ecotourism should involve environmental and social principles and among local communities;
- e) As some members were committed to conserving forests, “it should not be assumed that all CF/CPA community members are driven by IGA opportunities” (TE pg 53).

Best and worst practices are (TE pg 53):

- a) Multi-sector platform “regularly coordinated their technical and other support to communities engaged in CF and CPA planning and management, within the locally administered framework of CLUP” (TE pg 53);
- b) The project explored different modalities of community forestry to increase the regulatory framework for SFM;
- c) The project successfully integrated SFM within local governments “thereby maximising its institutionalisation and ownership at grassroots level” (TE pg 53);
- d) The introduction of energy efficient cook stoves demonstrated that benefits can outweigh costs in carbon emission reduction. “These new income-generating activities have improved livelihoods significantly for producers and distributors of such technologies. The products have also benefitted the livelihoods of the consumers, with reduced financial or labour costs in obtaining fuel wood” (TE pg 53); and
- e) The project did not have an exit strategy ahead of the end of implementation.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The recommendations given are (TE pgs 50-52):

- a) Finalize approval and disseminate the community forest and protection area management plans as a high priority;
- b) Disseminate best practices and lessons learned in community forestry and emissions reduction;
- c) Institutionalize provincial multi-sector platforms so that communities continue to be supported;
- d) Facilitate revenue generation opportunities in implementation of community forest and protection area management plans;
- e) Analyze the increasing gender gaps, ground-truth the increase in forest degradation detected in target sites and complete the assessment of inventories of forest resources;
- f) Explore markets for products of IGAs and establish pro-poor value chains;
- g) Adopt a precautionary approach to health and safety aspects of income generation activities;
- h) Adopt ecotourism principles and community based orientation in ecotourism developments;
- i) Consolidate the existing achievements and adequately resource implementation of management plans for mainstreaming of community-based SFM;
- j) Develop an exit strategy which clearly identifies what needs to be in place by the end of the project; and
- k) Identify funds for mainstreaming SFM across all provinces and expand the scope of the REDD+ demonstration sites to include SFM target sites.

## 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 elaborate assessment of outcomes, however, it is very brief with its evaluation of impacts. There is no information on socioeconomic and governance impacts.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report's ratings are well explained and it gives appropriate rating to each component with relevant evidence.	<b>S</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project sustainability was incomplete and needed more evidence for the ratings given. The project did not have an exit strategy which the report mentioned.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported well with evidence but more detail could have been helpful	<b>MS</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report included actual costs and expenditure per year.	<b>S</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of project M&E is well discussed but slightly overrated.	<b>MS</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 other sources.