

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3642	
GEF Agency project ID		GFL/2328-2716-4A85	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Support the Implementation of the National Biosafety Framework of Lao PDR	
Country/Countries		Lao PDR	
Region		South East Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP6-Biosafety	
Executing agencies involved		National Authority for Science & Technology, Lao PDR	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		August 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		October 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 2013	
Actual date of project completion		November 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant			
Co-financing	IA own	0	0
	Government	0.505	0.505
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		0,995	0.944
Total Co-financing		0.505	0.505
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.5	1.449
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Camillo Risoli	
Author of TE		February 2015	
TER completion date		December 30, 2015	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS	NR	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	ML	NR	L
M&E Design	S	U, S*	NR	MS
M&E Implementation	S	MU	NR	MS
Quality of Implementation	NR	HS, U**	NR	MS
Quality of Execution	NR	MS	NR	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	HS	MS

* U for M&E design, and S for M&E budgeting and funding, which this TER considers as part of the M&E design component.

** HS for UNEP supervision, and U for project design

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The stated objective of this project is “to assist Lao PDR to implement the draft Biosafety Law, which was based on the draft NBF, into a workable and transparent NBF by 2010, to fulfill its National Socio- economic Development Plan and implement its obligations as a Party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety” (PD p.2).

It is essentially an institution-building project aiming to fulfill Lao’s obligations under the Cartagena Protocol, which is expected to contribute to global benefits “through the conservation and sustainable use of Lao PDR’s mega biodiversity, ecosystems and habitats” (Revised Milestones Document, p.5).

The expected outcomes for this project are the following:

- Information on needs analysis of the country is updated ^[1]_[SEP]
- Biosafety is integrated into National development plans ^[1]_[SEP]
- The regulatory regime for biosafety is workable and supported by regulations ^[1]_[SEP]
- An efficient administrative system for handling requests is established ^[1]_[SEP]
- Public awareness and education in biotechnology and biosafety is increased and participation in decision making is active. ^[1]_[SEP]

(PD p.2)

Those five outcomes are expected to be achieved through the delivery of the following eight project outputs: (1) stocktaking analysis; (2) National plan (policy) consolidation; (3) regulatory regime; (4) handling requests; (5) System for ‘follow-up’ activities; (6) public education, awareness and participation; (7) project review & evaluation, and audit and (7) regional networking.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

There is no specific development objective as part of this project.

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

There was no change in the GEOs during implementation

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 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE assesses relevance as satisfactory, a rating that is shared by this TER given the good alignment of this project with national and GEF priorities.

National Relevance

While LAO does not appear to have biosafety clearly stated as a priority in its various national strategies, the project indirectly supports the “the 6th National Socio- economic Development Plan (NSED) from 2006-2010, by supporting 7 of the 8 identified national socio-economic priority programmes.” (Revised Milestones Document, p.6). Indeed, the project contributes to the NSED by “by empowering its citizens, irrespective of gender, creed or status, to have access to information, participate in decision-making on LMOs and to allow farmers to have the choice and capacity to adopt agricultural biotechnology (for increased food production and poverty reduction) in a safe manner” (Revised Milestones, p.6). The project is also aligned with the National Strategy on Environment to year 2020.

Without GEF support, Lao PDR would not have had the financial resources required to implement the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

GEF Relevance

This project is also well aligned with the GEF Strategy for Biodiversity, and more specifically with Strategic Objective 3 and Strategic Program 6 of the Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy: Capacity Building for the Implementation of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety. This project also falls within the GEF

Biosafety Program, which was designed to “transform the *GEF Strategy for Financing Biosafety* into an operational program under GEF-4 and beyond, through which GEF Agencies with a comparative advantage in biosafety can provide support to countries that have established or are in the process of establishing biosafety priorities under their Resource Allocation Framework.” (Revised Milestones Document, p.7).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------	--

The TE rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory. This TER also rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory due to the important contributions made by the project to the Biosafety agenda in Lao PDR, but acknowledging that several outcomes have only been partially achieved.

Several valuable outputs were produced as part of this project:

- The Biotechnology Safety Law was adopted in 2014
- Secondary regulations on Biosafety were adopted
- A National Biotechnology Strategy and Action Plan were prepared
- The first GMO laboratory of Lao was equipped
- Capacity was built and awareness was raised among national stakeholders

That being said, several planned outputs were not produced, including the training of key personnel and the production of a training manual. Similarly, most outcomes, but not all, were achieved:

- Outcome 1 for the project (capacity building strengthened for decision-making, detection, monitoring, inspection and enforcement on LMOs (Living Modified Organisms), has only been partially achieved. At project end, the planned Technical Coordination Committee was still being formed, and training material was lacking. However, infrastructural resources and equipment for LMO detection had been completed, and a basic training in detecting LMOs had been offered.
- Outcome 2, (policy framework and regulatory regime in place), has been achieved as the Biosafety Law was approved and draft Regulations were being reviewed by the Ministry of Justice at project end.
- Outcomes 3 (an administrative system to handle requests for authorizations) and 4 (a monitoring, inspection and enforcement system) were simply not achieved.
- Outcome 5 (Improved knowledge management & communication) was partially achieved as material for information and awareness campaigns were produced, and other outputs related to the Biosafety education curricula and public participation were in the early stages of implementation at project end.

Overall and as a result, “the main project outcome (a workable and transparent National Biosafety Framework) is on its way to be achieved, yet relevant components are still at their initial stage” (TE p.20). More will need to happen after project completion to consolidate what has been achieved into a

real National Biosafety Framework, but steps have been taken to that effect and the TE assesses the likelihood of success to be quite likely. (TE p.20) The project most certainly contributed to the implementation of the planned Biosafety Agenda in Lao PDR.

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

The TER rated efficiency as moderately unsatisfactory. This TE also rates it as moderately unsatisfactory due to severe implementation delays and lower than expected cost effectiveness.

The project suffered important delays during its first two years of operation due to political and institutional factors (see more below in the section on delays, p.7). Those delays have necessitated the extension of the project by a year, which was not enough to ensure that all planned outputs and outcomes were achieved. Given the lower-than-expected results, cost effectiveness was lower than anticipated. A cost-benefit analysis was not conducted, nor was the project compared to other similar projects, and this TE therefore cannot assess cost effectiveness beyond noting that it was lower than expected.

However, during the last two years, the project was very efficiently implemented and several planned outcomes were realized or partially realized, which partially made up for the initial delays. Truly, the team should be commended for the way the project was handled during the second half of the project. Nonetheless, on the whole, this TER cannot assign more than a moderately unsatisfactory score.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
---------------------------	-----------------------

The TE assesses overall sustainability as moderately likely. This TER instead rates sustainability as likely, finding that most risks have been addressed as part of the project and that almost everything is in place to ensure that project outcomes are maintained and improved following project completion.

According to the project document, sustainability was largely supposed to be insured by the large capacity building exercises undertaken as part of project activities, and by increasing Government awareness of the importance of biosafety issues, thereby insuring adequate funding for those issues after project completion. As will be discussed below, the project was successfully able to ensure its sustainability.

Socio-political Sustainability- Likely

The Biosafety Law was indeed adopted, thereby including biosafety into national development priorities and ensuring that the Cartagena Protocol will be implemented going forward. In addition to the law, three additional relevant Regulations (secondary laws) were on their way to being finalized at project end, thereby demonstrating that political commitment is present beyond the scope of the project. The strong commitment of the Biotechnology and Ecology Institute is, in Lao, the main driving force for the

implementation of biosafety policies (TE p.26), and should continue after the end of the project. The Socio-political sustainability is considered likely.

Financial Sustainability – Likely

While the approval of the Biosafety Law greatly increases the likelihood of national funding towards biosafety issues, it does not guarantee it. According to the TE, “external support is indispensable to put forward the Biosafety agenda in the country” (TE p.26). Luckily, at project end, the Government had already negotiated funding to pursue the implementation of the National Biosafety Framework with the GEF-6. For this reason, financial sustainability is considered likely.

Institutional Sustainability – Moderately Likely

According to the TE, “Institutional sustainability will highly depend on the effective functioning of the two main coordinating bodies created by the Law: The National Committee for Biotechnology Safety and the Technical Coordination Committee. (TE p.26) Given the two committees have only been recently created and are still in their development phase, institutional sustainability is uncertain and difficult to assess. However, because all relevant institutions are in place to ensure future productive engagement with biosafety policy in Lao, this TER gives institutional sustainability a rating of moderately likely.

Environmental Sustainability- Not applicable

There are no environmental risks threatening the outcomes of this project and their future impact.

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?

100% of the in-kind co-financing expected from the Government of Lao PDR came through, and was essential to the achievement of the objectives. No details are given in the PD and the TE regarding how exactly the money was used, or how it contributed to project outcomes.

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 was initially delayed as the National Executing Agency for the project, the National Authority for Science and Technology (NAST) was abolished as part of some important international restructuring in Lao PDR. Instead, a new ministry established, the Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST), and its Biotechnology and Ecology Institute (BEI) was appointed as the new National Executing Agency. A new Project Steering Committee was established in June 2012 and a new project team was established in February 2013. Those institutional changes lead to severe delays. The project was initially granted a no-cost extension for one year until 07/09/2014 and eventually granted a supplementary extension until 30/11/2014. This delay does not appear to have affected project outcomes.

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:

This project was part of a longer-term commitment of Lao PDR towards the implementation of its obligations as a party to the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety, and the continuation to a previous GEF project on Biosafety in Lao. Indeed, "Lao PDR acceded to CPB in 2004 and participated to the GEF/UNEP project to develop a national Biosafety Framework (NBF), also completed in 2004, through which a draft NBF was prepared." (TE p.7) Ever since the Biotechnology and Ecology Institute (BEI) was appointed the Executing Agency, its commitment for the project has been strong, and has positively driven country ownership. Indeed, the BEI was the main driving force behind the adoption of the National Law on Biosafety. However, as noted in the TE, "while that represents a tangible proof of country ownership, other elements still have to materialise or consolidate, such as the two National Committees and the inclusion of Biosafety in some programs and plans financed through the Public Budget. " (TE p.28)

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rated M&E design as unsatisfactory without providing strong arguments to that effect apart from those listed in the paragraph below. It also rated M&E budgeting and funding as satisfactory. This TER assesses M&E design as moderately satisfactory for having set an overall good M&E plan, but having relied on a logframe that was too ambitious and mixed up outputs and outcomes.

The PD includes a very detailed M&E plan, including a logical framework, organizational arrangements, budget, baseline, responsibilities and an M&E budget. The organizational arrangements for M&E were overall adequate. However, the logical framework was unsatisfactory. First, it contained no mention of outcomes, and largely seemed to conflate outputs and outcomes. Second, the logical framework contained too many outputs (37), too much for this overall small project. The logical framework was too ambitious.

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as moderately unsatisfactory, largely due to the format of the PIRs, which was not in the control of the project:

“The Evaluation has observed (and not only in the case of the Lao PDR project) that the information acquired through the UNEP/GEF Monitoring system in place (progress reports, PIR rating, etc.), though timely flowing from the project to UNEP, is not very helpful to really understand (at least, by an outsider view) the progress and problems of project implementation. The formats are not helpful for channeling synthetic data and meaningful information. As a result, the reports are often repetitive, poor and boring; the scoring exercise looks somewhat “standardised” and is rarely supported by any evidence or value judgment. In sum, the effectiveness of the whole system, in terms of result-based management, is highly questionable. Overall, Monitoring and Evaluation is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU).”

While the TE provides little information about the way M&E was implemented, it is clear from project documents that yearly monitoring reports were produced and that they adequately reported against the project’s objectives and outcomes. However, and as mentioned above, the PIRS submitted are somewhat lacking in evidence. The TE or PIRs also do not provide evidence of M&E findings feeding into project decisions. Overall, M&E implementation can be rated as moderately satisfactory.

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 implementing agency for this project was UNEP. UNEP's performance will therefore be the focus of this review of the quality of project implementation.

The TE rates UNEP supervision as highly satisfactory, and 'preparation and readiness' as unsatisfactory. This TER instead rates project implementation as moderately satisfactory, finding the UNEP to have fulfilled all its duties as implementing agency but finding no ground to grant a rating of highly satisfactory, and noting the important gaps in project design also identified by the TE.

As mentioned in the M&E design section above, the project logical framework had some weaknesses, having too many outputs and being overall too ambitious. In addition, despite having identified several important risks to the project, the project did very little to mitigate those. Finally, the socio-political context and institutional framework of Lao were not sufficiently considered and discussed with national stakeholders. According to the TE, had this been done better, "a smoother, more efficient project implementation" could have been achieved.

Project implementation, however, appears to have been done very well, with national stakeholders considering UNEP supervision to have been of high quality. UNEP provided fast and useful backstopping to the Biosafety Unit, and adequately prepared the supervisory missions and project meetings. The international consultants hired by UNEP were highly appreciated and said to be key to the preparation of the Biosafety Law and Regulations (TE p.29). Overall, UNEP appears to have provided good leadership to the project and fulfilled its role of implementing agency very well.

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

The executing agency for this project was the Biotechnology and Ecology Institute (BEI). The BEI's performance will therefore be the focus of this review of the quality of project execution.

The TE rates project implementation, which it largely assesses in terms of the performance of the BEI, as moderately satisfactory. This TER rates project execution as moderately satisfactory given the ability of the BEI to drive the adoption of the National Biosafety Law, but noting its shortcomings in achieving several project objectives.

The original national executing agency for this project was the National Authority for Science and Technology (NAST), but after institutional restructuring in Lao, the national executing agency was changed to the BEI in 2012, when a new Project Steering Committee was also set up.

The project was completely ineffective during its first two years of operation, but "turned completely functional and effective" after BEI was made the executing agency. The TE does not provide much

information about the way in which the BEI has executed the project, but assesses its management as “very satisfactory” (TE p.28). However, this TER cannot help but not acknowledge that several outcomes were only partially achieved, with several outputs not delivered.

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 has had no measurable impact to date. As mentioned above, the main outcomes of the project were the adoption of the Biosafety Law in 2014, and the preparation of additional regulations. As a result of the project, Lao PDR is in a much stronger position to deal with issues of biosafety. A lot remains to be made, but the achievement of long-term impact appears likely. It is quite clear from the TE and various project documents that, absent this project, Lao PDR would not have been able to make as much progress towards meeting its obligations as a Party of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

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.

No socioeconomic change was achieved as part of this 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

Capacity building was an important component of this project, and one that has been relatively successful. Capacity of various kinds has been built, ranging from capacity to detect LMOs to capacity to understand the policy issues around Biosafety, and including broader awareness campaigns, for example by developing a Biosafety curriculum (TE p.vi-vii).

At an individual level, decision makers have been trained in risk assessment, management and communication. Officers have been trained in detecting LMOs. The general public has been made more aware of LMOs. At an institutional level, the arrangement for the effective implementation of a Biosafety Program was strengthened as part of the program, with coordination between institutions being made more clearly defined and an effective mechanism for monitoring and inspection being put in place.

Several of the many capacity building activities planned as part of the project were not realized, but enough were realized to support the Biosafety agenda in Lao PDR.

b) Governance

No changes in governance were noted as part of the project.

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.

There were no unintended impacts recorded.

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.

This is not applicable to this project.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE offers one key lesson:

“The Project shows how decisive the socio-political environment and the NCA institutional up-taking can be for implementing Biosafety Framework. In a new socio-political and institutional context, the Project has dramatically improved its performance. ” (TE p.34)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Readers will find below a summary of recommendations (TE p.viii). The comprehensive recommendations can be found in the TE pp. 34-35.

1. In order to consolidate the positive achievements so far and to enable the achievement of the Outcomes not yet fully attained, it is strongly recommended:

a) to follow up and support the swift completion of the approval process of the three draft Regulations and of the NBSAP.

2. In order to consolidate the positive achievements so far and to enable the further achievement of the Outcomes not yet fully attained, it is recommended to give continuity to GEF/UNEP assistance in the framework of the new round of GEF funding for Lao PDR, namely through:

a) Technical and methodological support of UNEP to the NCA (MOST / BEI), particularly through coaching and targeted trainings of the Biosafety Team in place;

b) Training needs assessment and targeted, intensive training to key human resources responsible for and/or directly involved in Risk Assessment and Monitoring, with particular reference to the members of the Technical Coordinating Committee;

c) Finalization, in collaboration with the National University, Faculty of Science, of the Biosafety Curriculum and its implementation in the Education programme

3. In order to put in value the national human resources involved so far and to foster continuity and sustainability of activities and results, it is strongly recommended:

a) to maintain and consolidate the current BEI Biosafety national team, to match them with a targeted training and coaching (see Rec.1) and to explore forms of staff's motivation according to national policies on Human Resources management.

4. In order to consolidate networking allowing cost sharing and service-sharing among countries of the Region, it is recommended:

a) to prepare and implement, with the support of UNEP and ASEAN, a joint programme of human resources upgrading and of mutual technical assistance in specific areas, by building on the comparative advantage of each country of the region.

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?	The report does contain an assessment of outcomes and impact, which are very clearly discussed and thoughtfully assessed.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, the evidence is complete and convincing, but the M&E section could have had more detail and ratings could have been better substantiated	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	All dimensions of sustainability are addressed and assessed. The sustainability assessment appears realistic.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons are rather short, but useful. They are based on evaluation findings.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not include actual project costs per activity, but only total project costs. Actual co-financing is mentioned.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	M&E is discussed, albeit very shortly, and only limited information is provided to justify the scores assigned. The discussion of M&E implementation is inadequate as it pertains mostly to the M&E obligations as set by the GEF, and not to broader M&E activities done as part of the project.	U
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this terminal evaluation report.