

Terminal Evaluation Review Form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		367	
GEF Agency project ID		1337	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Conservation of Biodiversity in the Eastern Wetlands	
Country/Countries		Uruguay	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP 2 - Coastal, marine & freshwater ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NOGs were targeted for collaboration and cooperation.	
Private sector involvement		One of the beneficiaries - Private reserves were created.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 1, 1992	
Effectiveness date / project start		Nov 22, 1992	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		Sep 1, 1996	
Actual date of project completion		1995	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3	
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3	U/A
Total Co-financing			
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		3	(not reported in TE)
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Nov 28, 1995	
TE submission date		Nov 28, 1995	
Author of TE		Pablo Canevali, Thomas Crisman, Renato Sales	
TER completion date		November 5, 2014	
TER prepared by		Dania M Trespalacios	
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/R	N/R	N/R	U
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	N/R	N/R	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	MU
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	U/A
Quality of Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	U
Quality of Execution	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	HU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective is to conserve biodiversity in the Eastern Wetlands of Uruguay. This region hosts a remarkable collection of ecosystems with high biodiversity, with endemic plant species, unique palm tree concentrations, and species of economic importance and in danger of extinction. (PD pg. 2) The area is affected by uncontrolled and growing tourism, intense rice agriculture, ranching, altered hydrological systems, and over-utilization of natural resources. (PD pg. 3-4, 6) The destruction of the wetlands will reduce available habitat for migratory birds and numerous endemic flora and fauna, and will negatively affect coastal fishing and the beach ecosystem. (PD pg. 11)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of this project is to promote sustainable development in the region by increasing local knowledge about natural resources, by training human resources in science and management, by increasing the availability of environmental information, and by promoting the involvement of local stakeholders, both public and private. (PD pg. 1)

The immediate objectives, as stated in the project document, are:

- 1- Increased knowledge and conservation of Eastern Wetlands fauna.
- 2- Increased knowledge and conservation of Eastern Wetlands flora.
- 3- Sustainable use of water, soil, and geomorphological resources of the Eastern Wetlands.
- 4- Reduction of pollution produced by dumping of polluted water and by the use of biocides in brooks and irrigation ditches.
- 5- Training of human resources in research and environmental management.
- 6- Increase flow of environmental information to local public and private stakeholders so that they better contribute to proper management in the area.
- 7- Make resource use compatible with conservation.
- 8- Raise public awareness of the economic, ecological and sociocultural value of Wetlands biodiversity and promote local community participation in its conservation.
- 9- Implementation of a system of protected areas in the Eastern Highlands.
- 10- Create a regional station for scientific research, community service, and environmental information and training.
- 11- Incorporate national and international laws into conservation of the Eastern Wetlands. To apply existing standards and create new legislative, administrative and constitutional provisions, as applicable.

(PD pg. 13-26)

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

There were **no changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives and Development Objectives.

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 project outcomes are consistent with the GEF’s Biodiversity focal area. This project will attempt to conserve Uruguay’s Eastern Wetlands, a rich complex of wetlands in subtropical South America with formally recognized biological importance, designated as a Ramsar site in 1982. Several of the region’s flora and fauna are included in the Convention on International Traffic in Endangered Species. (PD pg. 11)

The project is consistent with Uruguay’s priorities. The protection of the Eastern Wetlands is a national priority for Uruguay, as stated in the Uruguay Environmental Plan, which proposes to incorporate the region into a national system of protected areas. (PD pg. 11) The project document explains that this project consolidates a multidisciplinary group of experts that will work to conserve biodiversity in the context of sustainable development. This will support Uruguay’s National Environmental Plan. (PD pg. 5)

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

The Project Document specifies 11 immediate objectives (listed on page 2 of this TER), each with several specific outputs and activities. (PD pg. 13-26) The project document also lists six thematic areas for the project’s activities, although it does not explicitly connect these to the project’s objectives and outputs. The six themes listed in the Project Document are: (1) Research and Monitoring, (2) Human resource training, (3) Community Information Services, (4) Sustainable Development, (5) Environmental Education and Social Promotion, and (6) Protected area system. (PD pg. 10)

The TE does not list the Immediate Objectives or Outputs prescribed by the Project Document. Instead, it recounts the project’s achievements and shortcomings, grouping them into six main thematic areas. These are (1) Project Executive Leadership, (2) Project Management and Administration, (3) Wetland Management, (4) Research and Monitoring, (5) Sustainable

Development, and (6) Environmental education and communication. Note that only 2 of the TE's thematic areas overlap with the Project Document's thematic areas: Research and Monitoring, and Sustainable Development. (The TE's Environmental Education theme is similar to the Project Document's separate themes of Environmental Education and Community Information Services).

The TE explains that this project had too many components, many of which were very ambitious and without specific limits. Thus the project had trouble defining its priorities. (TE pg. 3) The project document also underestimated the difficulties that the project would face, the most notable of which are the lack of experience with multidisciplinary projects in Uruguay, the lack of a clear policy that assigns administrative responsibility for territorial management, and the lack of a national law for protected areas. (TE pg. 3) Overly ambitious and undefined goals, combined with serious governance and capacity weaknesses, created difficulties throughout project implementation. The project lacked a well-defined role, well established priorities, precise goals and adequate methodologies. (TE pg. 3)

To assess the project's achievement of expected results, the Project Document's original Objectives will be compared with the TE's reported results.

Table 1 lists the Objectives and main Outputs specified by the Project Document, and groups the Objectives according to the thematic areas that best describe the activity, whether listed in the TE or the Project Document.

Table 1 Project Objectives and Outputs, and Results, grouped by Themes.

Theme	Objective and Main Outputs	Results
Research & Monitoring	Objective 1 & 2 Increased knowledge and conservation of Eastern Wetlands fauna & flora. Outputs include: electronic database on Eastern Wetlands fauna & flora; technical reports on migratory bird populations, on experiments in restocking endangered species, species of key interest; conservation management of key plant communities, and dissemination of findings.	Partially achieved. Many investigations were begun, in coordination with the Universidad de la República. Plans for re-introduction of endangered species were produced. Archeological studies produced. But research program had many shortcomings, particularly the lack of management studies.
	Objective 3 Sustainable use of water, soil, and geomorphological resources of the Eastern Wetlands. Outputs include: characterization of geomorphology, geology, sedimentology of the area; and a water resource management program that ensures the conservation of biodiversity.	Partially achieved. Project created a proposal for a Hydrological Regulation Plan.
	Objective 10 Create a regional station for scientific research, community service, and environmental information and training.	Achieved. (TE pg. 4)
Wetland Management/ Protected Area System	Objective 4 Reduction of pollution produced by dumping of polluted water and by the use of biocides in brooks and irrigation ditches. Outputs include: evaluation of the impact of pollution, and draft management standards for waste water and biocides.	Not reported in TE.

	<p>Objective 9 Implementation of a system of protected areas in the Eastern Highlands. Outputs include public and private protected areas, management plans for these, and strategies for obtaining funds.</p>	<p>Partially achieved. The Private Reserve system was begun, with 4 functioning sites. A public PA was created and functioning, as well as the Biosphere Reserve Project. But there is no general wetland management plan.</p>
	<p>Objective 11 Incorporate national and international laws into conservation of the Eastern Wetlands. To apply existing standards and create new legislative, administrative and constitutional provisions, as applicable. Outputs include a rationalized legal framework, proposals for new laws that will facilitate conservation and sustainable development, and an environmental law advisory service.</p>	<p>Not reported in TE.</p>
Human Resource Training	<p>Objective 5 Training of human resources in research and environmental management, including professionals trained in protected area management, environmental management, environmental education, and environmental law.</p>	<p>Partially achieved. Many people were trained, including park rangers, teachers and police.</p>
Environmental Education and Communication	<p>Objective 6 Increase flow of environmental information to local public and private stakeholders so that they better contribute to proper management in the area. Outputs include GIS mapping and databases, and an environmental information service that includes local resource use.</p>	<p>Partially achieved. The GIS mapping system was not operational. An environmental learning course was implemented with good results. The training of police has been particularly successful.</p>
	<p>Objective 8 Raise public awareness of the economic, ecological and sociocultural value of Wetlands biodiversity and promote local community participation in its conservation. Outputs include: identification of local communities to involve in project, evaluation of how existing conditions can accommodate sustainable development, coordinate with stakeholders to involve the population in conservation efforts, and information and training on conservation for local stakeholders.</p>	<p>Not reported in TE.</p>
Sustainable Development	<p>Objective 7 Make resource use compatible with conservation. Outputs include identification of alternatives for economic activities that impact the environment, the promotion of these alternatives in the zone's management plan, proposals for economic support for economic alternatives, dissemination programs for economic alternatives.</p>	<p>Achieved. Various alternatives for locals identified, and resulting products from alternative activities were promoted.</p>

From Table 1, it may be observed that 2 out of 10 project objectives were achieved, 5 objectives were partially achieved, and for the remaining 3 objectives, there is insufficient information in the TE to determine what, if anything was achieved. It is clear that this project had major

shortcomings, most of which were probably caused by an excessively ambitious and poorly planned project preparation. Effectiveness is rated unsatisfactory.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unable to Assess
----------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide information on the project’s efficiency in relation to inputs, costs and implementation times. It is clear that the project was completed before its expected end date, but many of the project components were not completed, and the TE does not provide information on the final amounts disbursed and how they were used. There is no information on whether the project suffered from implementation delays. Due to the lack of information, efficiency is not rated.

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

Financial Risks – (Likely) The project activities are recognized and included in the budget of the Ministry of Environment. (TE pg. 7) The TE reports that the project has made international contacts that promise further financing. (TE pg. 7) The Universidad de la República, one of the important partners in this project, may also finance further research and studies. Private land owners show increasing interests in private reserves, as they derive financial benefits from ecotourism. There is also interests from the International Fund for Agricultural Development (FIDA), and several departments from the National University, to continue project activities. (TE pg. 7)

Socio-political Risks – (U/A) The TE does not discuss any socio-political risks, but also does not explicitly report that there are none present.

Environmental Risks- (U/A) The Project Document discusses the environmental risks of increased rice agriculture, intensive ranching, unchecked growing tourism, and multiple demands on water resources. The TE does not discuss how the project addresses these risks, or whether there has been a change in risks after project completion.

Institutional Risks –(Likely) The TE states that the project has had a positive impact in the project’s Rocha Region, and has had an impact at the national level. (TE pg. 7) The Santa Teresa protected area has been developed and fully equipped, and it’s financial stability will benefit from increased incomes from new visitors. (TE pg. 7) Small scale producers have begun to incorporate alternate production technologies. The TE reports support and continued interest from government ministries, universities, local stakeholders, and private reserve operators. The TE reports that the techniques and themes of the project have been adopted by professional schools and scientific organizations. (TE pg. 7)

Many of the activities begun by this project will continue on a second phase, beginning in 1997. The TE concludes that the project activities and successes have a high potential for sustainability, based mostly on the institutional support and the financial stability of the project. The TE does not provide sufficient information on the environmental and socio-political risks of the project. The information given by the TE suggests that sustainability is likely, but lack of complete evidence suggest that the final rating should be more cautious, therefore sustainability is rated moderately likely.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

The TE does not report on co-financing, or on any other financial details of the project. The Project Document does not report any co-financing. It seems that there was no co-financing in this project, but this fact needs confirmation.

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 completed before the expected due date. The TE does not report any delays.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE provides evidence that there was country ownership of this project. The project activities are recognized and included in the budget of the Ministry of Environment. (TE pg. 7) Many of the activities begun by this project will continue on a second phase, beginning in 1997. But there is insufficient evidence available in the TE to assess whether country ownership affected outcomes and sustainability.

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 Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	--

In the very short Project Review, Reporting and Evaluation subsection of the Project Document, the following actions are specified:

- the project is to be examined "by the parties" on a semi-annual basis
- the Project Director would submit a report every 6 months to evaluate the project's performance, and a final report to evaluate project outcomes
- an in-depth midterm evaluation would be conducted after 18 months of project implementation

(PD pg. 33)

The Project Document does not include SMART indicators, not any mention of indicators that would adequately measure the project's progress. There is no budget allocated for M&E activities, and the only specific dates set for evaluation activities are for the midterm review and final evaluation. (PD pg. 35-37) It seems that the M&E design at entry was insufficient to adequately monitor results, track progress, and inform the project implementation. The TE points out that because the project was one of the first during the GEF's Pilot Phase, there was not a very careful evaluation of the project proposal. (TE pg. 3) This may explain why the M&E design was insufficient. Therefore, M&E design at entry is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to Assess.
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------

The TE does not provide any information on whether the M&E plan proposed in the Project Document was implemented, or on the completion of any monitoring or evaluation activities. Because there is insufficient information, M&E implementation is not rated.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
--	-------------------------------

The implementing agency is the UNDP. The TE does not mention the UNDP, but does discuss the project's executive leadership. The TE reports that the executive leadership of this project was excellent, and that it was instrumental in achieving many of the successes of this project, including protected areas, environmental education, research studies of various disciplines. (TE pg. 4)

It is clear that project implementation suffered from very poor planning. The project had too many components, too ambitious and without specific limits, and was unable to define priorities or outline feasible strategies for achieving success. The difficulties faced during implementation were underestimated. (TE pg. 3) These were all issues which could have been better addressed by the UNDP, both during project preparation, and during implementation, through a mid-term project restructuring. As a result, the project fell very short of expectations, and did not achieve most of its unrealistically expected goals. For its failure to address poor planning and implementation challenges, the quality of project implementation is rated unsatisfactory.

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

The executing agency of this project is the Ministry of Housing, Territorial Organization and Environment. The TE does not mention the Ministry directly, but does discuss the project’s administrative activities. The TE reports that the administration of the project was very efficient, and that procurement for the new research station, and for equipment for other project components, was well designed and executed. (TE pg. 4) The project management built new relationships with important stakeholders, including regional producers, international research groups and NGOS. Despite an overambitious plan and multiple implementation challenges, it seems that many of the project components were at least partially achieved, and are likely to be sustainable after project completion. Based on the limited information provided by the TE, and the evidence provided by the project’s results, it seems project execution was moderately satisfactory.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE reports that several protected areas were established, made operational, and have a very high probability of sustainability. This provides evidence of improved environmental status. But the TE does not directly report that there were reductions in environmental stress or improvements in environmental status.

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 has identified and piloted alternate economic activities that ensure sustainable development. The TE reports that these pilot projects have a high potential for replication. The TE reports that a group of small scale producers was assessed in order to optimize output, and was informed about the ‘rational’ use of natural resources. (TE pg. 6)

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

a) Capacities - The TE reports the following changes in capacities:

- Various societal groups received information about the importance of the conservation of natural resources and spaces, and their functions. The project has created a greater awareness and concern for environmental issues in the region and the country, and has shown to society in general, but in particular the economy, the value of the conservation of wetlands. (TE pg. 6)
- There is a greater awareness among producers and governmental agencies of the need to develop national environmental policies and laws. (TE pg. 6)
- There is a new perspective in the region regarding the production of traditional goods (particularly ranching and agriculture) that is more in line with sustainability. (TE pg. 6)
- The project trained park guards and professionals that would advance the goals of the project, and improved the environmental knowledge of teachers and professors. (TE pg. 6)
- The project produced advanced plans and studies, including:
 - to reintroduce endangered species. (TE pg. 5)
 - archeological studies. (TE pg. 5)
 - numerous scientific investigations have begun, many in conjunction with the University of the Republic. (TE pg. 5)

b) Governance - The TE reports the following changes in governance:

- A Private Reserve program was created, with four functioning reserves. (TE pg. 5)
- The protected area Potrerillo de Santa Teresa became operational. (TE pg. 5)
- The project has produced and proposed a Hydrological Regulation Plan. (TE pg. 5)
- The Biosphere Reserve Project was developed, and ties have been made with the adjacent Mata Atlántica Biosphere in Brazil. (TE pg. 5)

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

The TE does not report any unintended impacts.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE reports the following evidence of adoption of GEF initiatives at scale:

- The project established a Private Reserve program, and publicly administered protected areas. **Sustained – Adopted.**

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 does not list lessons learned from the project.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE includes a very comprehensive list of recommendations (TE pg. 8-10). They are summarized below:

- The different areas of the project should be more closely related, to ensure a systematic exchange of information.
- The second phase of this project should include greater participation from civil society, NGOs, producers, tourism operators, and tourists. Relations should be improved with all to ensure a better management of protected areas.
- Relations with the Ministry of Agriculture and Husbandry should be improved, to better target common problems.
- The project should increase relations with international groups that are experienced in the areas and activities that the project is engaged in, to benefit from this existing experience.
- Establish a voluntary contribution from tourism operations that would be used to fund conservation projects and public services for populations living in protected areas.
- Initiate discussions on the zoning of wetlands, and implement GIS to aid in the ecological-economic zoning of wetlands.
- Propose improvements to environmental legislation and policy that would then support environmental conservation and sustainable development.
- Professional training should be performed in various disciplines to facilitate multidisciplinary studies. Research on the biological and socio-economic situation of the region should continue.
- Sustainable development projects should be supported, particularly those furthering lake and marine fisheries, management of plant resources, and management of wild animals. Those projects already begun should increase the possibility of replication and sustainability.

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 TE provides a cursory summary of the main achievements and shortcomings of the project, organized by thematic areas. It does not address the Project Document's original objectives or components.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE does not provide sufficient evidence for many of the evaluated aspects, and provides no ratings	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE addresses project sustainability by thematic area, although it does not address all of the sustainability risks identified by the Project Document.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE provides a long list of recommendations, although no explicit list of lessons learned.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	There is no financial information included in the TE.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does not discuss M&E systems, or any monitoring activity.	HU
Overall TE Rating		HU

$$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(4) + 0.1(9) = 1.2 + 0.9 = 1.1$$

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

The only documents available to the TER writer were the Project Document and the Terminal Evaluation.