

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3688	
GEF Agency project ID		4174	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Strengthening the Sustainability of the Protected Areas System of the Republic of Montenegro	
Country/Countries		Montenegro	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO-1 Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems SP-2 Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems SP-3 Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism (formerly: Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Protection)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		National and regional NGOs involved As consultants and subcontractors	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		September 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		November 2012	
Actual date of project completion		May 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.05	0.05
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.95	0.95
Co-financing	IA own	0.04	0.04
	Government	1.78	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	2.5 ¹	NA
	Private sector	1.1	NA
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1	1
Total Co-financing		5.4	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.39	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 29, 2015	
Author of TE		Max Kasperek and Ana Katnic	
TER completion date		2/5/2016	

¹ German Government owned German Technical Cooperation (GTZ)

TER prepared by	Molly Watts
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Caroline Laroche

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is to “achieve global environmental benefits by mitigating the threats to the biodiversity contained in at least 108,866 ha of protected areas of Montenegro”. (May 09 Project Document p.1)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s Development objective is “developing the capacity in protected area institutions to design, plan and manage a more representative system of protected areas.” As part of this objective the project had two components: 1) Expand and rationalize the PA system to ensure better habitat representation and more secure conservation status, and 2) Strengthen the capacity of PA institutions to effectively manage a more representative protected area system. (TE p.19)

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

There were no changes to the Global Environmental Objective, Development Objectives, or other 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.

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

The TE rates project relevance as ‘relevant’ and this TER, which uses a different scale, rates Relevance as ‘Satisfactory’. The project is relevant to GEF’s Strategic Objective 1 of the Biodiversity focal area, ‘Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems’, specifically as part of Strategic Program 2 and 3, ‘Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems’ and ‘Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks’.

The project is relevant on a national level because sustainability of the PA system is a highly critical issue. The TE notes however that the regional parks which the project focused on were “from a conservation perspective, not necessarily a top priority for Montenegro’s biodiversity.” (TE p.8)

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

The TE rates achievement of the project’s effectiveness is Highly Satisfactory (S), and this TE downgrades that rating to Moderately Satisfactory. The project delivered all foreseen outputs with only minor shortcomings, such as the completion of the proclamation process of Komovi Regional Park, and the finalization of some reports which are still available as draft versions. (TE p.44) The project established two regional parks, the Komovi Regional Park, and the Piva Regional Park. Additionally institutional capacities for managing Montenegro’s PA system are improved from project onset. However, although outputs were largely achieved, planned outcomes and objectives were not fully reached, and the impact rating given in the TE is ‘minimal’. The project produced two national parks. Though this is a significant achievement, for a project of this size, these parks were not located in biodiversity hotspots, and their main aim is tourism promotion rather than preservation of fauna and flora. The project produced technical studies, but these have not been put into use yet, although they could be used to make the PA system more sustainable. The TE concludes that overall, Montenegro’s PA system is not much more representative at project end than at the start, and that sustainability of Montenegro’s PA system is not significantly higher than it was at project start.

The project’s achievements are listed below by component:

1) Expand and rationalize the PA system to ensure better habitat representation and more secure conservation status. The project completed a protected area gap assessment, however it completed it too late to serve as a planning document for the project. An inventory of protected areas in Montenegro was prepared, but revalidation did not take place, and the study was still in draft version by project end. The Regional Parks of Komovi and Piva were established (with some outstanding bureaucratic issues for

Komovi Park). Additionally, a feasibility assessment and agreed designation plan for establishment of marine protected area in Platamuni was completed. Additional work supported by the project as part of this component was produced, including a management plan for the Tivat Slat Plant Natural Reserve. Although the project produced two national parks under this component, these parks do not represent biodiversity hotspots, and are targeted instead at tourism promotion, thus the TE concludes that “Montenegro’s PA system is not much more representative at the end of the Project than at its onset.” (TE p.8)

2) Strengthen the capacity of PA institutions to effectively manage a more representative protected area system. As part of this component, a management information system was developed in 2013, with PENP staff are now using in their daily work. A document on management and governance options for PAs was developed and some attempts to apply the results have been made. In terms of developing skills of protected area staff, two university program curricula have been developed, with several study tours and training courses conducted, and a grant scheme to ensure involvement of local communities in Komovi Regional Park has been created. The project launched a small grants program called “Promotion of the values of protected areas and the impact of climate change on people’s lives” in the areas of Piva and Komivi, to encourage small and medium enterprises to work on improving their business.

Finally the project developed a communication strategy including an activity plan of communications and awareness, key messages, communications and awareness for Komovi and Piva parks.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates efficiency as Satisfactory, which this TER downgrades to Moderately Satisfactory, based on some evidence of inefficient spending.

The TE notes that financial management has been efficient and satisfactory in general, although some spending items were questionable. (TE p.8) Management costs were low throughout the project as all staff worked on a part-time basis. (TEp.45) This allowed administrative costs to remain under 10% of the total budget throughout the project, even after the extension of the project implementation period from three to five years. However, an inefficiency in terms of project planning was initiating two Postgraduate Studies Programs on Protected Area Management and Rural Development rather than just one. As there was overlap between the courses, and only 26 total students, it would have been more efficient to initiate only one. Another cost which was raised by the TE as inefficient and non-cost-effective was a study tour to New Zealand for decision-makers from Montenegro for 8 participants.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates overall sustainability as Moderately Likely, while this TER downgrades that rating to Moderately Unlikely. Especially in the area of environmental sustainability, but also in terms of institutional framework and governance, and sociopolitical sustainability, it seems the project’s efforts may be lost due to a lack of national project ownership, and a lack of focus on biodiversity conservation. (TE p.9)

Financial Resources Sustainability: Moderately Likely. There is some potential for sustainability in terms of financial resources in that protected areas in Montenegro have a high potential for generating income through tourism. A risk is that protected areas are seen as tourism development areas rather than conservation areas, as this could mean that funds accumulated are not inverted into activities to sustain project outcomes. (TE p.49) This project was implemented jointly with project 3947 “Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of the Protected Area System” in Montenegro, covered by a separate TER. As such, sustainability of financial resources is somewhat outside the purview of this project. (TE p.23)

Sociopolitical: Moderately Unlikely. The TE notes that stakeholders have expressed their support for the project, but that it is unclear whether or not local people could make use of opportunities to realize new business opportunities within the concept of green entrepreneurship without external assistance. Ultimately the project put only minor focus into the area of income generating activities for local stakeholders. Another sociopolitical drawback is that the project has developed no knowledge management system. (TE p.26) Finally, the TE notes that there are no concrete measures to generate alternative income for the local population in the project area. (TE p.50)

Institutional Framework and Governance: Moderately Unlikely. Although the project has invested in capacity building, the TE notes that the “technical know-how of the PA administrations is still not on a sufficient level.” (TE p.49) Several of the technical studies produced by the project remained as recommendations at project end, and had not been put into practice. Ultimately, ownership on the part of the protected area institutions for the process has been limited.

Environmental: Unlikely. The project has established two regional parks, however, there are still no concrete measures in place to protect biodiversity within these parks. (TE p.50) It seems that little has been done by this project to identify gaps in the present protected area system in terms of protecting the country’s characteristic and threatened species and habitats, and closing these gaps. The gap assessment undertaken by the project produced more of a Protected Areas inventory rather than a prioritization of conservation needs. Even within the protected areas, it has not been assessed what type of biodiversity should be protected, through what measures, as well as costs. The TE assess the risk to be high that the parks established by this project become “paper parks” or “only formally declared parks without enhanced hands-on conservation”. (TE p.49)

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 projects received \$40,000 in co-financing from UNDP, which was used for management costs such as project staff salaries. An additional 5,360,000\$ in in-kind co-financing is identified as expected in the project document, \$1.78 million of would have come for the Ministry of Tourism and Environment, 2.52 from the German Government, and 1.1 from Lux Development. None of this in-kind co-financing was tracked, and the authors of the TE are of the opinion that the estimate of government contribution was

“badly inflated.” (TE p.29) At the time of TE, Lux Development had no ongoing projects in Montenegro, and the German Government (though GIZ) had one project beyond this project’s intervention area, thus it is quite unclear how the co-financing from these sources was meant to materialize. (TE p.23)

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’s original planned duration was three years. “Operation of the Project started in May 2010. A first no cost extension was granted till December 2014, a second no-cost extension till April 2015. The overall project duration was thus five years.”(TE p.15) There is no evidence that the delay affected the project’s outcomes or sustainability. According to the midterm review, these delays were largely as a result of “reforms taking place within stakeholder protected areas management institutions.”(MTE p.1)

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:

Country ownership for the project was found to be weak. The TE attributes this partly to the Direct Implementation Management “DIM” modality, which made UNDP essentially both the implementing and executing organization for the project. (TE p.46) The TE notes that none of the stakeholders interviewed take responsibility for the project as a whole. Civil Society was involved in activities as consultants and sub-contractors, but were not included in the project’s steering committee. On the other hand, country authorities did establish the two regional parks, and in this way were essential to achieving project outcomes. In-kind contributions expected from the Ministry of Tourism and Environment were not monitored by the project, thus it is impossible to say if they were achieved or not.

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: Satisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated M&E design at entry as Highly Satisfactory, however there is not much support for this beyond saying that “provisions for monitoring and evaluation in the project document are based on the standard UNDP/GEF M&E template and are relevant and appropriate for a project of this magnitude and nature.”(TE p.28) This TER finds M&E Design at entry to be **Satisfactory**. The project document clearly lays out major M&E events including the project inception workshop, midterm evaluation and final evaluation. The strategic results framework includes impact and outcome objectives which are SMART,

or Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant and Time bound. The MTE assessed the project's M&E system and found it moderately satisfactory, as there are weaknesses in the RFM which make it hard to measure the quality of changes. (MTE p.37)

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

The TE rates M&E plan implementation as Moderately Satisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. Key M&E events such as the inception report, and mid-term evaluation were carried out in a timely fashion, and the inception report, Annual Project Reports and Project Implementation reports have been produced on time as planned. PIRs report on indicator values. However, although in these ways the M&E System is functioning, adaptive management of this information has been lacking. For instance, major recommendations of the midterm evaluation were not implemented. The midterm called for a re-inception workshop which was not conducted. It also suggested revisiting the project results framework, which was not done, and improving monitoring of co-financing, as well as establishing an effective replication strategy, neither of which occurred.

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: Satisfactory
--	----------------------

UNDP was the project implementation agency. The TE rated quality of UNDP Implementation as **Satisfactory**, and the TE agrees. According to the TE "UNDP supervision over staff was adequate, transparent and frank, focused on results and responsive, professional and timely. The technical and operational support from UNDP was overall appreciated and considered adequate by the project team and stakeholders." Staff took regular visits (typically monthly, visits to the project area, and cooperation between UNDP supervisors and government patterns was fruitful and effective. (TE p.30)

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

The TE rated quality of project execution as Satisfactory, which this TE downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The project executing agency was the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism, however the TE describes an execution modality called "Direct Implementation Modality" through which UNDP assumed overall management responsibility and accountability for the project. The midterm evaluation found that the Government of Montenegro had instated to apply the Direct Implementation Modality "due to limited capacity and heavy workload of institutions in question." (TE p.24). The project management unit (PMU) consisted of three staff, who worked part time on this

project as they shared time with other projects, and were based in the Centre for Sustainable Development, an organization run jointly by UNDP and the Government of Montenegro. (TE p.45) The major drawback of this arrangement was a lack of country ownership and responsibility.

The Project Steering Committee comprised the Director General of the Directorate for Environment and Climate Change, of the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism (also GEF Focal Point), the Director of National Parks Public Enterprise of Montenegro, the Advisor in the Sector for Nature Protection, Monitoring, Analysis and Reporting, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); Advisor in the Sector for Forestry, Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development; President of the Municipal Assembly, Municipality of Pluzine. The project's municipalities and civil society were not represented, and the project steering committee met once a year. Due to their infrequent meeting, the TE finds that the PSC "were not much engaged in proactively steering and managing the Project. (TE p.46)

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 resulted in the establishment of two regional parks, however, the TE rates the project's impact as minimal because the parks established do not represent biodiversity hotspots, and their main aim is tourism promotion rather than preservation of fauna and flora. (TE p.8)

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.

This project sought to make use of socio-economic opportunities through an "NGO grants" program launched in 2014 in the target areas of Andrijevisa, Berane, Bijelo Polje, Danilovgrad, Žabljak, Kolašin, Mojkovac, Nikšić, Plav, Plužine, Pljevlja, Rožaje and Šavnik. This was meant to involve small and medium enterprises to work jointly on improving business. It is not clear that this initiative however was successful in training and financing local businesses. (TE p.40) Thus there is no evidence this project has brought about socioeconomic change.

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 measured capacity development in protected area institutions using a “capacity development indicator scorecard.” Using this system some impact was found on both systemic and individual capacity levels. Capacity to engage and build consensus among all stakeholders increased from 33% to 47%; capacity to mobilize information and knowledge increased from 33% to 44%, and capacity to monitor, evaluation report and learn increased from 20% to 33%. (TE p.68)

b) Governance

The project produced a document “Management and governance options for protected areas review” in 2014. This study supported and strengthened cooperative government models as a way to improve management of Protected Areas and reduce conflict. (TE p.38)

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 are noted as having occurred as a result of the project.

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

There has not been adoption of GEF initiatives at scale as a part of this project. However, the two protected areas established as part of the project will continue as part of Montenegro’s protected area system after project closure. The TE notes that a knowledge management system would have been essential to ensure replication or adoption at scale, but this was never a part of the project results framework. (TE p.22)

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. (from TE p.49)

Although they are described as General Recommendations, the following more appropriately can be described as the project's lessons learned:

- The design of such projects should be less ambitious; it should be clearly outspoken that pilot measures are a tool for learning, and that one cannot expect from pilot measures impacts on national level.
- More responsibility for managing such projects should be given to national institutions; it needs to be avoided that the project carries out tasks which are actually tasks of the national project partners (substitute performance).
- More attention needs to be given to proper project designs; it needs to be avoided that the project takes responsibility e.g. for the adoption of regulatory instruments rather than only for the preparation of the necessary documentation; also more attention needs to be given to the fact whether the planned outcome of the project can actually be expected from the outputs foreseen.
- Such projects – medium-sized projects with limited financial and time horizons – need an exit strategy which defines responsibilities for following-up project measures and which enhance the probability to become sustainable.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation. (from TE p.51-52)

Link capacity development implementation activities with baseline findings: The project addressed recommendations to assist institutions in actively pursuing PA agenda and achieving desired effects, improve institutions' adaptability to change, create preconditions for political dialogue, and public support. Huge effort was invested in improving skills for PA management and planning, including establishment of a representative PAs and establishment of partnerships with various stakeholders to achieve protection objectives. On the other side, recommendations on improving transparency and accountability of PA institutions, improve leadership in PA institutions, motivation, opportunities for continued staff development, develop appropriate values, integrity and attitudes among PA staff; and develop systems to measure individual performances and mechanisms for internal monitoring and evaluation were inadequately addresses through the project activities.

Integrate capacity development indicators to monitor progress made: Capacity development indicators are the primary operational targets of any capacity development program, set to guide the identification of specific measures for inducing the process of change toward achieving the development goal. They represent the tool which assures signals for any immediate or gradual modification of the action. Therefore, they should be firmly assimilated in project implementation tracking tool in close collaboration and communication with project beneficiaries.

Ensure ownership over the capacity development activities: Capacity development efforts should be defined by strong consensus among stakeholders and owned by the leaders of key beneficiaries involved in the project. The principal goal should be well defined, and its economic and social value clearly articulated and understood, because it determines the purpose and direction of capacity development efforts. The value of capacity development activities should be enunciated in a way that project partners/beneficiaries/stakeholders recruit their awareness and potentials to capitalize on raising their capacities and thereafter initiate and lead changes in approaches towards capacity development at the institutional level.

Capacity development is continuous process: Stakeholders need to create learning mechanisms that allow information to be absorbed, accumulation of knowledge products and identification of knowledge to be shared. The project should insist on providing the wide platform of information and knowledge sharing between all stakeholders from all levels (central, local) and from all sectors (public, private and NGO). Also, stakeholders need to develop mechanisms to record, monitor, evaluate and direct further capacity development efforts.

Capacity development requires resources: In order to make the capacities sustained and cultivated further, the project activities should raise awareness on necessity for investment into knowledge. At the moment, country's context considers this investment a cost. However, responsiveness towards external opportunities rely strongly on internal skills to better manage, plan, execute strategies, raise funds, advocate for common interest, etc. and ultimately provide sustainable growth of their institutions and consequently PAs.

Capacity development needs shared decision making: Not only institutions should define capacity development needs and decide on their amplification, but it should be a systemic effort approached both horizontally and vertically and in communication with other key stakeholders at the field. The DIM modality that was used at the insistence of the Government of Montenegro (GoM) at the time of project design, due to the limited capacities and heavy workload of the institutions in question should be re-examined. Flexible but functional multi-stakeholder structures (including private sector and NGOs) should be established in future to steer the project implementation that would provide for both raising capacities and assure accountability of individuals from key institutions. Also, institutions should develop systems for communicating with their staff and regularly investigate and assess their capacity gaps.

Capacity development needs to be specific: Namely, based on the previous analysis projects should unambiguously define which capacities should be raised, for what concrete purpose, as well as target individuals who needs capacity increase.

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 a detailed assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts, and achievement of objectives.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	This project was implemented jointly with another GEF project (ID 3947), covered in a separate TER prepared by the same authors. There are some inconsistencies in terms of mixing up the acronyms for the two projects (PAF and PAS) which can be confusing. Ratings often are inflated in comparison with the evidence provided. Otherwise the report is consistent.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report gave a detailed discussion of sustainability. The TE notes that the project did not develop an exit strategy.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are supported by the evidence presented.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs, but acknowledges that no information was available on in-kind co-financing.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Discussion of M&E design at entry was lacking evidence, although discussion of M&E implementation was well supported.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

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

No other sources of information were used.