Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3717	
GEF Agency project ID		GEF-FSP-021-EC	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF - 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		SFM Sustainable Management of Biodiversity and Water Resources in the Ibarra-San Lorenzo Corridor	
Country/Countries		Ecuador	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Multifocal (BD and LD)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-4; BD-5; LD-2	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture, Aquaculture and Fisheries; Ministry of Environment; Plan Ecuador	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Plan Ecuador (executing partner)	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		3/7/2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		11/16/2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		6/31/2016	
Actual date of project completion		3/31/2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.1	
	Co-financing	.1	
GEF Project Grant		2.7	2.7
Co-financing	IA own	12.83	12.83
	Government	2.43	2.58
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Beneficiaries	0.78	2.2
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		2.8	2.8
Total Co-financing		16.15	17.69
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		18.75	20.49
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		12/1/2017	
Author of TE		Gabriela Arcos Olarte	
TER completion date		3/13/2019	
TER prepared by		Cody Parker	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Ritu Kanotra	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective is not specifically outlined in the project document, but is taken to be the same as the development objective.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective was "to promote biodiversity conservation as well as sustainable land and forest management in the Ibarra-San Lorenzo corridor so as to preserve and improve the provision of environmental services in the area, reduce poverty and foster social inclusion to the benefit of indigenous people and local communities" (Endorsement Request, p. 1). This was originally to be achieved through three project components:

1. Capacity development for the locally-driven sustainable management of natural resources;
2. Catalytic investments for the conservation, restoration and sustainable management of natural resources;
3. Incentives for community-led sustainable forest management.

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

There were no official changes to the Objectives. However, the project's framework and activities were significantly modified at least 3 times over project lifespan. Not all of these changes were explained, but they seem to partly relate to overlapping of agencies' responsibilities: many of the outputs originally envisioned fell under the legal auspices of the Ministry of Environment, which was not officially made an executing agency (despite being indicated as an "Executing Partner" in the Endorsement Request), and therefore they could not be carried out (TE, 39).

By the end of the project, the logframe and project design had essentially been completely revised to be identical to that of the broader IFAD Ibarra-San Lorenzo Corridor Territorial Development Project, to which this project had initially been intended to be incremental. Component 3 was eliminated, as government budget cuts precluded the coordination/synergy with the Socio Bosque program which was necessary for that component's activities. Component 1 retained its basic capacity-building premise but

was scaled down; Component 2 was also scaled down. As a result, the additionality/incremental nature of the project was essentially lost, and it ended up only contributing in small part to the goals of the broader Ibarra-San Lorenzo Development project.

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 assigns a rating of Moderately Satisfactory for Relevance. This TER rates Relevance as Satisfactory.

The project was relevant to the local, national and global context and the GEF strategic objectives on the focal areas of Biodiversity under Strategic Objective BD SO2: "Mainstreaming biodiversity in production landscapes" and Land Degradation. It was also closely aligned with the Ecuador's National Well-Being Plan (Plan Nacional de Desarrollo del Buen Vivir-PNDBV) and the national policy and strategic framework on Biodiversity, Sustainable Forest Management and Climate Change.

This project was a child of the GEF Sustainable Forest Management program, and associated with the IFAD Ibarra-San Lorenzo Development Project, which aimed to reduce poverty and improve the living conditions of Afro-Ecuadorian, indigenous, and farming communities in the area. The project aimed to add to that baseline project an integrated approach to mitigate threats and pressures placed on the natural resources of the area, specifically preserving and enhancing key environmental services that are beneficial to the indigenous peoples and local communities (Endorsement Request, 5). As such, the project as originally designed was highly relevant and its activities, especially the legal and institutional strengthening outcomes under Component 1, were well-targeted to achieve biodiversity and sustainable land management benefits beyond the scope of the baseline project.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Unsatisfactory**

The TE rates Effectiveness as Moderately Unsatisfactory. This TER downgrades the rating to Unsatisfactory, as the GEO was largely not achieved, most of the original and most potentially impactful activities were dropped, and as a result the overall impact left by the project was small-scale and scattered compared to its original goals.

As mentioned above, only activities under Components 1 and 2 were carried out. In practice, project activities took the form of 15 sub-projects, of which 3 were studies that did not reach the

implementation stage due to limited funds. The remaining 12 projects included combined agroecology activities, management of soil, micro-watersheds, biodiversity corridors and management of native forest species (TE, 20). No detailed descriptions of these subprojects are available. Achievements in the TE are reported in the framework of the overall Ibarra-San Lorenzo Development Project, not against original project targets, making it useless to compare achievements to targets. However, achievements of this project are disaggregated from those of the larger one, enabling some assessment of results.

Component 1: This component originally aimed to strengthen adoption and enforcement of biodiversity conservation regulation by the government and other organizations, increase capacities for environmental management, and improve monitoring of forests. Although the general capacity-building spirit of the component remained the same, the policy/regulatory outcomes were dropped, and activities mostly focused on small-scale training.

Various trainings in resource management, SLM practices, and business management were undertaken through this component. Project activities resulted in the creation of 412 jobs, and 325 families involved in subprojects increased their income by at least 20%. 6 community/grassroots organizations benefited from better land management, and 51 families benefited from improved land and resource management, productive capacities, business management, and improved participation in productive chains. These results, however, were a relatively small contribution to the goals of the overall Ibarra-San Lorenzo project (for example, the 51 families represent only 11% of the total achieved by the larger project.) Nonetheless, the TE reports that despite initial resistance on the part of many farmers, the project was successful in changing agriculture practices among small-scale farmers to be more sustainable, although due to more limited capacity building than originally envisioned, the sustainability of these benefits was in doubt.

Component 2: This component originally focused on reducing land degradation and deforestation through the deployment of sustainable management techniques, and also included an output pertaining to improved waste management. Like Component 1, the overarching goal remained the same, but outputs were scaled down.

A few of the targets in the original design were maintained. Against a target of 2,500 ha under sustainable land management practices, 1,633 ha was achieved. Of those 1,633 ha, 728 were dedicated to the conservation of primary forests and sustainable management of secondary forests. However, the overall impact of this achievement is difficult to evaluate as no information was available on which actual practices (agroforestry, soil management, watershed management, native species, etc.) were being used in what portions of the other 55% of the land (TE, 19). In addition, 4 innovations in solid waste management were applied, exceeding the original project target of 2. Among other socioeconomic results, 397 families gained access to infrastructure to support production, marketing and transformation, and 8 communities improved the conditions of their surroundings. As in Component 1, though, these results represent minor contributions to the overall Ibarra-San Lorenzo project, and some outputs were not achieved at all, e.g. 5 mangrove productive-environmental projects, 3 base studies for productive projects in forestry/pollution/aquaculture, etc.

Overall, the TE concludes that the vast reduction of the project's scope caused it to "lose sight of the objective, impacts, and expected benefits at the local and global level" (TE, 18). Although some real improvements were made in terms of agroecological practices, they were very small-scale and fell far short of the original objectives of the project. The project's global environmental impact can be taken as minimal, largely restricted to the relatively minor forest conservation and land management achievements of Component 2. Therefore, project effectiveness is rated as Unsatisfactory.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Unsatisfactory**

The TE rates Efficiency as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER downgrades the rating to Unsatisfactory, as fewer and less-impactful activities than originally planned were carried out using the full project budget.

The full GEF grant was disbursed, although with 92% of GEF funds going towards Component 2, a much higher proportion than originally planned. However, activities undertaken were not incremental as planned. The analysis in the TE differentiated planned project activities as "substitutive", those that improve biodiversity by bettering baseline practices, or "complementary", those that are entirely incremental to the baseline and are most important to achieving GEBs (such as the regulatory and institutional strengthening originally planned under Component 1). It concludes that none of the complementary activities that were essential to reduce the identified threats and achieve the global benefits identified for the Project were actually executed, making the impact of the project very low in relation to the resources invested (TE, 23).

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Unlikely**

The TE rates overall sustainability as Moderately Likely. This TER rates sustainability as Moderately Unlikely, due mostly to a lack of coordination and uncertain commitment from relevant government agencies as well as continuing low associative capacity of beneficiaries.

Financial: The sub-projects that were implemented have the potential to be financially sustainable, but still need external support in the short and medium term to develop the necessary decision-making and business skills. Primarily, this will depend on the continued operation of the Rural Good Living program, which is not certain in the long term due to a change in government at the end of the project (TE, 24).

Sociopolitical: As part of the capacity-building for local organizations, the project emphasized "associativity", i.e. collective planning and action for small farmers. These efforts seem not to have made much impact, as it was observed that the majority of small producers still develop their activities individually, from production through marketing. Training provided by the project was limited; while some options were identified to allow access to markets, a specific plan adapted to the realities of the beneficiary organizations was not developed, and the issue of value chains and productive partnerships between the public and private sectors was barely explored (TE, 26). This leaves small producers less empowered to deal with other actors in the system (producers, processors, traders, etc.) to achieve sustainable production and marketing.

Institutional: The lack of coordination of actions and policies between the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture, as well as other key sectors of the Government, jeopardizes the implementation of the legal framework and policies that have been developed to achieve sustainable management of natural resources, and the application of measures necessary for climate change adaptation and mitigation. Additionally, high turnover of personnel within local agencies constitutes a great risk for the continuity of programs and projects and for the application of environmental norms and policies (TE, 26).

Environmental: Environmental sustainability will depend on beneficiaries understanding the importance of sustainable agricultural practices and knowing how to implement them. Interviews carried out by the TE indicate that beneficiaries do have this knowledge and have changed local agricultural production schemes. On the other hand, environmental threats such as African palm cultivation have increased rapidly over the project's lifetime, reducing and scattering the cover of primary and secondary forests, and may pose a greater threat than small-scale agricultural operations. More financial and technical resources are needed to address this threat, and it is unclear whether any are forthcoming (TE, 25).

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?

Co-financing appears to have materialized mostly as expected, and was generally provided in a timely manner (TE, 12).

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 extended by a total of 9 months, with operational close 5 months later than planned and administrative close 4 months after. There were some delays in execution due to inefficient practices within the Government which delayed the disbursement of funds (TE, 50). A monitoring system to track results of subprojects locally was also greatly delayed in its set-up, although this appears to be a system which will continue after the project, so it is unclear whether this was a cause of the project's delayed end.

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 government's overall level of commitment is difficult to assess, as it is unclear to what extent the failure to undertake institutional capacity/policy activities through the Ministry of Environment was caused by legal barriers or other factors. At the local level, organizations were "totally committed to the

execution of the sub-projects", as evidenced by the higher-than-expected materialization of beneficiary co-financing (TE, 50).

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 rates M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory. This TER also rates M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory.

The project document adequately lays out the planned activities for M&E and presents an associated budget. However, more consideration of the project's close linkage to the larger IFAD Ibarra-San Lorenzo Development project might have resulted in a more detailed plan to capture how synergies in M&E might have been achieved while clearly maintaining the additional nature of this project. M&E design at entry is therefore rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The TE rates M&E Implementation as Moderately Satisfactory. However, while the specific modalities of the M&E system of the associated Rural Good Living program are outlined, little information is provided as to how well M&E was carried out for this project, and how it affected evaluation. Therefore, this TER is Unable to Assess quality of M&E implementation.

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 Unsatisfactory**

The TE does not provide a rating for quality of project implementation. This TER rates project implementation as Moderately Unsatisfactory, due mostly to IFAD's failure to keep the project on track.

The technical assistance provided by IFAD was high-quality, and problems were identified in a timely manner (TE, 12). IFAD was also efficient in disbursing funds from its loan and the GEF grant. However, project design was overambitious in terms of expected outcomes. The project area targeted should have been smaller, in order to be proportional to the financial and temporal scale of the project. The TE notes that the project also could have "improved its performance by including institutional capacity activities to generate science-based biophysical and socio-economic spatial information and to use it in land-use planning as to lay the foundations for biodiversity mainstreaming readiness" (TE, 5). Indeed, this institutional focus was part of the original idea of the project, as outlined under Component 1. But these activities were not carried out, which the TE blames on a failure to assign the Ministry of Environment a role as co-executing agency along with the Ministry of Agriculture; instead, it was involved as a "partner" via an agreement with the Ministry of Agriculture (TE, 39). However, it is not clear exactly why this subsidiary role precluded it from carrying out the institutional strengthening and policy activities. Nonetheless, it is clear that, partially for this reason, this project ended up losing sight of its original incrementality to the broader Ibarra-San Lorenzo development project, and the blame for this must lie with IFAD. Quality of project implementation is therefore rated as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for quality of project execution. This TER rates quality of project execution as Moderately Satisfactory.

The project's executing agency was the Ministry of Agriculture, with the Ministry of Environment and the NGO Plan Ecuador as partners, although Plan Ecuador is not mentioned in the TE and it is unclear whether or not they were actually involved.

The project management unit had sufficient capacity to coordinate and execute the technical and administrative management of the project, and communication between the two execution units was adequate. However, more specialized support in the area of natural resource management could have allowed a more rigorous monitoring of activities and impacts. Annual work and procurement plans were submitted in a timely manner, and in general project management complied with deadlines. The team responded to the recommendations of IFAD supervision missions promptly in some issues, but belatedly for others.

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.

1,633 ha of land were brought under sustainable management practices, including 728 ha of forests, although these achievements fell short of project goals (2,500 ha).

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.

Several socioeconomic benefits of the project are reported, for example: i) 412 jobs created; ii) 325 families involved in subprojects have increased their income by 20%; iii) 397 families gained access to infrastructure to support production, marketing and transformation; and iv) 8 communities have improved the conditions of their surroundings. However, the TE presents these figures with caution, noting that they were reported on behalf of this project by the logframe of the associated Rural Good Living project, and no other analysis was available to confirm them (TE, 18). It is also noted that due to the reduced scale of the project, the sustainability of these benefits is uncertain.

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

Despite the project’s capacity-building activities reaching many important beneficiaries, they were not sufficient to ensure sustainability of project achievements. Activities focused heavily on sustainable agriculture techniques without devoting enough attention to commercialization and business management (TE, 13).

b) Governance

No changes in governance are noted as a result of project activities.

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 of the project are reported.

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

The project did manage to achieve a change of agricultural production schemes in some groups of farmers, despite initial resistance, and integrated people and organizations that had not traditionally been included in agricultural development programs. It also fostered associativity and organizational strengthening under a scheme of territorial management of natural resources (TE, 27).

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

Key lessons included (TE, 5):

- For future GEF operations under the "Mainstreaming Biodiversity on Productive Landscapes" strategic objective, the goal, objectives, outcomes and outputs should be designed based on a rigorous baseline assessment, so as to provide a realistic social, economic and environmental context. This exercise is necessary to avoid overly ambitious goals and targets that at the end of the day, will not be accomplished.
- A solid institutional and policy framework at the national and local level, is a key element to ensure the sustainability of project interventions. Beneficiary organizations and producers, if properly trained, could develop the capacity to carry out an integrated management of natural resources within the territories, however, without the support of national and local governments, it is unlikely that they will be able to reach the commercialization stage and have regular access to markets.
- The expected outcomes established under the original project design were too ambitious. During the design stage, a more rigorous analysis on how the proposed activities will lead to the intermediate outcomes and expected impacts should have taken place. The geographic areas and scale to be targeted should have been proportional to the time and funding available. In addition, more detailed biophysical and socio-economic data and knowledge at appropriate spatial scales should have been developed to achieve project's success. The project would have improved its performance by including institutional capacity activities to generate science-based biophysical and socio-economic spatial information and to use it in land-use planning as to lay the foundations for biodiversity mainstreaming readiness.

- It is important to bear in mind that mainstreaming biodiversity in productive landscapes is a complex, long and costly process, it takes quite a time to achieve the desired impacts at a large scale and cross-cutting the relevant productive sectors.
- In order to achieve biodiversity conservation and sustainable management of natural resources, agro-ecological practices must follow a territorial approach, being implemented over extensive and continuous portions of land. Due to its scale and spatial distribution, the project was implemented on small parcels (1-6 ha) surrounded by farmers implementing unsustainable agricultural practices.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE's main recommendations were as follows:

- A solid policy and strategic framework for the sustainable and integrated management of natural resources is very important to secure the success of projects such as this one. However, Ecuador needs to move to the next level that includes the development, implementation and enforcement of the associated regulatory instruments and provide a solid ground to increase and upscale this kind of operations and strengthen the enforcement capacity of the local governments.
- It is necessary and extremely important to secure the long-term financing of the Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation System under the Rural Good Living program (PBVR), to allow its full development and to become the main planning and management tool of the local producer organizations. This will provide the opportunity to upscale the project investments.
- It is crucial at this stage to re-initiate conversations with the Ministry of the Environment to follow up on the request to include the 728 ha belonging to the Chachi communities to be attached to the territories under the Socio Bosque Program. It would also be important to identify opportunities and establish the mechanisms to articulate the activities aimed at an integrated management of natural resources based on a territorial and programmatic approach.
- The sub-projects and the related outcomes must be articulated to the ongoing programs of the Ministry of Agriculture, as a mechanism to secure the sustainability of both, the approach and the investments developed under the PBVR. Although this articulation was expected under the implementation strategies of the PBVR, the operational mechanisms are not yet in place.
- Given the relevance of the climatic and hydrological monitoring for decision making on territorial planning, it is highly recommended that the monitoring currently implemented at the micro catchment level at the Carchi Province, is expanded to other regions as to establish a Monitoring Network. For this purpose, PNBV, sponsored by the Ministry of Agriculture, should seek additional funding and coordinate with other relevant public institutions.

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 thorough assessment of project achievements and impacts.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and complete, although a longer and clearer explanation of the institutional issues causing the project's scale-down would have been welcomed.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides a thorough assessment of project sustainability.	**S**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons presented are appropriate and justified.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides all financial details appropriately.	**S**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Although the report provides a detailed description of the M&E frameworks utilized, it does not evaluate the effectiveness of M&E as a whole.	**MU**
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 additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.