

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3718	
GEF Agency project ID		00057508 / 00071082 / 4045	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Building the Capacity of the Agriculture Sector in DR Congo to Plan for and Respond to the Additional Threats Posed by Climate Change on Food Production and Security	
Country/Countries		Democratic Republic of Congo	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LCDF	
Executing agencies involved		Ministère de L'Environnement, de la Conservation de la Nature et des Eaux et Forêts. (MECN-EF)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		January 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		January 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 2015	
Actual date of project completion		June 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.1	0
	Co-financing	0.08	0
GEF Project Grant		3.00	3.00
Co-financing	IA own	0.05	0.15
	Government	4.00	3.00*
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		3.1	3.00
Total Co-financing		4.13	3.15*
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		7.23	6.15*
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 2015	
Author of TE		Jean Folack and François Kapa	
TER completion date		January 14, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

* Initially, the TE reports that the government contribution in-kind was worth \$USD 3.0 million (TE p.3). In another section, the TE claims that the in-kind contribution was much smaller (TE p.36). Later in the same paragraph, the TE claims that no in-kind contribution took place (TE p.36). The actual budget figures are therefore unreliable.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The main objective of this project is a development objective. Nonetheless, the project “is expected to deliver enhanced capacity to manage natural resources in an agricultural context (land, water, and genetic resources). Through its efforts to promote sustainable agricultural practices, the project will also indirectly contribute to avoided deforestation and better forest management. In addition, the project will contribute to the conservation of genetic resources and biological diversity through its efforts to update and maintain genetic material (original and enhanced), and to promote the sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity” (PD p.20).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The official project objective is “to strengthen capacities of agriculture (including cropping, livestock husbandry, and fisheries) communities to adapt to climate change” (PD p.25). Indeed, the project seeks to enhance the resilience of the DRC’s agriculture sector “ by providing the tools, information, inputs and capacities to the main actors of agricultural development to enable them to adequately understand, analyze and react to climate risks” (PD p.16).

By increasing agricultural productivity and thereby increasing earning potential, the project is expected to benefit households. In addition, the project aims to strengthen the DRC’s agricultural institutional capacity.

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

There were no changes in the objectives of this project during implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory, a rating that this TER agrees with. Indeed, the project was important, strategically relevant and well aligned with both DRC and GEF priorities.

As part of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), a fund managed by the GEF that finances the preparation and implementation of National Adaptation Programs of Action (NAPAs), this project was naturally well aligned with GEF priorities. Part of the climate change focal area and the LDCF operational program, this project came out of the 2006 submission by the DRC Government of the National Adaptation Programme of Action, which identified urgent priority project profiles related to climate change adaptation. The DRC's process for the preparation of the NAPA involved all relevant national stakeholders, this project is therefore naturally aligned with national priorities.

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

The TE rates effectiveness as satisfactory due to the fact that “the 3 main project results were achieved” (TE p.29). However, it does not provide a very detailed justification for the score. This TER also rates effectiveness as satisfactory due to the three outcomes having been satisfactorily achieved, and most project activities having been delivered as planned.

Outcome 1: Climate resilience of crop systems used by rural populations is improved

The main targets for this outcome were (i) for there to be a fully operational supply chain for key resilient agricultural inputs, for agricultural productivity to be increased and for natural resources to be sustainably managed in accordance with climate risk management, and (ii) for farmers in the 4 pilot sites to be equipped to cope with climate induced risk.

According to the 2014 PIR, at project completion, the supply chain for resilient seeds was “operational for the production and dissemination of resilient varieties of maize, cassava, rice, groundnuts, beans and cowpeas at each project area. Yields for those crops were higher and the crops were more resistant to droughts and disease. 400 households benefited from resilient seeds (PIR 2013 p.6). Farmers were better equipped to cope with climate risks and natural resources were more sustainably managed; for

example, “bucking and mulching soils practices were popularized and systematized at field level for households” (PIR 2014 p.8) to ensure better conservation of water soil at the communal fields.

Overall, the project appears to have delivered most of the planned outputs, although numerical targets for output delivery or outcomes were not specified. While it is difficult to assess the extent to which the activities and outputs mentioned above are indeed improving climate resilience, outcome activities appear to have been satisfactorily conducted.

Outcome 2: The technical capacities of small farmers and agricultural institutions are strengthened

The main targets for this outcome were (i) increases in individual and institutional capacity, (ii) the ability of farmers to receive and use agro-meteorological forecasts, (iii) the review of agricultural strategy at provincial and national level to take into account climate risk, and (iv) the overall better climate change awareness and capacity of agricultural staff at provincial and national level.

In terms of capacity gain, the TE (p.30) reports that training modules were developed which were sent to agricultural staff at the provincial and national level. In addition, a manual of procedures was created for provincial development plans, and provincial committees were trained and set up. Workshops were organized to strengthen the capacity of policy makers and key agricultural actors. Meteorological information was used for agricultural planning after being shared on community radios. Climate risks management were integrated into two provincial planning documents, and the National Agricultural Investment Programme 2013-2020 was approved, integrating climate change mitigation and adaptation components. (PIR 2014 pp.9-11)

Overall, planned activities have been delivered and, while no indicator used measures actual capacity gained, there is convincing evidence that capacities have been strengthened.

Outcome 3: Best practices are captured and disseminated

The main target for this outcome was (i) the presence of a forum for sharing lessons learned from the project and (ii) increased public awareness regarding adaptation and resilient agriculture.

Under this outcome, provincial climate risks management committees were set up, a website (www.pana-asa.cd) was created to disseminate project experiences and a training manual, and those experiences were also shared on the radio, television, as well as during agricultural fairs and forums. (PIR 2014, p.12)

Overall, the planned targets for this outcome appear to have been delivered, and best practices have been captured and disseminated. According to the UNDP Technical Advisor, “good progress are made in term of resilient seeds and climate information allowing target communities to better plan their agriculture seasons and manage climate risks” (PIR 2014, p.16).

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

The TE rates efficiency as satisfactory. This TER also rates efficiency as satisfactory due to the overall good management of project funds and the ability of the project team to deliver project outcomes on time despite the difficult operating conditions.

Cost effectiveness was taken into consideration at the design phase. Indeed, “the project preparation phase provided some time to undergo a cost-benefit analysis of certain activities, particularly as regards investment activities, as well as an inventory and a valuation of the development baseline relevant to this project. Activities have been budgeted so as to achieve the maximum level of impact (as related to the project objective of reducing vulnerability) in relation to their cost.” (PD p.26). Given that the project did not require additional funds and managed to satisfactorily achieve its objectives, it can only be assumed that cost effectiveness was ensured.

Despite the delays in getting it started, the project was able to satisfactorily achieve its planned outcomes, even with a much shorter effective implementation time. According to the TE, this was possible as “the result of an active collaboration between the stakeholders involved in the implementation and management of the project” (p.24). In addition, according to the TE, the project responded well to challenges. When the audit found that the human resources devoted to the project were too scarce – the project was effectively being managed by two people only – two additional members of staff were added to the team (TE p.24).

However, there were some inefficiencies in the management of funds. Payments and reimbursements were often made late, which was detrimental to the implementation of activities needing to take place following a strict schedule related to the agricultural calendar. (TE p.27)

Overall, apart from minor financial and human resources issues, there is nothing to indicate a lack of efficiency in the operation of this project.

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

The TE rates the sustainability of outcomes as moderately satisfactory, but only provides a limited description of the factors that might influence sustainability. Despite there being little evidence for the institutional gains made as part of the project to be continued after project end, financial risks to the project are still fairly small due to continuation of LCDF projects in the country. This TER therefore assesses sustainability as moderately likely.

Financial Risks - Sustainability Moderately Likely

The TE describes how “field observations and interviews with direct beneficiaries show a good probability of financial sustainability in households by the fact that they all have the concern to invest profits in the most profitable activities” (TE p.32). This TER is unconvinced by this anecdotal evidence and deplores the lack of a more comprehensive description of financial sustainability in the TE.

Clues regarding financial sustainability can be obtained in the 2014 PIR. For example, on p.16, “the implementation of the 2nd and 3rd LCDF projects” is mentioned, which makes this TER guess that, at project end, follow-up LCDF projects had already been approved. Given the potential for some of the project activities to be continued as part of future LCDF projects, and despite the lack of formal commitment of funds by the Government, this TER rates financial sustainability as moderately likely.

Socio-political Risks – Unable to Assess

The TE provides no useful discussion of socio-political risks, country ownership or national intentions regarding the continuation of project activities. It does not discuss the political climate and the risks it may pose to the project, nor does it discuss some of the socio-economic problems that could hinder project achievements. Other project documents, including the 2014 PIR, also provide little additional information on this topic.

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Moderately Unlikely

The TE describes institutional sustainability in a positive light, claiming that some of the participating organizations are ‘building on the achievements’ of the project, and that the weather broadcasts were taken over and would continue after project end (TE p.32). However, this assessment does not appear to be comprehensive.

The 2014 PIR mentions that the operationalization of the agricultural supply chain for resilient seeds isn’t fully operational, but that “without project intervention, there is no guaranty that such production chain is going to be operational. Until the end of the project, [no] relevant commitment from the government to continue such operation is made. [No] official agreement is set in place between seed multipliers, INERA, SENASEM and communities to establish sustainable mechanisms for this production chain.” (PIR 2014, p.16)

Due to this lack of institutional continuation mechanism in place, institutional sustainability is rated as moderately unlikely.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE and PIRs do not present any environmental risks. Environmental sustainability is therefore rated as 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 is unclear about the extent to which the planned Government co-financing was delivered as part of the project. Initially, the TE reports that the government contribution in-kind was worth \$USD 3.0 million (TE p.3). In another section, the TE claims that the in-kind contribution was much smaller. (TE p.36). Later in the same paragraph, the TE claims that no in-kind contribution took place (TE p.36). The actual budget figures are therefore unreliable.

This TER guesses that the planned in-kind contribution from the Government was received, but that the authors of the TE do not believe it was worth \$USD 3 million.

In any case, the TE does not describe the way in which co-financing affected project outcomes.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

Project implementation effectively started two years later than expected, but the project was nonetheless completed on time and outcomes were satisfactorily achieved. The TE does not clearly describe the reasons for the delay, but mentions that the resilient seed needed for the project was not actually available for distribution at the beginning of the project, and that there were delays in the availability of funds (TE p.28).

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 is not described in the TE, and the project PIRs do not offer any additional information.

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
------------------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E Design at entry as moderately satisfactory. This TER downgrades that rating to moderately unsatisfactory, given the overall adequate M&E framework put in place, but noting the weakness of the Results Framework.

The Project Document presents a Results Framework (p.25) featuring a set of indicators to track project. Unfortunately, those indicators do not meet the SMART criteria. For example, the indicator “climate resilient practices at farm level” had as a target “in the 4 pilots sites defined during the PPG, farmers will be equipped to cope with climate induced risk”. This is unspecific – what does it mean for a farmer to be ‘equipped? – and hardly measurable. This is only one example of several indicators that were of little help in tracking project progress and measuring change. The TE also deplores “the absence of SMART indicators for project activities from the beginning in the project document”(p.13). In addition, no numerical baselines were established, making progress tracking even more difficult.

The Project Document did include a M&E Framework (PD p.39) with clear key activities, responsibilities, budget and time frames. The M&E framework largely included all necessary building blocks and, if it had a solid Results Framework, could have led to a solid M&E system for the project.

Because of the weakness of the project’s result framework, the cornerstone of the M&E framework, M&E Design at entry is rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as unsatisfactory, but provided a confusing rationale that pertained as much to M&E design as to M&E implementation:

“The logical framework included in the project was not a utility barn to facilitate monitoring and evaluation of the project is that almost all indicators of performance and impact contained therein has not been accompanied targets. Thus, the operation of these indicators by the project team and the two support committees (CP and CTS) became irrelevant. In response, the project has corrected this in the context of the preparation of the PTA (Annual Work Plans) and the preparation of PIR.” (TE p.36)

From this account, it appears like the project team did not use the indicators proposed by the PD for monitoring. However, the PIRs clearly demonstrate that annual reporting was made against those indicators. Overall, this TER does not have enough coherent information on M&E implementation to make a sound assessment.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	--

The implementing agency for this project was UNDP. The TE rates UNDP's performance as the project implementing agency as satisfactory but provides only limited information to justify its rating. This TER rates UNDP's performance as implementing agency as moderately satisfactory due to the issue with project design noted below.

The TE notes an important issue related to project design. "During the development of PRODOC, the project was built on the assumption that the resilient seed obtained on the basis of research results was available. This was not the case. This influenced the implementation strategy of the project that has had to make resources and time, not provided for conducting screening assays varieties/clones to identify those who are resilient and multiply before to ensure distribution to the beneficiary communities. This created the delay in the distribution of seeds to farmers and marred ownership and sustainability of broadcast technology packages." (TE p.28)

That issue aside, the TE appears to assess UNDP performance rather positively, and justifies its satisfactory rating based on the UNDP' "periodic monitoring of project progress level" and its help solving some of the difficulties encountered as part of the project (TEp.36). However, it also notes minor issues regarding UNDP's disbursement of funds (TE p.40).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
---	---------------------------------

The executing agency for this project was the Ministère de L'Environnement, de la Conservation de la Nature et des Eaux et Forêts (MECN-EF) of the DRC (Ministry for the Environment and the Conservation of Water and Forests). The TE barely mentions the MECN-EF's role in the project, and the PIRs are equally silent. This TER is therefore unable to assess the quality of project execution

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.

No environmental change has been recorded as part of this project.

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 2014 PIR reports that “women, heads of household, distinguished with great leadership, were chosen in participative manner by the members of the community to serve along side men, as beneficiary of the project in the pilot villages. With the support from the project, jobs were created for women, which developed sustainable livelihoods and generated income that benefited first to children.” (PIR 2014 p.20)

The TE unfortunately does not describe the impact from the project, as it has not been well assessed as part of the project’s M&E activities.

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

Building the capacity of small producers and agricultural institutions to better respond to climate change was an important objective of this project. As part of the project, “small producers were trained on water management, agro-ecological techniques agro-forestry and have good yield using organic fertilizers instead of chemical fertilizers” (TE p.34), some aspects of climate change adaptation have been integrated into provincial development plans and more

meteorological information has been made available, thereby increasing the ability of farmers to make informed agricultural decisions. (TE P.34)

b) Governance

No changes in governance were recorded in the TE.

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 consequences were recorded for this 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.

The TE provides no evidence that project activities have been replicated, mainstreamed or scaled up.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE offers the following lessons:

- Long periods of time between interventions leads to a disinterest on the part of stakeholders and beneficiaries and are liable to harm the smooth running of the project and ownership expected;
- Institutional and governance structures should be kept simple, and avoid duplication of roles.
- Financially depending on uncertain funding sources is dangerous and can hinder the implementation of follow-up project activities planned after official project completion. For a nationally executed project, it is important to clarify the funding and disbursement procedures as well as the responsibilities of the implementing parties. In this case, poor communication between project actors created confusion about the state of the project's finances, and about remaining funds for implementation.

- Resilient seeds enabled farmers to withstand climate shocks, including droughts, and provided significant improvements in performance. There is a need to identify varieties adapted in each pilot site or in each ecological zone because of climate variability and ecological zoning;
- Rural communities are now better able to plan their agricultural activities and to integrate climate hazards thanks to information provided by daily weather reports, agro- meteorological bulletins and quarterly newsletters. Those are relayed by community radio and listening clubs;
- A fair partnership between utilities, NGOs and farmers' associations would ensure a better supervision and monitoring of learning to ensure beneficiaries maintain project benefits;
- Providing a technology package to rural communities helps stimulate transformational change leading to a reduction of pressure on natural resources and to the socio-economic resilience of households;
- The success of agricultural adaptation to climate change lies in the effectiveness and efficiency of innovations, knowledge and knowhow rendered by scientific research, despite the time and resources required for the research process;
- To ensure ownership and sustainability, a strong community commitment by the beneficiaries and effective support from the rest of the village community is necessary;
- Given their involvement in agricultural production activities, income generation and household management, women are essential for the sustainability of the rural activities initiated as part of this project;
- A development project should be done for the long term taking into account the climatic and soil in each province or pilot site.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE (pp.10-12) offers the following recommendations:

a) Recommendation for corrective action for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation.

- For future projects, support teams should develop simple and effective devices for monitoring and evaluating the project. Those could include a monitoring and evaluation manual and the establishment of a project database.

b) Recommendations for action to support or reinforce initial benefits of the project

- Conduct advocacy with public institutions for greater ownership / integration of project achievements by the country, for example by organizing open forums and open days to present the project results and highlight how to improve the appropriation of the project by the national party.
- Initiate a second phase of the project which would focus on supporting communities in the implementation of activities that have shown good results, which communities have appropriated elsewhere and which have continued to run after the end of the project. The second phase would also focus on activities that communities have identified as priorities in their areas during the field mission, particularly poultry, fish farming and cattle breeding. These activities should be supported with a veterinary service. Women should be more involved in those activities.

c) Recommendations for future direction

- Given the climate vulnerability of the project's pilot, it would be important to conduct a comprehensive study of socio-economic, cultural and ecological climate vulnerability in order to prepare specific responses in each area.
- Conduct a thorough socio- economic diagnosis in each pilot village and take stock of the needs to improve health, nutrition, governance and other development needs.

d) Recommendations for practices to address issues related to the relevance, performance and success

- Organize a national workshop on the integration of issues related to climate change in the rural sector development strategy.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report includes information about all relevant outcomes, but no systematic assessment. It is unclear where the information came from, or what methodology was used to collect the data. This TER is unconvinced by the TE's discussion of outcomes and achievements, and there is virtually no discussion of impact.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report has some internal inconsistencies, and the evidence is very incomplete. It is never clear what evidence ratings and assessments are based on, or that the data used and reported is trustworthy. Ratings are poorly substantiated and their discussion often provides no convincing arguments or evidence supporting the rating give.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project only provides a shallow discussion of sustainability and exit. The description of project sustainability is very vague and at times irrelevant.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Some of the lessons learned do not appear to be rooted in evidence supplied in the TE, and it is unclear where they come from. They are difficult to understand. Lessons learned mentioned in the TE are repeated in the 'lessons learned' section.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does include some figures for project costs, but there are inconsistencies and the TE is not convinced those figures are reliable. Costs per activity are not mentioned. Co-financing provided is mentioned, but inconsistent between various sections of the report.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE provides some criticism of the M&E at entry, but does not describe well M&E implementation and does not overall provide a comprehensive assessment of M&E	MU
Overall TE Rating		MU

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

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