

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3752	
GEF Agency project ID		4176	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Consolidation of Cape Verde's Protected Areas System	
Country/Countries		Cape Verde	
Region		West Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO 1: to catalyze sustainability of protected area system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP2: Increasing representation of effectively managed marine protected area networks in Protected Area systems • SP3: Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks 	
Executing agencies involved		Directorate General of Environment (DGA), Ministry of Environment, Housing and Land Planning	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Natura 2000, Amigos de Natureza, ATMAR, SOS Tartaruga, and Turtle Foundation were involved as local partners	
Private sector involvement		None involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 6 th , 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		08/04/2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		05/30/2014	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.10	-
	Co-financing	0.10384	-
GEF Project Grant		3.100	3.100

Co-financing	IA own	0.3	15.697,738
	Government	6.648,926	0.783
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	9.456,812	0.3
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	0.375	-
Total GEF funding		3.200	
Total Co-financing		16.884578	16.780,738
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		20.084578	19.980,738
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		12/23/2015	
Author of TE		Juliane Zeidler & Margarida Santos	
TER completion date		12/09/2016	
TER prepared by		Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environment Objective of the project is “to consolidate and strengthen Cape Verde’s protected areas (PA) system through the establishment of new terrestrial and marine PA units and the promotion of participatory approaches to conservation” (PD pg 29).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is “to conserve globally significant terrestrial and marine biodiversity in priority ecosystems of Cape Verde through a protected area system’s approach” (PD pg 29). The project aims to achieve its objectives through three components (PD pg 29):

Component 1: The governance framework for the expansion, consolidation and sustainability of the National PA system is strengthened;

Component 2: Management of effectiveness at selected terrestrial and coastal/marine PAs is enhanced; and

Component 3: The sustainability of PAs is strengthened through community mobilization, sectoral engagement and local capacity building for sustainable resource management within Pas/MPAs and adjacent areas.

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

There were no changes to the objectives or 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 the relevance of the project as Highly Satisfactory as it was “confirmed by all interviewees and consultations” (TE pg 26). The TER finds that the project was consistent with the GEF Focal Area of biodiversity. The project’s objective of consolidating and strengthening Cape Verde’s protected areas is aligned with GEF’s Strategic Objective One under biodiversity of “catalyzing the sustainability of protected areas” (PD pg 27).

The project was in line with Cape Verde’s development plans and policies such as the Grand Options Plan, Growth and Poverty Reduction Strategic Paper (2004-2007), and National Environment Action Plan (PANA II for 2004-2014) (PD pg 48). Thus, the TER gives a Satisfactory rating to relevance.

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

The TE rates the effectiveness of the project to be Moderately Satisfactory, however, notes that the “outputs were often produced, however, not brought to full fruition as a strategy to align them to a national strategy for effective PA management” (TE pg 27). The TER finds that the project met targets for enhancing management effectiveness at Protected Areas and strengthening Protected Areas through community mobilization, but failed to deliver results to strengthen governance framework of the national Protected Area system. As the project delivered on two out of three outcomes, the TER also gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to the project’s effectiveness.

The achievements under the project outcomes are listed below:

Outcome 1: Governance framework for the expansion, consolidation and sustainability of the national PA system is strengthened

This outcome was given Moderately Unsatisfactory rating by the TE as two of the four outputs were not achieved. The main expected outputs were to establish Protected Area Autonomous Authority (PAAA) with appropriately trained personnel and have effective cooperation of PAAA with relevant institutions for sustainable resource management (PD pg 31). Although the government managed to set-up “an in-house sub-service on PA management”, the project failed to establish the envisaged PAAA and there was no preparation done for cooperation with relevant institutions (TE, pg 25, MTR pg 80). However, the project was able to deliver its target of developing Protected Area plans and management tools. The TE notes that Zoning Plan and National Strategy for Protected Areas were approved at the Meeting of High Representatives (RAR) and submitted to the Cabinet for approval (TE pg 63). As the main intended outputs were not delivered, the TER agrees with TE’s rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory.

Outcome 2: Management effectiveness at selected terrestrial and marine PAs is enhanced

The TE rates this outcome as Moderately Satisfactory and notes that “most plans developed are still not under significant implementation and most have not yet been approved at the national level” (TE pg 26). The TER finds that four out of five outputs were achieved and the quality of the outputs were moderately satisfactory. As the main purpose of this outcome was to improve the management effectiveness, the outputs were designed to prepare and implement strategic and business plans as well as to set-up ecological monitoring systems. The project developed and got approved management plans, ecotourism plans and regulations by the government, which were in the implementation phase at the time of the evaluation (TE pg 65). The project also got approved island-wide strategy and conservation plans by the RAR and the “measures proposed in these strategies are being implemented at the level of respective islands” (TE pg 67). For setting up ecological monitoring system, the project initiated a monitoring campaign and observation of sea turtles, inventoried existing plan species, introduced good practice in outdoor activities to tour operators, and trained tourist guides (TE pgs 67-69). However, in regard to implementing Fisheries Management Plan, very little work was done to get cooperation agreements between the Directorate of Fisheries and Island-wide Offices. The TE notes that there was “limited ownership and integration with the work and responsibilities of the Directorate of Fisheries with regards to the MPA and linkages to the national Fisheries Management Plan” (TE pgs 69 and 26).

Outcome 3: The sustainability of PAs is strengthened through community mobilization, sectoral engagement and local capacity building for sustainable resource management within PAs/MPAs and adjacent areas

Under this outcome, all four of the expected results were achieved and the TE gives a Satisfactory rating. The TE states that “building partnerships clearly has been the biggest success of the project during its implementation period. All outputs have been addressed to some extent and even one year after project closure these partnerships seem to continue and ownership is clearly discernible” (TE pg 26). The TER also finds that the project achieved its outputs because, for example to build capacity of communities and farmers associations, the project conducted training sessions on income generating activities, prepared and disseminated education and awareness materials (TE pg 71). For local governments and resource institutions to collaborate in biodiversity conservation, the project formed Advisory Councils to have meetings about biodiversity conservation in Protected Areas and Marine Protected Areas. There has been “continuous sharing of information between partners (and) application of knowledge acquired in training” (TE pg 73). Lastly, to spread awareness on restrictions of ecological carrying capacities, a document assessing the limits of sustainable use of natural resources was approved by the Steering Committee. However, it was yet to be approved by the Ministry of Environment at the time of the TE (TE pg 86).

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

The TE gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to project efficiency, although it states that “project cost efficiency in relation to project impacts was questionable. Value for money was not always realized in the implementation of the project, and it seems by virtue of employment an attitude of entitlement was fostered” (TE pg 27). Although two out three outcomes were achieved, the TE says that the outputs lacked quality. The MTR reports that there were delays in recruitment and due to insufficient attention to detail in important documents, such as drafting TOR and inception report, there was a slow start to the project. In 2013, the project was given an extension due to the delay (MTR pg 36). In terms of financial management, there was disproportionate allocation of funding given to staff versus project implementation (TE pg 27). According to the MTR, expenditure for years 1 and 3 was roughly in line, but for year 2 it was higher than anticipated in the project document which resulted in shortage of US \$244,000 for year 4 (MTR pg 29). Due to inefficient financial management and project delays, the TER gives a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to the project’s efficiency.

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

The TE assessed sustainability at national, sub-national and Protected Area levels, and gave a Satisfactory rating to the project's sustainability. However, the TER gives a Moderately Unlikely rating after finding there are financial, governance and environmental risks that could undermine the project benefits. The following is a detailed assessment of sustainability on financial resources, sociopolitical, institutional framework, and environmental factors:

Financial Resources: The TE reports that there was lack of finances for implementation of activities. Also, there is no mention of resources available for future activities. In terms of income generation, the Protected Areas that are identified as eco-tourism hubs need more infrastructure development to be able to attract entry fees from visitors. According to the TE, "while some (PAs) are quite clearly discernible, others completely lack signage and demarcation" (TE pgs 28-29). Due to inadequate financial resources, there is a risk to continuation of project activities.

Sociopolitical: The project had investments in community projects that promoted small business enterprises for eco-tourism. It is reported that these enterprises continued beyond project end and engaged in biodiversity-friendly activities, such as small home restaurants catered for hikers, juice and marmalade production from fruit trees that were planted in areas adjacent to Protected Areas, and home herbal gardens were used for tea and other products. Additionally, as the project raised awareness on biodiversity and conservation issues amongst local people, it "seemed to have generated a lot of enthusiasm and buy-in into the national conservation agenda" (TE pg 29). On local level, the project beneficiaries were directly involved with implementation, which generated good partnership arrangement. There was also close integration of partners with the government especially the Directorate General of Environment (TE pgs 19-20). Considering the flow of benefits, stakeholder engagement and awareness of long-term biodiversity conservation objective, the TER gives a Likely rating to sociopolitical sustainability.

Institutional framework and governance: Although the current national environment policies and plans are aligned to project objective, policy approval for Protected Areas and governance framework for strengthening the national Protected Area system have not been achieved. The TE states that there have been number of reports and management plans approved but there is a lack of policy development and follow-up (TE pgs 7, 25 and 82). To manage terrestrial and marine Protected Areas, the project focused on establishing a new institution of PAAA instead of capacity building in existing Protected Areas (MTR pg 37). But the project failed to establish

the PAAA, which was meant to be the main Protected Area institutional mechanism. Hence, the TER finds there is a risk to continuation of project benefits.

Environmental: The TER finds that there are some environmental risks to the sustainability of the project due to lack of concerted efforts. For instance, the TE notes that just a year after project closure there were loss of turtle nests, eggs and hatchlings and this was attributed to withdrawing of military from the beaches. This indicates that there is a greater need for continued effort and government commitment to ensure environmental sustainability (TE pg 29). The MTR also expresses concern that there was not enough consideration given to the potential side-effects of alternative livelihood and small grant interventions (MTR pg 38).

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 expected and actual co-financing remained the same at US \$16,780,738. The TE does not provide any data on how the co-financing was utilized.

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?

Although the TE does not report of delays, the MTR states "there were some delays in recruitment and establishment of field offices but this was to be expected with so many staff to be recruited" (MTR pg 36). It also notes that there was a slow start to project implementation because of inadequate "attention to detail in the internal revisions, work planning, and establishment of committee membership, definition of monitoring protocols and drafting of TOR" (MTR pg 36). In 2013, the project was granted an extension (MTR pg 36) but there is no mention of effects on project outcomes in the mid-term review and TE.

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:

As per the TE, country ownership was "highly related especially considering that ownership was not only created on national but also on sub-national levels" (TE pg 27). The TER finds that the project did receive substantial support from the government as the objectives of the project

helped to fulfill Cape Verde's conservation and biodiversity policies such as the National Environment Action Plan (2004-2014) (PD pg 49). Also, due to partnership arrangement during the project and awareness of biodiversity benefits, local institutions as well as communities helped in carrying out project activities (TE pg 64).

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 project document provided a baseline analysis and aligned it with the project outcomes. The project had a detailed results framework with indicators for each output but the MTR finds that were "inadequate for measuring project impact" (PD pgs 64-66, MTR pg 31). It also had an incremental cost analysis as well as a detailed budget with work plan (PD pgs 69 and 71). The MTR observes "an indicative work plan was prepared at the time of the Inception Meeting for the whole project and for 2011, with activities defined under each output" (MTR pg 30). The MTR also states that the project document had specified to incorporate a detailed schedule of project review meetings as well as impact indicators of global biodiversity benefits into the Inception Report. But neither of these were included in the inception report (MTR pg 30). The TE does not give a rating or any details on M&E design at entry. However, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating because of the inclusion of basic M&E features such as the baseline, inception report, budget, results framework with indicators and activities per outputs.

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

The TE does not provide any information on M&E implementation but relies on the MTR for an assessment of M&E performance (TE pg 23). The project had been monitored following the indicative M&E plan in the project document as well as UNDP and GEF reporting procedures. The mid-term review was conducted in year 3 and there were also Annual Project Implementation Reviews conducted (PIR 2013, 2014 and 2015).

The MTR mentions that the indicators were found to be inadequate but there was no action taken to revise them. As the indicators in the Strategic Results Framework (SRF) set targets linked to GEF Biodiversity Tracking Tools, there was double monitoring of the tools. Also, the tracking proved to be difficult because reliable data was not readily available. The MTR gave a Satisfactory rating to M&E implementation but commented that “more should have been done to deal with some of the problems with the SRF that were acknowledged by the project staff” (MTR pg 31). Due to moderate flaws in monitoring, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating.

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 implementing agency for the project and its office in Praia provided administrative support to the executing agency. UNDP provided time and effort in managing “financial and progress reporting procedures such as the annual PIR/APR and guidance on GEF requirements” (MTR pg 31). It also communicated regularly with the project management office and occasionally visited project sites. UNDP’s Regional Technical Advisor had attended the Inception Workshop and gave comments on the project reports as well as the Biodiversity Tracking Tool. There was also coordination of activities at the field by UNDP-GEF Small Grants Fund. However, the MTR observes that the UNDP’s decision to extend the project by seven months is questionable especially without addressing staff and budget constraints (MTR pg 32). As UNDP had provided quality supervision and assistance in project implementation, the TER gives a Satisfactory rating.

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

The General Directorate for Environment (DGA) was the project's executing agency and had a good working relationship with local stakeholders as well as UNDP Praia. The DGA had a dedicated staff for project implementation at Praia and field sites, and also had support from technical specialist and many international consultants. However, the MTR notes that it was not necessary to engage with many consultants as "it would probably have been much more effective to choose a single consultant to work, for example, on the main institutional outputs...a more process oriented approach to management would have been better" (MTR pg 31). On staff capacity, the TE states "there are no clear staff development plans in place, and the performance expectation of staff in the PA sub-service is unclear" (TE pg 24). It is worth noting that by the end of the project, the DGA had absorbed many of the staff in its service (TE pg 28). Although the DGA provided ample staff and coordination support, due to the shortcomings in the quality of execution the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating.

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.

As per the TE, the "investments made into Invasive Alien Species (IAS) control on Santo Antao had major impacts on vegetation structure and rehabilitation of endangered species such as the Dragon Tree" (TE pg 29). On impact, The TE notes that there was increased awareness on biodiversity conservation and Protected Area management amongst local stakeholders (TE pg 29).

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 does not describe any socioeconomic changes as a result of the project.

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

a) Capacities: Infrastructure was built on Protected Area sites but it is inadequate. Awareness on Protected Area systems and eco-tourism had created more knowledge about biodiversity conservation amongst local stakeholders (TE pg 29).

b) Governance: No changes in relation to governance are reported.

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 reported affecting ecological or social aspects.

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 states that many of the outputs were mainstreamed through various sectors by the partners. The development of management and eco-tourism plans had created a good multi-institutional partnership, such as between government and NGOS, which is being continued with the implementation of the plans. However, the mainstreaming of Protected Area management in fisheries sectors was insufficient (TE pgs 27-28).

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 that could have application for other GEF projects are:

- a) **Timely MTRs:** Due to project delays, mid-term reviews (MTR) are done closer to the project completion and, often times, MTRs are not conducted well. As the MTR in this project was well-conducted, it helped to add value to project delivery and prescribed management adjustment at an earlier stage (TE pgs 30-31).
- b) **Valuing M&E activities:** In this project, important recommendations from Project Implementation Review were disregarded both by the UNDP Country Office and project team. However, valuable lessons can be learned from M&E activities especially in regard to financial resources and staffing decisions (TE pg 31).
- c) **Adaptive management know-how:** In this project, the leadership team were rigid with the project document and were resistant to adaptive management. To instill adaptive management approach, relevant orientation training could be conducted for the project team at the start their appointments (TE pg 31).
- d) **Oversight responsibility of UNDP:** To ensure projects are delivered successfully, UNDP Country Office and regional team “must be more candid in following through on recommended project adjustments” (TE pg 31).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE describes the following recommendations to reinforce initial benefits from the project, especially the Protected Area sub-service at DGA (TE pgs 31-32):

- 1) **Refine the long term vision:** Adopt a clear strategy of Protected Area management arrangements, especially in relation to budget allocations and financing. Based on outputs, produce a paper on long-term plan on effective Protected Area management and next steps for realization.
- 2) **Focus on effective operationalization:** Review TORs and staff profiles to help define responsibilities and budgeting. Improve performance management system by securing appropriate staff for key positions. Also improve operationalization of Procedure for Payments to suit Protected Area management, especially where people work in remote areas, and clearly allocate budget for 2016.
- 3) **Finish the strategy that has been started:** Follow-up and articulate a clear plan to bring to fruition the unfinished work of the project. Mobilize resources for on the ground actions and include it within the TORs of staff members.

- 4) **Create cutting-edge community of practice:** Develop strategy for knowledge management and capacity building. This should be done through systematic documentation and make it available on an online platform as this would very useful because “of the difficulties and costly nature of physically travelling between islands” (TE pg 32). Identify creative support mechanisms such as international and university partnerships. Utilize modern technologies for communications and knowledge sharing.

Proposal for future directions:

- 1) The TE proposes investing into the “further expansions of the PAs to out compete other claims on land and seascapes and areas” (TE pg 32).
- 2) For further interventions, “GEF 6 intervention could further improve and upscale community-based and innovation eco-business” (TE pg 32).
- 3) Conduct specific scoping of public-private partnerships with tourism investors (TE pg 32).

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?	There has been a thorough assessment of outcomes but many of the project impacts needed further appraisal.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report's ratings are moderately consistent with its explanation. But in some cases, such as M&E, and project implementation and execution there was no rating and explanation given respectively.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does not provide assessment of sustainability as per GEF components, which made it very difficult to analyze, and also the assessment failed to identify whether there were any risks involved for project benefits.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are well supported by examples and are quite relevant.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not include project costs and expenditures per activity but gives the total co-financing used.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report does not provide an independent analysis of M&E systems but rather relies on the MTR for M&E review.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

Other than TE and Project Document, the report used MTR for information.