

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3806	
GEF Agency project ID		4229	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Strengthening National Management Capacities and Reducing Releases of POPs in Honduras	
Country/Countries		Honduras	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		POPs	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		POPS-1;POPS-2;	
Executing agencies involved		The Ministry of Natural Resources and the Environment (SERNA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		No involvement of NGO or CBO	
Private sector involvement		Private sector as beneficiaries and sub-contractor	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 24, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 11, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		April 29, 2015	
Actual date of project completion		March 2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.1	0.1
	Co-financing	0.1	N/A
GEF Project Grant		2.65	2.44
Co-financing	IA own	0.25	0.05
	Government	7.09	1.31
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	4.0	NA
	Private sector	1.24	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	0	
Total GEF funding		2.75	2.75
Total Co-financing		12.68	11.87
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		15.43	14.62
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		October 2015	
Author of TE		Anna Ortiz	
TER completion date		February 15, 2017	
TER prepared by		Matteo Borzoni	
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	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Satisfactory
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	Moderately likely	N/R	Moderately likely
M&E Design	N/R	Highly satisfactory	N/R	Highly satisfactory
M&E Implementation	N/R	Highly satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of Implementation	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of Execution	N/R	Satisfactory	N/R	Moderately satisfactory
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	Moderately satisfactory

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project document does not state a global environmental objective, however it includes a country program outcome, which is formulated as follows “an integrated national environmental policy promoting equal access as well as the sustainable use and conservation of natural resources” (ProDoc, p. 25).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project is “the reduction in health and environmental risks of POPs through the application of principles of sound environmental management within the context of the National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention” (ProDoc, p. 39)

The development objective was to be achieved through the following four outcomes:

1. Institutional capacities developed and regulatory and policy framework strengthened for the management and elimination of POPs and the reduction of their impacts.
2. Awareness increased regarding the nature, impacts and management of hazardous chemicals and wastes.
3. Sound environmental management and elimination of intentionally produced POPs.
4. Releases of unintentionally produced POPs from current waste management practices are reduced.

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

No

#### 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The TE rated the Relevance criterion as “relevant” and this TER, which uses a different scale, rates relevance as satisfactory.

The National Implementation Plan for the Stockholm Convention (NIP) identifies the principal problem with Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) in Honduras as the emissions of dioxins and furans. It is estimated that 368.86 g I-TEQ<sup>1</sup>/yr of dioxins and furans originate from domestic waste burning and 28 g I-TEQ/yr from landfill fires. Additional sources include burning of tires and electrical equipment to recover metals, burning of agricultural residue, forest fires, and the use of biomass for domestic and industrial energy.

Responsibility for solid waste management lies with the country’s 298 municipal governments. By the end of the 90s, 70% of the collection services for solid waste in the main cities of Honduras were functioning. In 1999 in Tegucigalpa, only 60% of the citizens could access solid waste collection services. Neither Tegucigalpa nor any other city in the country relied on a proper system for the final disposal of municipal waste, nor was there an adequate system for the management of hazardous wastes, hospital wastes (though some hospitals acquired their own autoclaves in recent years), or industrial wastes.

Domestic wastes are routinely burned, both at household level and in municipal landfills, resulting in large scale emissions of dioxins and furans. The management of solid wastes is considered deficient in the majority of municipalities (ProDoc. p. 14).

By implementing activities aimed at addressing problems of waste burnings and POPs, the project was in line with the implementation of the NIP for the Stockholm Convention. The project was also consistent

---

<sup>1</sup> TEQ: Toxicity Equivalency

with the National Plan objectives with vision to 2038, which has the Millennium Development Goals as reference (ProDoc., p.38).

The project contributes to Strategic Priority 1 (SP1) of the POPs focal area as it developed an enabling environment for institutional capacities, awareness and regulations for the implementation of the country's NIP. The project also contributed to Strategic Priority 2 (SP2) through the elimination of PCBs and POPs Pesticides. Through proper solid waste management practices the project also contributed to the reduction of unintentional POPs emissions, which is again part of SP2.

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: Highly satisfactory
--------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated effectiveness as “satisfactory” and this TER revises that rating to “Highly satisfactory”. This is because the number of regulatory instruments approved by the government was higher than planned. Also the disposed quantity of PCB and the quantity of solid wastes properly managed was higher than planned.

For the first expected outcome the project was supposed to develop institutional capacities and to strengthen the regulatory and policy framework for the management and elimination of POPs. A total of 13 regulatory instruments were developed. When the TE was conducted five of these then were approved and implemented (out of a target of three) and include the Policy on Sound Environmental Management, the handbook for best environmental practices (BEP) for Polychlorinated Biphenyls (PCB), the regulation for equipment and waste containing PCB, the regulation for the Pollutant Release and Transfer Register (PRTR) and the procedures manual of the PRTR. In addition, the National Commission for the Sound Management of Chemicals (CNG) was created and the already existing Center for Control and Study of Pollutants (CESCCO) was appointed as the executive branch of CNG. The project also developed important instruments to improve CESCCO laboratory services, such as a methodology to calculate annual costs of laboratory services and a proposal for the establishment of an automated system for laboratory services (TE, p.40-41).

For the second expected outcome the project was supposed to develop actions to increase awareness about the nature, impacts and management of hazardous chemicals and wastes. In this regard, a methodological guide on chemicals management for teachers was developed by the project. 374 teachers of natural science from 236 schools were trained in the use of the guide. The methodological guide was formally approved by the Ministry of Education as an official training document. In order to increase the number of post-graduate programs that include risk management of hazardous chemicals in teaching curricula, the project developed the curriculum of the Master Program of Occupational Health of the Faculty of Medical Sciences of the Autonomous University of Honduras (UNAH), the curriculum of the Bachelor Program in Agricultural and Environmental Chemistry of the University of Agriculture and the technical curriculum in control and environmental monitoring for the Instituto Tecnológico Superior de Tela of UNAH. In addition, the project designed the Diploma in Industrial Safety and Chemicals Management for the University of San Pedro Sula. All curricula developed by the project still had to be approved when the last PIR was conducted (PIR 2015, p. 22).

Under the second outcome the project organized an awareness raising campaign to reduce the use of chemicals and to prevent garbage burning. The campaign was based on radio messages, highway billboards, and printed media. In addition, the project implemented activities aimed at improving knowledge of chemicals management among ministry staff. These include training more than 140 members of CNG in eco-toxicology, strategic planning, inventory and management of pesticides. 20 members of the soil standards committee were trained, along with 40 members of municipal authorities in solid waste management, and 15 persons in recycling. Other initiatives of sound management of chemicals were directed at students from primary and middle education schools (PIR 2015, p. 24).

For the third expected outcome the project was supposed to contribute to the environmental management and elimination of intentionally produced POPs. An inventory was completed and included a total of 211 tons of PCB containing equipment and wastes in 150 sites. 112 tons were exported to Spain for a safe disposal (against a target of 30 tons), while 99 tons are still to be disposed (PCB pieces of equipment were still in use) (PIR 2015, p. 27). In addition, in collaboration with CESCO, the project provided technical assistance to private companies to gradually comply with the registration process for PCBs. One company named Nystar was expected to submit its PCB management plan to the relevant environmental authority (PIR 2015, p.29). The project also designed one temporary storage facility for PCB equipment (against a target of 2 facilities) of the National Enterprise of Electric Energy (ENEE), which is a major holder of PCB . The construction of the facility was authorized by relevant authorities and it was funded by the World Bank. Under the third expected outcome the project also trained 200 employees of ENEE and other electrical companies in the management of PCB wastes (PIR 2015, p. 33). In addition, 60 tons of pesticides were removed from the storage facilities of the Ministry of Health and of the Ministry of Agriculture and were properly disposed (PIR 2015, p.37). The project also provided CESCO laboratory with equipment and trainings. As a result, CESCO is now able to conduct PCB analyses through chromatography and electrodes and POP analysis through chromatography (PIR 2015, p.36).

For the fourth expected result the project developed actions aimed at minimizing releases of unintentionally produced POPs from wastes management. The project provided support to nine pilot municipalities to comply with their master plans for the integrated management of municipal solid wastes. Five municipal master plans were developed and approved (TE, p. 41). The project also developed tools to monitor and evaluate solid waste master plans and trained municipal staff to use them. In total 95,552 tons of solid waste were properly managed by municipalities (against a target of 50,000 tons), thus avoiding waste burning.

Overall the indicators of project results framework indicate that the development objective was achieved.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rated efficiency as “highly satisfactory”. The TE revises the efficiency criterion to “moderately satisfactory”. Although the expenditure rate was high, there have been project delays.

The TE does not provide much discussion of efficiency aspects. It simply mentions that the project was managed efficiently. In any case, the expenditure rate was high. The total project financing and co-financing committed for this project was USD\$ 12.528.067. When the TE was conducted actual expenditures were USD\$ 11.873.833. Consequently, the total expenditures were 94.8% of planned expenditures (TE, p. 27).

However, there have been delays in the project implementation and the project ended 11 months later than planned (see Section 5.2).

4.4 <b>Sustainability</b>	Rating: Moderately likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The TE rated sustainability as “moderately likely” and this TER agrees with that rating.

Environmental sustainability was rated as “likely” by the TE and this TER agrees with that rating. This is because the TE specifies (p. 49) that there are no environmental risks that could threaten the sustainability of the project outcomes.

Socio-political sustainability was rated as “moderately likely” by the TE. This TER is unable to assess this criterion. Although the TE uses the terms “socio-economic risks” in the sustainability chapter no relevant information is included for the analysis of socio-political sustainability.

The TE rated financial sustainability as “moderately likely” and this TER agrees with that rating. The TE reports concerns of the president of board of directors of CNG regarding the capacity of CNG to cover meetings and training costs when there will be no projects to cover these costs (TE, p.26). This suggests that dependency of the CNG on external sources of funds is high. Moreover, more financial and human resources will be needed to allow CESCO to enforce the new regulation developed with the support of the project (TE, p.22). In this regard, the CESCO director complained that the project coordination unit developed new regulations without consulting CESCO on the implications of the new regulations.

The TE rated the sustainability of the institutional framework and governance as “moderately likely” and this TER agrees with that rating. The TE specifies (p. 22) that there is a high risk that the institutions involved in monitoring and controlling the requirements of new regulation will not be able to perform their expected tasks. The reasons underlying this concerns are not explained.

The TE also mentions (p.49) that the project coordination unit (PCU) developed an exit strategy but it does not discuss it. It simply specifies that it is meant to address one main problem phased by the project, that is, the lack of integration of the PCU with CESCO (TE, p.50).

## 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?

Materialized co-financing was \$US 11,873,833 which was just 5% less than planned. The distribution of materialized cash, in-kind and grant co-financing is in line with the planned distribution of co-financing at the design stage.

The TE does not provide any relevant information on the extent to which co-financing was essential to achieve the project objective. However, about 80% of the project costs was provided by co-financing. This suggests that the role of co-financing was important.

The project document identifies various contributors. The Municipality of La Ceiba and Grupo Terra did not have any role in the project and did not provide co-financing. However, the project enrolled the Municipality of Potrerillos and the Municipal Association of Colosuca as beneficiaries and co-financiers (TE, p.32).

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 experienced some delays. The project started in July 2011, but the project manager was contracted only in October 2011. No activity took place before the recruitment of the project manager. The original end date was April 2015. However, the TE mentions (p.14) that the expected end date is March 2016. No reason for this is provided in the TE in addition to the delay for contracting of the project manager. Moreover, consequences and casual linkages are not discussed in the TE. However, the last PIR mentions (p. 41) that the lengthy approval process to export hazardous substances was at the origin of delays.

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

Five regulatory instruments developed by the project were approved by decree by the government. In addition, the methodological guide on chemicals management for teachers drafted by the project was approved by the Ministry of Education as an official training document. At local level five municipality master plans for the management of solid wastes were developed and approved by municipality councils. All this suggests a high degree of ownership among government authorities at local and at

national level. However, the TE stresses (p.27) that the Ministry of Environment (SERNA) did not take the institutional leading role that it was supposed to assume.

## **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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: Highly satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated M&E design at entry as “Highly satisfactory” and this TER agrees with that rating.

The M&E system was designed on the basis of standard UNDP formats and included a project inception workshop, annual project reviews and project implementation reports, a mid-term evaluation and a final evaluation. The M&E plan specified responsibilities for the different components. A detailed M&E budget was included.

The project results framework was based on SMART indicators. It also included clear baseline figures and targets.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rated M&E Implementation as “Highly satisfactory”. This TER revises that rating to “Moderately satisfactory”. This was because the MTE was not used as an adaptive management tool.

Data for informing the indicators of the project results framework were collected and PIR were properly drafted. Data collected were used to change two municipalities that did not have the necessary requirements to be beneficiaries of the solid waste management component of the project.

The mid-term evaluation (MTE) took place in June-July 2014, which is one year later than planned. According to the TE the MTE should have taken place much earlier so that it could provide recommendations to re-adapt the project before completion (TE, p.27). A good part of recommendations were not applied. (TE, p. 28)



## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
--	---------------------------------

UNDP was the implementing agency. The TE rated the Quality of Project Implementation as “satisfactory”. This TER revises that rating to “moderately satisfactory”. This is because UNDP was not particularly effective in promoting a higher leadership of the executing agency and also because UNDP provided lower than planned co-financing.

According to the TE, UNDP should have been more active in requesting a greater participation of SERNA and of CESCO to lead the project, while the project was mainly lead by the PCU with minimal participation of SERNA and CESCO (TE, p.29). In addition, UNDP requested the MTE too late (see Section 6.2).

Co-financing planned to be provided by the implementation agency was \$US 250,000 (in cash). However, the actual contribution of the implementing agency was \$US 50,000, all as in-kind co-financing (TE, p.33).

The TE barely touches aspects of quality of implementation. However, no major problems are mentioned in the TE.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
---	---------------------------------

SERNA was the project execution agency. The TE rated the Quality of Project Execution as “Satisfactory”. This TER revises that rating to “moderately satisfactory”. Although the political endorsement of SERNA was effective to facilitate the approval of the new regulation, the leadership provided by the project execution was low during the implementation of the project.

The TE stresses (p. 29) that the participation of SERNA and of CESCO in the development of new regulation was not effective. Moreover, in some cases CESCO and SERNA did not take the institutional leading role that they were supposed to assume (TE, p.27). This was also due to changes in organizational policies and in staff of CESCO and SERNA (TE, p.29). As a result, the PCU implemented the project on its own and with little integration into government institutions (TE. p.29).

However five new regulations were approved by the government. This suggests that the political endorsement of the executing agency was effective.

## 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.

An important environmental impact caused by the project was the reduction of burnt solid wastes. More specifically 95,552 tons of solid wastes were properly managed at municipal level without burning them, thus avoiding emissions of dioxins and furans (TE, p. 49). The project estimated that the proper management of solid wastes reduced the unintentional emissions of POPs by 89 g-TEQ. This is equivalent to a reduction of 22% over the baseline (PIR 2015, p.10).

An inventory of sites with PCB equipment and wastes was completed, thus facilitating a proper management of PCBs. 112 tons of equipment and PCB wastes were exported to Spain for a safe disposal. An addition, 60 tons of pesticides were removed from the storage facilities of the Ministry of Health and of the Ministry of Agriculture. The pesticides were properly disposed and the facilities were decontaminated. Also, a temporary storage facility was built to store PCB equipment of a large PCB holder.

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.

Socio-economic changes are not discussed in the TE.

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

A temporary storage facility for PCBs was constructed in Tegucigalpa (TE, p.23). Laboratory capacities of CESCO were also strengthened by providing equipment and training for pesticides, PCB and POP analyses.

The project also trained 374 teachers in the use of a new methodological guide to teach chemicals management in schools. In this regard, a methodological guide on chemicals management for teachers was developed by the project. Various teaching curricula on management of chemicals were developed for university and technical schools.

More than 140 members of CNG were trained in eco-toxicology, strategic planning, inventory, and management of pesticides. In addition, the project trained 20 members of the soil standards committee, 40 members of municipal authorities in solid waste management, 26 persons of the M&E committee, 30 persons of the pesticides management committee, and 20 people of the PRTR committee (PIR, 2014, p. 14).

Staff members of five municipalities were also trained in the development and implementation of master plans for solid wastes management.

#### b) Governance

The project took numerous initiative aimed at improving the governance of POP, PCB and solid wastes. At municipality level, five master plans on solid wastes management were developed. At national level various regulatory instruments were approved. These include the Policy on Sound Environmental Management, the handbook for BEP for PCB, the regulation for equipment and wastes containing PCB, and the regulation for the PRTR with its procedures manual. In addition, the project promoted the establishment of CNG, which has CESCO as its executive branch.

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 impact is reported in the TE.

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.

Following the experience of municipalities supported by the project with solid wastes master plans, the Ministry of the Environment issued a generic guide to develop master plans for solid wastes for other municipalities (PIR 2015, p.37).

## 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.

Most important lessons learned are reported below.

- The international tender lead by UNDP for the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes took much more time than expected. In future projects all activities related to transboundary movement of hazardous wastes should be started as soon as possible.
- In this project only the final disposal cost of pesticides was budgeted. In future projects also packing, field services and transportation costs should be also budgeted.
- Initial awareness raising activities with stakeholders is important to gain a higher commitment from the same stakeholders at later stages when other activities are proposed.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Most important recommendations are reported below.

- The Director of CESCO, UNDP program officer and the PCU should meet and agree on the project work plan that needs to be completed before the project ends, with the ultimate purpose of improving the sustainability of project. The work plan should be shared with the Project Coordination Office of the Ministry of Environment.
- More laboratory equipment and materials for CESCO should be purchased in case there are unused financial resources.
- More trainings should be organized for the staff on CESCO and SERNA on the new approved policy, regulation, and technical guidelines.
- In the future CESCO and SERNA should work with the municipalities that were not involved by the project so that they can also learn about the health and environmental impacts caused by burning solid wastes.
- The implementation of PRTR regulation by private companies needs to be strengthened and systematically monitored.

## 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?	Information on impacts, outcomes and on the project objective is provided, however it has not been expressed in a clear way. A table reporting the state of completion for each indicator is included but many sentences are incomplete. As a consequence this TER used PIRs as the main source for the analysis of outcomes.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Rating are well substantiated, evidence is quite complete. Overall the report is internally consistent	<b>S</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability analysis is weak. The main argument of the financial sustainability is that the Honduras national budget is very limited and that the country may have other priority in the future. This is very obvious. An analysis of socio-political risks is not included. The analysis of the exit strategy could have been elaborated better.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The report includes 13 lessons learned, however only three have some learning value and are supported by some evidence.	<b>MU</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE includes two tables with cost figures: Table 3 and Table 4. The first table is titled "project budgeted vs expenditures" however the content of the table does not distinguish between actual and planned expenses, thus confusing the reader. This table probably reports budgeted costs only since Table 4 clearly distinguishes between planned and actual expenditures (and also because the total of Table 3 coincides with planned costs up to the last digit). Confusion between actual and planned expenditures also appears in other part of the report. For instance, at page 30 the author comments the figures of Table 3 and mentions that 100% of the budget was executed, while at page 27 the same rate is 94.8% (for the rate at page 30 the author probably used planned expenses). Costs per activity are included in Table 3 only. As mentioned, values here included are planned costs and not actual costs. Co-financing used is included in Table 4.  The author confuses decimals and thousands separators. Moreover, one co-financer is mentioned in the TE as a stakeholder that was supposed to contribute to the project (Municipality of La Tela), but the Request for CEO Endorsement does not mention that stakeholder. Also, the TE sums up the materialized co-financing of various stakeholders without distinguishing how much was contributed by each stakeholder. Other mistakes are the in Table 1 (which report incorrect information regarding co-	<b>HU</b>

	financing from the private sector) and in Table 4, which report an incorrect value for planned co-financing to be provided by UNDP and for the actual co-financing of other stakeholders.	
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The analysis of the M&E system is comprehensive and convincing	<b>S</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

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