

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3919	
GEF Agency project ID		UNDP 4050	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Mainstreaming Biodiversity Into Value Chains For Mediterranean Medicinal And Aromatic Plants In Morocco	
Country/Countries		Morocco	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-SP5 Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services	
Executing agencies involved		High Commission on Water and Forests and the Fight against Desertification (HCEFLCD)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		World Wide Fund for Nature (WWF) – involvement not specified	
Private sector involvement		N/A	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 24, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 7, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 31, 2015	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	\$0.050	\$0.050
	Co-financing	\$0.025	\$0.025
GEF Project Grant		\$0.95	\$0.95
Co-financing	IA own	\$0.20	\$0.20
	Government	\$2.355	\$0.76
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	\$0.050	\$0.2011
	Private sector	N/A	N/A
	NGOs/CSOs	N/A	N/A
Total GEF funding		\$0.95	\$0.95
Total Co-financing		\$3.375	\$1.161
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		\$4.325	\$2.1111
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		November 21, 2015	
Author of TE		BETAF Consulting: Majid Benabdellah, Ghizlane Echchgadda, Mohamed Benzyane	
TER completion date		January 2, 2016	
TER prepared by		Punji Leagnavar	
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	S		S
Sustainability of Outcomes		MS		ML
M&E Design		S		MS
M&E Implementation		MS		MS
Quality of Implementation		S		UA
Quality of Execution		S		UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-		MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's overall goal is that "Governmental institutions, non-governmental organizations and rural populations have the capacity and motivation to contribute to biodiversity conservation due to increased value of wildcrafted MAPs, accessed markets and applied sustainable land management practices." (Prodoc p.25) p.23)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective was to "mainstream biodiversity conservation in MAD sub-sector value chains." (Prodoc p.25)

The four outcomes for the project are:

- *Outcome 1:* Capacity to apply certified and sustainable harvesting techniques through biodiversity-friendly management plans, is developed and strengthened.
- *Outcome 2:* National MAP strategy is operational and includes certification systems, strengthened regulatory and environmental policy and biodiversity considerations along the value chains
- *Outcome 3:* Effective channels of communications are implemented and improved vertical and horizontal integration among value chain actors allowing quick responses to shifting market demands
- *Outcome 4:* Informal processors, collectors, distributors, and intermediaries are mainstreamed into the MAP value chain

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

Although there were no changes to the overall objectives and outcomes for the project, there were changes in the project activities throughout the 4-year duration. These changes in activities were:

- Changing a type of certification body the project wanted to engage with (from FairWild to Bio)
- Switching some project sites due to budget reasons and socio-economic reasons (availability of cooperatives, physical location of site, etc.)
- Downsizing the service units that would work on value chains (by 50%)
- Not establishing an inter-sectoral steering committee (TE, p.47)

Other activities were added instead, which included developing good practice guides for collection and post-collection of plants, and organizing cooperatives.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates project relevance as *satisfactory*. The MAP project is in line with: i) Morocco's National Development Strategy of the Medicinal and Aromatic Plants sector; ii) the National Charter for Environment and Sustainable Development; iii) the Convention on Biological Diversity; and iv) the UNDP 2014-2017 Strategic Plan (TE, p.8)

The objectives of the project are relevant to the GEF-4 Biodiversity Objective, specifically the SP-5 'Fostering markets for biodiversity goods and services', since the project works to incorporate biodiversity goods and services into the Moroccan aromatic spice market. The project works to do this through supporting local cooperatives, mainstreaming conservation techniques to harvesting and post-harvesting, and adopting environmentally friendly certification schemes.

In regards to country needs, the project is relevant to the Moroccan government's national strategies (specifically in National Charter of the Environment and Sustainable Development + National Development Strategy for the Medicinal and Plants Sector) on commercializing value added projects that also respond to concerns about sustainable development.

The project is also relevant to beneficiary needs because it contributes to generating incomes, building the capacity of small businesses/cooperatives and creating partnerships that foster future sales growth for cooperatives.

4.2 Effectiveness

Rating: Satisfactory

The project was able to overall meet most of its defined targets and outcomes (although not all). In some cases, targets were surpassed. For this reason this TER rates it as *satisfactory*. A detailed discussion is below:

Outcome 1: Capacity to apply certified and sustainable harvesting techniques through biodiversity-friendly management plans, is developed and strengthened.

- The project was able to meet many of its targets for this outcome and in many cases, was able to surpass the initial target developed. For example, *the % of exploitation areas of the certified species where certified and sustainable harvesting techniques are applied* was initially targeted at 50%, and the project was able to expand the percentage to 96%. 3 out of 5 other expected outcomes were achieved.
- The remaining 2 expected outcomes were partially achieved. For the indicator-*The number of management plans respectful of biodiversity, developed and applied in each cooperative partner of the project*- the project was able to meet 57% of its initial target (from an expected 7 hectares to 4 hectares), and the *hectares of certified Bio* met 79% of the target (from an expected 56,737 hectares to 44,754 hectares) (TE, p.35).

Outcome 2: National MAP strategy is operational and includes certification systems, strengthened regulatory and environmental policy and biodiversity considerations along the value chains

- The project again achieved 3 out of 5 of the expected outcomes. There are examples of the project excelling beyond the initial target. For instance, the project initially had a target of training 17 cooperatives/companies on standards, norms and practices related to the collection and valorization of MAPs. And it surpassed this target by 141%, having trained 24 cooperatives/companies in the end. The project was also successful in achieving the target of establishing a regulatory framework on streamlining exploitation and standardization of processing.
- What it could not fully achieve was the targeted number of MAPS collection permits which were granted; and hectares of certified Bio. These indicators had success rates of 67% and 79% respectively.

Outcome 3: Effective channels of communications are implemented and improved vertical and horizontal integration among value chain actors allowing quick responses to shifting market demands

- The project attempted to create communication outlets and partnerships among market actors that would help support the growth of MAPs along the value chain. This outcome was also satisfactorily achieved. 2 out of the 4 expected outcomes were achieved (the project went over the target to develop public/private partnerships by 113%, for example)

- The project failed however, to deliver as many training days (91 instead of 95 days) and attract website users to its MAP website (835 users as opposed to 1500) as planned. But these shortcomings are not significant enough to say that the project didn't successfully contribute to the outcome.

Outcome 4: Informal processors, collectors, distributors, and intermediaries are mainstreamed into the MAP value chain.

- 5 out of 7 expected outcomes were successfully achieved for Outcome 4. The project was able to reach its targets of creating MAP cooperative associations (in total 5), which is one of the main sustainability factors for the project. Additionally the project surpassed the initial targets in several areas. For example, the number of entities benefitting from technical assistance was targeted at 15, but reached 57 at the end of the project.
- Where it failed to fully deliver was the work with existing cooperatives to monitor and adopt principles of biodiversity conservation, and the number of cooperatives who involve women more in MAPs.

Outcome 5: Adaptive project management by integrating lessons learned into the project's approaches

- The project also developed expected outcomes and target for adaptive management that were successfully achieved. These had to do with Steering Committee recommendations, number of audits performed, and people receiving training at the PMU to name a few.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Highly satisfactory
-----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates this as *highly satisfactory*. This TER agrees with the HS rating. The project was not able to secure all of its financing commitments from its partners and therefore had to reduce the budget and project activities (TE, p.39). Only a fraction (1.161 million USD) of the initial co-financing (3.375 million USD) had been raised. The project changed its activities and reduced its budget because of some pitfalls experienced regarding the initial certification body the project wanted to license. The project initially had activities planned to obtain FairWild certification, but due to changing the certification for another inexpensive one the project had to pay USD \$132,403 to cancel the contract (a significant figure that shrank finances). However, the TE states that despite the drawback in finances, the project was able to achieve most of its outcomes by adopting an adaptive management plan (TE, p.39). In terms of a cost-efficiency standpoint, it is an achievement that the project delivered its outcomes even though it operated on a fraction of the original budget.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The TE rates this as *moderately satisfactory* (MS). This TER rates it as *moderately likely*. The TE states that the project sustainability really rests upon the beneficiaries, and says that "the project's initiatives

are sustainable since they are expected to sustain through the beneficiaries even after the implementation period” (TE, p.51). The TE also observes that although the project was able to build the capacity of many cooperatives to continue valorizing MAPs products, and, market variables will be challenging to overcome. Despite these socio and institutional observations, there are economic and financial challenges to sustainability that seem to prevail.

Financial resources: Through capacity building activities, the project was able to illustrate to cooperatives how to reduce transaction costs for the production and selling of MAPs products, something that will likely continue after the completion of the project (TE, p.51). However, other external market variables will hamper and risk the financial sustainability of the project. For example, intermediaries control much of the MAPs value chain, and future pricing and transaction costs are controlled by them.

In addition, there has not been an external body or organization that has decided to continue financially supporting the continuation of activities. Although the High Commission on Water and Forests and the Fight against Desertification has made commitments to continue replicating the project, there is still no financial commitment to support specific programs that would do so.

Sociopolitical: The many cooperatives that were involved in the project have expressed a desire to continue activities at the end of project completion. The TE specifically noted the success of the knowledge products (research on the medicinal and aromatic plants) that the cooperatives would continue to use, as well as the collection practices and essential oils production practices.

Even though there is the support of cooperatives involved in the project, longer-term ownership risks are evident. For example, although the project initially tried to integrate women into the activities and present greater ownership, it was noted overall that it wasn’t able to successfully integrate women. This lack of ownership by women could potentially pose a sustainability risk since women are involved in the MAPs value chain.

Institutional: There seems to be institutional support for the project from the national government (specifically High Commission on Water and Forests and the Fight against Desertification (HCEFLCD)) whom have decided to integrate the MAPs project into its 10 Year Plan for 2015-2024. For the project to continue its objectives, however, other government or market institutions should be involved as the largest sustainability risks seem to be related to addressing market risks and challenges (e.g. fluctuations of the primary spices, lack of traceability along the VC, lack of information on market demands, etc.) (TE, P.13).

Environmental: One environmental factor that poses a problem to the sustainability of the project is climate change. Since the supply of the plants depends on weather conditions, fluctuations in annual production and reduction of fallows can potentially create a situation where there is an irregularity of supply (TE, p.51).

Overall, despite the desire for beneficiaries to continue the project activities, political and market forces, and the financial incentive for beneficiaries, might ultimately pose a challenge to the sustainability of this project.

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?

Initially the MAP project forecasted a significant amount of co-financing from government agencies. From the TER: "MAP Project's budget forecasts were estimated at US\$ 4.3 million [total including GEF funds] while the available budget in cash was only US\$ 1.7 million, representing an achievement rate of around 40%" (TE, p.10). However, because the project had an integrated adaptive management framework, it was able to reframe the project and activities throughout the duration of the project and adjust the budget according to the materialized co-financing amount (TE, p.10). It is difficult to assess whether or not the project could have met more of its expected outcome targets because of the co-financing materialized (TE, p.10). The TE does not make the casual link between the activities cut and the achievement of the 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?

The delay at the start of the project affected the achievement of planned activities (TE, p.39). This was the cause of the funds disbursement and commitment made by some of the co-financiers of the project (Oriental Agency, HCEFLCD, Agency for Promotion and Economic and Social Development of the Southern Provinces, etc.). Delays were experienced during implementation as well, and are explained by low installments of financial contributions from the national partners, the downsizing of the project staff, the lengthy procedures to grant funds and the launch of the certification (TE, P.11). There were financial constraints that the project experienced, such as budget restrictions by some organizations which carried management fees of 10% and recurring cost fees.

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

The ownership of the project on behalf of the HEFLCD (the project's EA) was strong and that the agency was very involved throughout the course of the project (TE, p.52). The TE notes that the organization has made plans to expand on the project objectives after the closure of the project (TE, p.14). Even though the HEFLCD was a strong national partner, other government institutions did not share the same sense of ownership. The Ministry of Industry and Commerce, while initially involved in the program decided to pull out of the partnership for

example (TE, p. 57); and other government donors who were originally interested in contributing co-financing to the project pulled out.

The sustainability of the project can be affected if other government institutions do not illustrate their ownership of the project outcomes, since regulatory and policy frameworks can help bolster the market of the newly certified spices before they become completely commercially competitive.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
-------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates this as *satisfactory*. This TER rates it as *moderately satisfactory*.

Although the logical framework is complete and there is a robust assessment of risks and assumptions, the M&E design had several weaknesses, including a lack of SMART indicators and usability. SMART indicators were lacking in the original M&E design (TE, p.33). For example, one indicator is “Number of farmers and cooperatives meeting international standards”, without provide the specific name of the standard (ProDoc, p.17). As well, an Outcome 1 indicator is: “Collectors (men and women) trained on MAP identification and sustainable harvest methods”, without specifying targets for the number, the duration, and their gender distribution (TE, p.33).

The project design also had causal relationships between the objective, components, outcomes, and project activities that were not clearly articulated in the Project Document (TE, p. 10). The TE states that: “considering the importance of the logical framework matrix (LFM) in the project design in order to ensure its relevance and feasibility, we can only agree that the present Project Logic Framework does not facilitate the planning and implementation as long as it does not provide a clear and easy visualization of the project document” (TE, p.32).

The total M&E budget at time of CEO Endorsement was USD 71,300. The CEO Endorsement includes a breakdown of all M&E activities (per the duration of the project) and a thorough budget breakdown per M&E item. The TE however, does not provide a final breakdown of the project per line item nor does it include final M&E cost.

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

The TE rates this as *moderately satisfactory*. It states that “The project regularly issued reports on the annual achievements, with a cumulative assessment of the project’s progress to achieve its overall objectives, especially with the help of a wide range of monitoring and evaluation instruments that are used (PIR, Di Monitoring, MES, monitoring of internal management of the project by the PMU, the annual monitoring of the project Steering Committee)” (TE, p.45).

However, the M&E implementation did not monitor impact oriented information that was important in order to ascertain the income progression for different value chain actors. As well, the project did not have regular assessments of the progress towards objectives nor a mid-term evaluation even though amid-term project review was initially planned (and budgeted for at USD 10,000) (CEO Endorsement, p.9).

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: Unable to Assess
----------------------------------------------	--------------------------

The TE rates this as *satisfactory* however, there is not enough evidence in the document that explains why this rating was given. The TE TOR also does not ask for the evaluation team to evaluate the quality of implementation, only to rank it. There is also no Mid-term Review for which to gather independent analysis.

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

The TE rates this as *satisfactory* however, there is not enough evidence in the document that explains why this rating was given. The TE TOR also does not ask for the evaluation team to evaluate the quality of execution, only to rank it. There is also no Mid-term Review for which to gather independent analysis.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The project's greatest environmental impact was that the project was able to secure 44,754 ha of land to be Bio certified, which means that it was able not only to increase the market value of the plants, and open them up to international markets, but those lands have retained a biodiversity integrity (TE, p.49).

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 project developed an agreement that enabled cooperatives to sell products directly to export companies (TE, p.48). The TE states that this helped to double the sales price of their products compared to the products start. The Bio certified products have also helped increase the market visibility of MAP-Morocco products and position them at a higher market rate (TE, p.49).

As well, the project has evidence to show that incomes were increased due to project interventions. The TE states "collectors and cooperatives improved their income and that jobs were created (120 days per person for an average of 300 collectors by cooperative)" (TE, p.49).

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

a) Capacities

The project was able to provide capacity building programs for actors in the MAPs value chain which have benefited several companies and cooperatives (TE, p.48). In terms of capacity and

knowledge: “the very rich production of qualities reports, documents, guides, manuals films, GIS tools, and other rich communication tools which can be used by the project’s partners presently and in future. This information will be of a great use for the operators involved in the production, sales, and valorization of MAPs at the national and also international level” (TE, p.45).

b) Governance

The project was able to develop a national action plan on MAPs which is integrated with the HCEFLCD’s ten-year plan (2015-2024). This action plan builds on the project’s outcomes and will continue to build the capacity of the stakeholders along the MAPs value chain (TE, p.48).

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 were noted.

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 does not discuss broader adoption or GEF initiatives at scale.

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.

- An adaptive management strategy can be a critical tool when the project experiences challenges in co-financing commitments, like this one did. The project team and Steering Committee were able to adjust to the budget constraints and change activities because they had a flexible management approach, which ultimately allowed the project to meet most of its outcomes.
- A thorough market analysis/assessment has to be fully integrated in project planning and potentially the PPG before the project inception meeting can take place. In the case of this project, several of the proposed sites/villages that the project wanted to operate in lacked a cooperative to work with, or a local plant/spice market. This could have been avoided in the planning cycle (and budget planning) if a robust market assessment was in place.

- The project at the outset had a gender approach, but when it came to mainstreaming it into the project, there was no methodological support on how to do it. In the end, the project was not able to make a significant impact on women in the sector. For example, only 30% of the total beneficiaries trained were women. The lesson here is to maintain the gender mainstreaming through the entire M&E cycle and project cycle.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE made specific recommendations for future projects working on MAPs in Morocco:

- *Strengthen cooperatives economic base by:* supporting leadership dynamic to ensure that cooperatives see the commercial added-value of products, empower these organizational structures, and support profitable investments, mainly in terms of implementing valorization units (TE, p.53). Especially work to support regional and national associations of cooperatives.
- *MAPs plans should consider socio-territorial units:* plots should be rotated and less pressure should be put on the resources; also deeper analysis of each species value chain should be conducted
- *Cross-governmental coordination for MAPs should be cultivated:* combine efforts across different institutions (forest, rangeland, and cultivated MAPs)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE provides a moderately satisfactory assessment of the achievement of expected outcomes. Although it provides the data showing the achievement or lack of achievement of each outcome indicator, it does not provide a very thorough or rigorous analysis of the reason why or why not an area was achieved.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE provides ratings for the various evaluative dimensions (i.e. quality of M&E, effectiveness, efficiency, etc.). However, it does not provide concise and complete analysis on why each rating was chosen and what the evidence is to support that decision making. For example, it did not thoroughly discuss the Quality of Implementation nor Quality of Execution, even though it rated both of them.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project TE does provide an assessment of sustainability and describes the project exit strategy.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE presents supportive evidence for some of the lessons learned in the project, and for others the statements sound like generalizations at times.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The project TE provides actual costs, but does not give that information in a clear manner. Some budget tables have different figures on them, and the TE does not explain the sources of the funding or type of funds they are. It does not list the co-financing amount per activity	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Although there are discussions about the M&E systems and the M&E implementation, the discussion could have been more robust. The TE presented more at length the factual evidence of the M&E implementation framework (i.e. the PIR's were conducted at this time, the Steering Committee meets at this time, etc.), then it did an analysis of the effectiveness of M&E implementation.	MS
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).

Additional documents: PDF document, PPG, Letters of Co-financing