

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3947	
GEF Agency project ID		4279	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Catalyzing Financial Sustainability of the PA System	
Country/Countries		Montenegro	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		BD-1 Sustainable Financing of PA systems at the national level SP-2 Increasing Representation of Effectively Managed Marine Protected Areas in Protected Area Systems SP-3 Strengthening Terrestrial Protected Area Networks	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Tourism and Environmental Protection, Center for Sustainable Development	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		National and regional NGOs involved were involved as consultants and subcontractors	
Private sector involvement		None given	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		June 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		May 31 st , 2013	
Actual date of project completion		May 31 st , 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.05	.05
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		.95	.95
Co-financing	IA own	.04	.04
	Government	1.45 cash 5.48 in kind	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	.3	NA
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1	1
Total Co-financing		7.27	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		8.27	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 2015	
Author of TE		Dr. Max Kasperek, MSc. Aleksandra Crvenica	
TER completion date		2/10/2016	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Caroline Laroche	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project did not have any explicitly stated global environmental objectives, however the TE notes that this project and its sister project ‘Strengthening the sustainability of the PA system of Montenegro’ [GEF project 3688] share a common objective, the “effective conservation of biodiversity in Montenegro.” (TE p.13) The core problem the project sought to address was that “the total funding currently available for the planning and administration of the protected area system of Montenegro is estimated to be at least 50% below what is required for its effective management. With the incremental expansion of the PA systems (in part, as a result of the activities undertaken in a counterpart GEF-funded project, Strengthening the sustainability of the PA system of Montenegro), this funding gap is expected to increase even further.” (TE P.13)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s objective is “improving the financial sustainability of Montenegro’s protected area system.” To achieve this objective, the project has three components:

- 1) Enabling legal and policy environment for improved financial sustainability
- 2) Securing revenue streams for the protected area system and
- 3) Development of institutional and individual capacity of protected area institutions to raise PA management cost-effectiveness (Project Document p.20)

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

There were no changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, or Development Objectives. There were some changes in project activities as a result of the mid-term evaluation. For example, as a result of the mid-term evaluation’s recommendation to establish a monitoring and evaluation system and program, a project steering committee meeting was held in 2013, and monthly briefings to relevant partners were organized. (TE p.23)

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 relevance as ‘relevant.’ This project is relevant to GEF’s Strategic Objective 1 of the Biodiversity focal area ‘Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas Systems.’ It is also consistent with Strategic Program 1 of SO 1, ‘Sustainable financing of PA systems at the national level.’ (TE p.17)

This project is also relevant to Montenegro as it responds to recommendations within the Second Environmental Performance Review of the Republic of Montenegro (2007) and the National Capacity Self-Assessment Report (2007). (Project document p.18) However, the TE notes that the project concentrated its efforts on national and regional parks, while ignoring other protected areas such as beaches or national monuments which require attention for financial sustainability. (TE p.42)

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

The TE rates effectiveness as Satisfactory, and this TE rates the effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory. The project’s objective was “improving the financial sustainability of Montenegro’s protected area system.” By project’s end, the financial sustainability scorecard increased from 26% to 33%, indicating that project activities did indeed improve the financial sustainability of Montenegro’s protected area system. (TE p.41) However, this achievement still falls short of the project’s goal of achieving 55% as a financial sustainability scorecard score. In reviewing the project’s achievements against its plans, it also seems that the project created many studies and plans which have not yet been implemented. Achievements under the project’s three components are listed below:

Enabling Legal and policy environment for improved financial sustainability. The first planned output under this component was to conduct an economic valuation of the protected area system, and a communication strategy for publicizing findings. The project produced two studies, “*Economic Valuation of Montenegro’s PA System* and *Protected Area Valuation Report*”, however a communication strategy was not developed. The TE notes that these studies provide “information to decision-makers on economic details for future investments in respective areas, where to find new niches and opportunities and inform and educate broad audience” (TE p.30). Another planned output was a financial plan based on the PA system needs, and the adoption of viable and diversified financial mechanisms to fund it. (TE p.30) A National Protected Area Financial Plan was produced in 2012, and a business support ‘help desk’ to assist in improving cost-effectiveness of PA institutions was also initiated. The TE finds that the

financial analysis was comprehensive, however it did not contain market analysis nor a detailed implementation program. Finally, as part of this output the project would support the implementation of actions for regulatory and policy reform identified in the National Protected Area Financial plan. The TE reports that the output deviated from what was originally planned, as instead of developing supporting regulation for implementation of the National Protected Area Financial Plan, the project developed further analysis reports.

Securing revenue streams for the protected area system. The first planned output under this component was to implement a pilot payment for ecosystem services (PES) scheme for clean water in the Durmitor World Heritage Site. Although a draft law and technical report were produced, along with general guidelines and procedures for payment for ecosystem services development, implementation, monitoring and reporting, the pilot scheme was not implemented. The TE concludes that “In brief, it was concluded that Montenegro has little opportunities to successfully apply PES schemes for the benefit of the PA system.” (TE p.33) The project also planned to pilot a nature-based tourism concessioning process in Komovi Regional Park as part of this component. The project produced a report, *Concessions as a source of funding of protected areas with special reference to Regional Park Komovi*, which included an analysis of national, regional and international best practice in PA concessioning processes, legal analysis, identification of concession opportunities, and concessioning process design. The TE concludes that “The concession output raised high expectations, but remained a mainly academic exercise showing the absence of necessary prerequisites in the regulatory framework. There was no concrete negotiation with the private sector on concessioning.” (TE p.33) Finally the project planned to improve income from user fees for adventure-based tourism in the protected areas of northern Montenegro. The project produced an adventure tourism strategy as well as a *Plan for use of Resources for Tara River*. A cooperation agreement was also signed with the EPA to create a comprehensive register of caves in Montenegro, and a cooperation agreement with the National Parks was signed. However, formalizing park approved sport climbing routes, and management and business plans for a cava as a nature-based tourism destination was not achieved, as originally planned.

Development of institutional and individual capacity of protected area institutions to raise PA management cost-effectiveness. The project’s final component focused on introducing business planning processes to different categories of protected areas, improving the fund raising capacity of the Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environment, and developing a business support ‘help desk’ to assist in improving the cost effectiveness of Protected Area institutions. Rather than creating business plans for two Protected Areas as planned, business plans were created for three National Parks: Durmitor, Biogradska Gora and Prokletije. The project created a fundraising strategy for protected areas in January 2015 to the NPAFP, National Protected Area Financial Plan. A series of trainings were also delivered on fundraising and project management, and EU funding, to staff members of PENP, EPA, and municipalities. Two study visits were also organized, one to New Zealand and one to Slovenia, to review management options for different categories of protected areas. Finally, the Government of Montenegro and UNDP established a joint venture-the Centre for Sustainable Development- in 2014. The Centre for Sustainable Development has taken on the ‘help desk’ role.

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

The TE rates Efficiency as 'Satisfactory', however this TER downgrades that rating to Moderately Satisfactory, due to some inefficiencies in planning and because of the need for a project extension in order to achieve project outputs. (TE p.10) The TE notes that several activities were randomly screened for cost effectiveness and have been found to be cost-effective and priced competitively. The project had a staff of three who split their time between this project and its sister project 'Strengthening the sustainability of the PA system of Montenegro' [GEF project 3688]. This arrangement helped to keep administration costs below 10% throughout the project. A cost which was raised by the TE as inefficient and non-cost-effective was a study tour to New Zealand for decision-makers from Montenegro for 8 participants. (TE p.44)

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

The TE's overall rating for sustainability was moderately likely, and this TER downgrades that rating to moderately unlikely.

Financial Resources Sustainability: The TE rates sustainability of financial resources as moderately likely, and this TE downgrades that rating to moderately unlikely. Relevant protected area institutions such as the National Parks Public Enterprise and Ministry for Sustainable Development and Tourism have not allocated budget to carrying on the project work. The TE expresses serious doubt on whether or not it will be possible to turn the information and knowledge generated by the project into practical results without further UNDP support. The project provided the information for the country to move forward with a Protected Area system that is financially sustainable, but it also revealed the hurdles the country will need to overcome in order to be able to implement Payment for Ecosystem Services. (TE p.47)

Socio-political Sustainability: The TE rates Socio-political sustainability as moderately likely, and this TE downgrades that rating to moderately unlikely. Biodiversity conservation is low on the political agenda for Montenegro, and after completion of the project, it appears that ownership for the process will decrease among Protected Area institutions, which will lead to less engagement.

Institutional framework & Governance Sustainability: The TE rates sustainability of institutional framework & governance as moderately likely, and this TE agrees. The institutional framework and governance structure for managing Montenegro's PA system is split over different organizations with different functions, strengths and weaknesses, but it is stable and appropriate in the estimate of the TE.

Environmental Sustainability: The TE rates the project's environmental sustainability as moderately likely, however this TER does not assess environmental sustainability, as the project was aimed at generating income for protected area management, and in this way has not focused on environmental outcomes. The TE notes that this lack of focus on biodiversity conservation creates a risk that an improved financial sustainability for Montenegro's PA system would not result in improved biodiversity conservation.

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?

UNDP allocated \$40,000 to finance the project, which went to cover staff costs. In-kind contributions from the government, and from the German government through GTZ, were reported in the project design but were not tracked and thus this TER cannot assess their level of realization, or their effect on project outcomes and sustainability. (TE p.26)

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 faced delays in project implementation, especially in the first half. The TE states that the reasons for the delays "are thought to be beyond the responsibility of the project." (TE p.8) The project had two one-year no cost extensions, the first until December 2014 and the second until April 2015, bringing the project length to five years. (TE p.13) The extension allowed for project completion, and there is no evidence that the delays affected project's outcomes or sustainability.

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

Country ownership was found to be weak, largely due to the Direct Implementation Modality used by the project in which UNDP became the implementing and executing agency at the same time. The TE notes that the stakeholders interviewed did not take responsibility for the project as a whole. (TE p.45) However the TE does note that target groups showed strong ownership for aspects of the project directly related to them. For example, National Parks Public Enterprise showed interest and ownership in aspects related to payment for ecosystem services in national parks and in strengthening their fundraising capacities. (TE p.45)

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: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated M&E design at entry as highly satisfactory, although no explanation was given. This TE rates M&E Design at entry as satisfactory, as a complete M&E system seems to have been presented at project start. The budget for Monitoring and Evaluation was 70,000\$ USD. (Project Document p.47) The project document calls for an inception workshop and report, as well as mid-term evaluation final evaluation report. (Project Document p.46-47) The project document sites a log frame in “annex a” but this log frame was not available to the TER preparer, therefore the soundness of the log frame and indicators cannot be assessed.

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

The project rating for M&E implementation is Marginally Satisfactory, and this TER, which uses a different scale, gives M&E implementation a rating of Moderately Satisfactory. M&E events such as the inception workshop, writing of the inception report, and midterm evaluation were all carried out as planned, and PIRs were also produced annually as of 2013, and report on project indicator levels. What appears to be lacking from the M&E system is a feedback loop to ensure adaptive management. The TE states that “the project lacks a formalized system for M&E that would guarantee the timely review and measurement of indicators, the management and analysis of data and their use as a support to management decisions.” (TE p.27)

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

The project’s implementing agency was UNDP, whose quality of implementation the TE rated as ‘Satisfactory’, and this TER agrees with that rating. “The UNDP supervision over the project staff was adequate, transparent and frank, focused on results and responsive, professional and timeliness. The technical and operational support from UNDP was overall appreciated and considered adequate by the project team. Regular UNDP staff consultation and participation in project meetings provides valuable inputs to national processes and could ensure required political support. Also the cooperation between UNDP supervisors and government partners was quite fruitful and effective in all relations. CO staff undertook regular visits (often one per month) to project area.” (TE p.27)

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

The TE rated quality of execution as ‘Satisfactory’, and this TER downgrades that rating to Moderately Satisfactory. This project was implemented through the “Direct Implementation” modality, through which UNDP implemented and executed the project. In 2014 the Center for Sustainable Development, which was organized as a joint initiative between the Government of Montenegro and UNDP, was given execution responsibility. Evidence from the TE suggests that the Direct Implementation Modality prevented country ownership, as stakeholders did not take responsibility for the project as a whole. (TE p.45) However, the TE also notes that “the PMU team was also oriented on results, professional and timeliness, candor and responsive, adequate in management, budgeting and procurement.” (TE p.27)

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 targeted improvement of the national legislation and regulations that promote updating and modernization of governance approaches at the state level. There is no evidence in the TE or other project documents to suggest the project has had an environmental impact.

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 TE notes that “indirectly, the project may promote the generation of new forms of income from the sustainable use of natural resources (e.g. development of small and medium-sized enterprises. As such, the project can potentially contribute to a decrease in women unemployment and an economic development of the area. As the project did not have a measureable impact on employment and income generation, there was also no evident impact on gender issues.” (TE p.46)

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

Although capacity shortcomings still exist, the financial sustainability scorecard has increased by 13 points between baseline and final value, with a 6 point increase for legal, regulatory and institutional frameworks and a 5 point increase for business planning and tools for cost effective management, and a 2 point increase in tools for revenue generation. (TE p.65)

b) Governance

The project made a series of recommendations on how to improve the regulatory framework, especially as part of its first outcome which created a National Protected Area Financial Plan. These recommendations have been elaborated, discussed and submitted to the responsible authorities. Some have been adopted, others are still in the process of discussion. (TE p.46)

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts of the project are described.

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.

No adoption of GEF initiatives at scale have taken place.

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.

No lessons learned were provided in the TE.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation. (TE p.49)

There are some key recommendations for the design of similar projects:

- The design of such projects should be less ambitious; it should be clearly outspoken that pilot measures are a tool for learning, and that one cannot expect from pilot measures impacts on national level.
- More responsibility for managing such projects should be given to national institutions; it needs to be avoided that the project carries out tasks which are actually tasks of the national project partners (substitute performance).
- More attention needs to be given to proper project designs; it needs to be avoided that the project takes responsibility e.g. for the adoption of regulatory instruments rather than only for the preparation of the necessary documentation; also more attention needs to be given to the fact whether the planned outcome of the project can actually be expected from the outputs foreseen.
- Such projects – medium-sized projects with limited financial and time horizons – need an exit strategy which defines responsibilities for following-up project measures and which enhance the probability to become sustainable.

Further to these main recommendations, the TE elaborated in cooperation with the TE of the PAS project the following specific recommendations regarding overall Capacity Development (CD) activities:

Link capacity development implementation activities with baseline findings: The Project addressed recommendations to assist institutions in actively pursuing PA agenda and achieving desired effects, improve institutions' adaptability to change, create preconditions for political dialogue, and public support. Huge effort was invested in improving skills for PA management and planning, including establishment of a representative PAs and establishment of partnerships with various stakeholders to achieve protection objectives. On the other side, recommendations on improving transparency and accountability of PA institutions, improve leadership in PA institutions, motivation, opportunities for continued staff development, develop appropriate values, integrity and attitudes among PA staff, and development of systems to measure individual performances and mechanisms for internal monitoring and evaluation were inadequately addressed through the project activities.

Integrate capacity development indicators to monitor progress made: Capacity development indicators are the primary operational targets of any capacity development programme, set to guide the identification of specific measures for inducing the process of change toward achieving the development goal. They represent the tool which assures signals for any immediate or gradual modification of the action. Therefore, they should be firmly assimilated in project implementation tracking tool in close collaboration and communication with project beneficiaries.

Ensure ownership over the capacity development activities: Capacity development efforts should be defined by strong consensus among stakeholders and owned by the leaders of key beneficiaries involved in the project. The principal goal should be well defined, and its economic and social value clearly articulated and understood, because it determines the purpose and direction of capacity development efforts. The value of capacity development activities should be enunciated in a way that project partners/beneficiaries/stakeholders recruit their awareness and potentials to capitalize on raising their

capacities and thereafter initiate and lead changes in approaches towards capacity development at the institutional level.

Understand capacity development as continuous process: Stakeholders need to create learning mechanisms that allow information to be absorbed, accumulation of knowledge products and identification of knowledge to be shared. The project should insist on providing the wide platform of information and knowledge sharing between all stakeholders from all levels (central, local) and from all sectors (public, private and NGO). Also, stakeholders need to develop mechanisms to record, monitor, evaluate and direct further capacity development efforts.

Provide the necessary resources for capacity development: In order to make the capacities sustained and cultivated further, the project activities should raise awareness on necessity for investment into knowledge. At the moment, country's context considers this investment a cost. However, responsiveness towards external opportunities rely strongly on internal skills to better manage, plan, execute strategies, raise funds, advocate for common interest, etc. and ultimately provide sustainable growth of their institutions and consequently PAs.

Take care for shared decision-making for capacity development: Not only institutions should define capacity development needs and decide on their amplification, but it should be a systemic effort approached both horizontally and vertically and in communication with other key stakeholders at the field. Flexible but functional multi-stakeholder structures (including private sector and NGOs) should be established in future to steer the project implementation that would provide for both raising capacities and assure accountability of individuals from key institutions. Also, institutions should develop systems for communicating with their staff and regularly investigate and assess their capacity gaps.

Capacity development needs to be specific: Namely, based on the previous analysis projects should unambiguously define which capacities should be raised, for what concrete purpose, as well as target individuals who needs capacity increase.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains a detailed assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts, and achievement of objectives.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The discussion of sustainability is detailed and complete. The TE notes that the project did not have an exit strategy.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The recommendations and lessons learned section contains only recommendations, however they are comprehensive and supported by evidence.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs, but acknowledges that no information was available on in-kind co-financing.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	M&E Design is rated but not discussed, instead the discussion focuses on M&E implementation, with a complete discussion.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

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

No additional information was used in the preparation of this terminal evaluation report.