

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4187	
GEF Agency project ID		4378	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Capacity building for integration of global environment commitments in investment/development decisions	
Country/Countries		Montenegro	
Region		Europe and Central Asia	
Focal area		Multifocal Area	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CD-4, CD-5	
Executing agencies involved		Environmental Protection Agency / Ministry of Spatial Planning and Environmental Protection	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		The NGO Ozone was commissioned to conduct measuring on air quality and waste	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		June 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		June 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 30, 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.03	0.03
	Co-financing	0.02	0.02
GEF Project Grant		0.5	0.5
Co-financing	IA own	0.03	0.03
	Government	0.56385	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.09	0
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.53	0.53
Total Co-financing		0.71	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.24	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		April 22, 2016	
Author of TE		Max Kasperek	
TER completion date		February 16, 2017	
TER prepared by		Mathias Einberger	
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	HS	MS	NR	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	NR	L
M&E Design		MS/S	NR	S
M&E Implementation		S/MS	NR	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	NR	S
Quality of Execution		MS	NR	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The objective of the project was to identify, analyze, and pilot advanced tools and practices for environmental information management, as well as compliance monitoring of national implementation of the Rio Conventions. In this regard, the project aimed to develop national capacities for collecting and analyzing data using a metric of global environmental indicators and integrating these into national sustainable development and environmental decision-making processes. Its expected outcome was the initiation of a systematic and sustainable approach for assessing the global environmental achievements from the implementation of national policies, programs, and plans. (CEO-End p. 12)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project was further designed to make an important contribution to the national experience in Montenegro with the development and implementation of tools and practices for measuring, reporting, and verifying the cost-effectiveness of official development assistance for implementing multilateral environmental agreements, particularly the Rio Conventions.

The project sought to achieve these goals through two project components:

Component 1: Global Environmental Management Indicators

Under this component, the project aimed to develop and apply on a pilot basis an environmental management information system and indicator framework for global environmental management, by:

- Developing a set of uniform indicators and guidance for measuring the contribution of regional development policy and spatial planning to meeting global environmental objectives, including low-emission and climate-resilient development strategies
- Designing and introducing a Data Flow System for institutions concerned with CBD, CCD, FCCC issues
- Testing and adopting advanced web-based tools for environmental data/metadata storage for environmental policy formulation
- Testing the application of an integrated environmental management information system to assess global and sustainable development outcomes of the National Spatial Plan and Tourism Master Plan, as well as regional development policies and low-emission climate-resilient development strategies

Component 2: Institutional strengthening for improved monitoring of the global environment and capacity to replicate successful environmental information management and integration practices

Under this component, the project sought to strengthen the institutional capacity of the Environmental Protection Agency to perform compliance monitoring in relation to global environmental conventions and to establish a system of knowledge management, by:

- Undertaking institutional reforms (based on a functional analysis performed through a consultative process) to enable the incorporation of global environmental commitments into planning and monitoring processes
- Developing and delivering an accredited training program for Environmental Protection Agency staff and other relevant organizations (on advanced planning tools, information systems for global and national environmental management, indicators, and trend analysis methods)
- Customizing and introducing the “Environmental Sustainability Theme Manager Office” system for integration of global environmental objectives at the Environmental Protection Agency
- Establishing an M&E and risk management system
- Establishing a web-based environmental project database for improved coordination and output analysis

(CEO-End pp. 2-3, 12-13)

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

According to the TE, the project objective was revised by adding the text marked in italics as follows: “To analyse, identify and pilot advanced tools and practices for environmental information management and compliance monitoring *and to develop capacity of institutions for global environmental management by institutionalizing identified tools and practices.*” (TE p. 17)

The TE also notes that the pilot installation of an environmental management information system (EMIS) and related capacity building measures were cancelled, because the EU launched a similar EMIS project in 2014. This essential change in the project design was however not properly documented vis-à-vis the GEF and approved only by the project’s own internal structures, according to the TE. Furthermore, the TE notes the project instead started various ad hoc activities (e.g. support of local herbarium, delineation of a watershed), which had not been foreseen in the project documents and were not in support of the project objective. (TE pp. 25 & 30)

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates the project as relevant, because it was consistent with both GEF strategies and priorities, as well as with Montenegro's national priorities. The TER agrees with this assessment, rating relevance as Satisfactory.

The TE notes that the project was consistent with GEF strategies and objectives, especially Capacity Development Objectives 4 and 5 under the GEF-5 Capacity Development Results Framework. The TE also notes that the project was highly relevant to the government of Montenegro, since it was both eager to meet EU accession requirements in regards to environmental standards, as well as to meet the requirements of the Rio Conventions, both of which the project supported. (TE p. 37)

The request for CEO endorsement further noted that the government of Montenegro had just adopted the Integrated UN Programme 2012-2016. This includes the Sustainable Economic Development and Environmental Protection programme, the strategic objective of which it is to achieve balanced and equitable regional economic development based on sustainable planning and use of natural resources. In this regard, the strengthening of capacities for environmental monitoring has been an agreed upon priority for both the UN system and Montenegro for the 2012-2016 period. (CEO-End pp. 20-21)

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

The TE rates the project's effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory, since it delivered most of its outputs in line with the planned results, but failed to fully materialize other key components. (TE pp. 37-38) The TER agrees with this assessment.

Under **component 1: Global Environmental Management Indicators**, the project developed a national list of 56 relevant environmental indicators across 12 thematic areas and the design for an integrated environmental management information system (EMIS). Efforts for implementing and piloting this integrated environmental monitoring / data exchange IT system, as was originally planned, were discontinued however, to avoid overlap with a EU-funded project for also establishing an EMIS. Web-based tools for environmental data storage were not developed by the project, as was initially planned, but some IT and environmental data storage related activities were carried out. While the EMIS was never installed or tested, the project did help to provide data for the Second National Communication of Montenegro to the UNFCCC and the revision of its National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan to the CBD. It was agreed at the project inception workshop to shift focus on these, from the initially targeted National Spatial Plan 2020 and Tourism Master Plan 2020. (TE pp. 32-33)

For component 2: Institutional strengthening for improved monitoring of the global environment and capacity to replicate successful environmental information management and integration practices, the project delivered training to EPA staff and stakeholder organizations on environmental indicators, preparing indicator-based State of the Environment reports, noise monitoring and acoustic maps, and the use of new technologies and social networks in environmental monitoring and decision-making. Although according to the TE only minor changes to the project's output indicators were made during implementation, one particular output under this component was changed from "institutional reforms undertaken to enable incorporation of global environment commitments into planning and monitoring processes" to "utilization of indicators for formulation of environmental policies and monitoring of variables", which constitutes a qualitatively substantial downscale. The project achieved the revised output by supporting preparation of the first indicator-based State of the Environment report published by the Environmental Protection Agency. Furthermore, although the TE does not mention the introduction of an Environmental Sustainability Theme Manager Office system to the EPA, as was originally planned, all stakeholder institutions established focal points for the project and the government mandated data collection from all relevant agencies. In terms of web-based activities, no efforts were made by the project to establish an online database or develop IT solutions to link the five participating institutions, because the institutions refused this. In terms of the establishment of an M&E and risk management system, the TE indicates that this did not occur and that the respective indicator was not formulated clearly enough to begin with. (TE pp. 15, 33-34, 38)

Further outputs delivered by the project, but not originally anticipated in the project's formulation, include pollen monitoring, a national herbarium, delineation of the Morača River watershed, and installation of a simple Document Management System (DMS) instead of the EMIS. The TE however views none of these outputs as conducive or relevant to the overall project objectives. (TE pp. 35-36)

One of the main inhibitors to the project's effectiveness seems to have been poor coordination with an EU-funded initiative for establishing a key element of the project with the EMIS. According to the TE, the EU launched an international tender for establishing an EMIS for the EPA in 2014, but this project was not well-coordinated with the GEF project. After the start of the EU-funded EMIS project, the GEF project turned over the results of its EMIS design study to the EU project, but then discontinued its own pilot of the EMIS and the related capacity building activities. Instead, it focused on building a simple DMS in the five stakeholder institutions, which is no adequate replacement for a real EMIS, according to the TE. The TE concludes that the project did not cooperate closely enough with the EU project and failed to take an appropriate strategic approach to meet the related challenges or tap potential synergies. This seems to be a significant missed opportunity, since, according to the TE, there was no serious attempt to join forces and to jointly develop a comprehensive EMIS system and the capacities to operate it, an endeavor which consumes substantial resources and will likely still be incomplete after the EU project. (TE pp. 25, 35-36)

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

The TE rates the project's efficiency as Moderately Satisfactory, because while it considers the project's financial management as generally satisfactory, significant resources were spent on activities the TE views as not directly contributing to the project objective. In also considering the sizeable delay in the project's implementation and the substantially lower than expected materialization of co-financing, the TER views this rating as too lenient and rates project efficiency as Moderately Unsatisfactory.

The TE notes that several project activities were selected at random to assess their cost-effectiveness and were found to be priced competitively. It also considers the size and scope of the project management team (one part-time project manager and one part-time project assistant) as appropriate for this type of project.

However, the TE also notes the project spent about 20% of its budget (or EUR100,000) on a pollen monitoring system, which, despite being useful in principle, did not contribute to the overall project objective of establishing an environmental information management system, but merely to the collection of primary field data. Furthermore, the project spent over EUR70,000 on the installation of DMS software in the relevant stakeholder agencies, which the TE regards as principally useful, but as not fully justified by the project design, since it is a general office management software package not specifically designed for environmental data management and reporting. (TE pp. 35 & 39)

There was a sizeable delay of the project by 1.5 years. The TE mentions elsewhere that two no-cost extensions were granted and instead of closing in June 2014 after an initially planned 36 months, the project actually closed in December 2015 after 53 months of implementation. In its section on project finance, the TE further notes that the disbursement of project funds was very low during the first years of the project and that co-financing eventually materialized also far below the initially promised level. (TE pp. 13, 26-29)

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

The TE rates the project's sustainability as Likely, assessing the threats to its sustainability along each of the four dimensions of financial, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, and environmental sustainability as low. The TER agrees with this assessment.

The TE views **financial** sustainability of the project as likely, since project components such as the installed DMS system are not very costly to maintain and therefore can be covered by the regular budgets of the participating institutions, and because other components such as the work carried out on indicators require mostly institutional coordination and have less financial implication.

Although environmental concerns generally rank low on Montenegro's political agenda according to the TE, it views the process of EU accession as a strong driving force for **socio-political** sustainability of the project. The TE notes that the government has been eager to fulfil its reporting requirements vis-a-vis both the EU and the Rio Conventions and therefore assesses socio-political risk to sustainability as low.

In terms of the **institutional framework and governance**, the TE notes the long institutional history of government entities tasked with environmental monitoring and the corresponding institutional stability. The TE also sees a clear division of labor between the relevant institutions and positively notes the bylaw initiated by the project as having regulated their function and confirmed the role of the EPA. It therefore assesses the risk to institutional sustainability as low.

Finally, the TE does not identify any **environmental** threat to sustainability, rating this risk as low. (TE pp. 42-43)

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?

According to the TE, only UNDP co-financing materialized fully, at US\$25,000. It notes that the US\$94,000 contribution from the "Municipal Land Management" and "Cross-border economic development, Montenegro/BiH" GIZ projects was not realized, because apparently these projects were completed shortly after the start of this GEF-supported project. It is further the TE's opinion, that the government's co-financing contribution was improperly classified and never realistic to begin with. The corresponding US\$563,850 promised at CEO endorsement were classified as grant, although the co-financing letters from the respective government entities state that these contributions will be managed by themselves. The TE therefore views these contributions as in-kind and further assesses them as likely having been provided as part of the regular work plans and approved budgets of these actors, meaning additional resources were actually generated by the project in this regard. Since the co-financing letters did not specify the exact modality with which funds were to be transferred to the project, no real tracking of materialization of these government funds seems to have taken place. The TE concludes that the government institutions contributed to the project within their general work plans, but hired no additional staff and provided no other facilities or financial contributions to the project. Therefore, while unable to provide a precise quantitative estimate of materialized government co-financing, the TE determines that its must have been less than US\$100,000. (TE pp. 28-29)

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 was endorsed in June 2011, with a planned implementation period of 36 months, from June 2011 to June 2014. Two no-cost extensions were subsequently granted, extending the completion date until December 2015 and the project's overall duration from 3 to 4.5 years. (TE p. 13)

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 TE notes a good level of country ownership of the project, mainly because it was seen as an instrument for EU accession. Although government co-financing contributions were overstated in the project documents, as previously noted, the TE views the adoption of suggestions of the project in terms of environmental indicators and standards/responsibilities for their measurement into the regulatory framework as a further sign of country ownership. (TE pp. 39-40) It is difficult however to assess the overall impact, of relatively high country ownership on the one hand and less-than planned materialization of government co-financing on the other, on the project's outcomes however.

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 discusses M&E design at entry and M&E implementation in one combined section, providing an overall M&E rating of Satisfactory. (TE pp. 29-30) The TE however also provides a separate and conflicting rating for M&E design at entry and M&E implementation in its rating summary tables, rating M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory at one point and then as Satisfactory at another. (TE pp. 9 & 22) The TER rates M&E design for this project as Satisfactory.

The TE notes that the M&E design laid out in the project document was based on standard UNDP/GEF templates and appropriate for this kind of project. It also notes that mid-term review assessed the project's M&E system as satisfactory.

In terms of the indicators specified by the project, the TE provides conflicting assessments:

- “The indicators are [...] not quantitative indicators, and clear targets have not been defined in all cases. As regards contents, structures and wording, they resemble more outputs than real indicators, [...] The formal requirements for project indicators to measure the level of achievement with well-defined baseline values and targets are not fulfilled.” (TE p. 16)
- “The indicators/outputs for both outcomes are appropriate and will lead to the expected result.” (TE p. 18)

It is this TER's opinion, while the indicators specified in the results framework were not SMART, they were largely appropriate to measure the simple outputs they were meant to capture.

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

The TE discusses M&E design at entry and M&E implementation in one combined section, providing an overall M&E rating of Satisfactory. (TE pp. 29-30) The TE however also provides separate and conflicting ratings for M&E design at entry and M&E implementation in its rating summary tables, rating M&E implementation as Satisfactory at one point and then as Moderately Satisfactory at another. (TE pp. 9 & 22) The TER rates M&E implementation as Moderately Satisfactory, because there seems to have been no strong connection between M&E and adaptive management.

The TE notes that the inception workshop and report, the mid-term review, and the TE itself, have all been carried out in a timely fashion and that project board meetings took place regularly between 2012 and 2014, although no meeting took place in 2015. The TE further notes that according to the mid-term review there was frequent communication between the project board and the project team and that monthly reporting was provided to the project board in the first two years of implementation, in addition to the standard quarterly progress reports.

However, according to the TE, the results of the mid-term review were not properly integrated into the project's operations for the remainder of its duration. Furthermore, as previously noted, the decision to not establish an environmental monitoring and information system, which was one of the key outcomes of the project, was approved only by the project's own internal structures but without proper documentation vis-à-vis the GEF. (TE pp. 29-30)

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 TE discusses the performance of the UNDP country office in its combined section on the quality of implementation and execution. It rates quality of implementation as Satisfactory in its rating summary tables. (TE pp. 9, 22) The TER agrees with this assessment.

The TE notes that UNDP supervision over the project staff was adequate, transparent, and frank, while focusing on results and being responsive, professional and timely. The technical and operational support from UNDP was generally appreciated and considered adequate by the project team and regular UNDP staff consultation and participation in project meetings provided valuable inputs to national processes, ensuring the required political support, according to the TE.

While the TE also attests a fruitful relationship between UNDP supervisors and government partners, including regular contacts with the Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism (MSDT) and the EPA, it also assigns at least partial blame for the poor coordination with the EU-funded EMIS project to UNDP. The EU-funded project seems to have started soon after this project, but their two complementary concepts were not agreed jointly between the EPA, the EU and UNDP, and ways to leverage potential synergies between them have apparently never been fully analyzed or discussed between the MSDT and the EPA on the one hand, and the EU and UNDP on the other. (TE pp. 21 & 30)

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

The TE discusses the performance of the project management unit and the project board in its section on the quality of implementation and execution. It rates quality of execution as Moderately Satisfactory in its rating summary tables. (TE pp. 9, 22) The TER agrees with this assessment.

The TE notes results-orientation, professionalism, timeliness, and responsiveness, as well as adequate management, budgeting, and procurement on the side of the project management unit. It also notes that all project board members interviewed during the evaluation mission expressed their satisfaction with the project implementation arrangements and the board's role therein, as well as with having received relevant and timely information throughout implementation. However, the TE also notes that some project board members were not fully aware about the exact goals of the project and that it was thus not possible to discuss with them whether there were deviations from these goals.

In terms of the coordination problem with the EU-funded EMIS project, the TE notes that it could also not discuss this with project board members, as they either stated that this was not their responsibility or that they were not in a position to release that information. The TE generally criticizes a lack of cooperation and transparency from the EPA in clarifying the relationship with the EU-project. What seems clear is that EU-funded project has started soon after this project, but their two complementary concepts were not agreed jointly between the EPA, the EU and UNDP, and ways to leverage potential synergies between them have apparently never been fully analyzed or discussed between the MSDT and the EPA on the one hand, and the EU and UNDP on the other. The TE also notes that there was no cooperation agreement between these two projects and that the issue of cooperation was not covered in the minutes of the project board meetings. The TE concludes that there was practically no communication between the two projects on the day-to-day implementation level and that no joint technical work meetings took place. (TE pp. 21, 30-31)

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 TE notes no environmental change, positive or negative, as a result of the project.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE notes no socioeconomic change, positive or negative, as a result of the project.

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

a) Capacities

The TE notes that the project provided training to EPA staff and stakeholder organizations on calculating environmental indicators and on using indicators in assessing national strategies, programs, and projects, as well as on using them in decision making processes. It also provided training in preparing an indicator-based State of the Environment report, training related to noise monitoring and the development of acoustic maps in all municipalities, and training related to using new technologies and social networks for environmental monitoring and decision making, according to the TE. (TE p. 34)

b) Governance

The TE notes that the project successfully catalyzed the utilization of environmental indicators for policy formulation. The Law on Environment stipulates the mandatory drafting of a State of the Environment (SoE) report every four years, based on the national list of environmental indicators that was adopted by the government in March 2013. Consequently, the EPA published the first indicator-based SoE report in 2014. Indicator-based information compiled by the project was further used in preparing the Second National Communication of Montenegro to the UNFCCC and for the revision of its National Biodiversity Strategy Action Plan. (TE pp. 33-34)

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.

The TE notes no unintended impacts, positive or negative, as a result of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE notes no adoption of GEF initiatives at scale that goes beyond the original goals of the project.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE provides the following lessons learnt:

- The project results framework turned out to be ambiguous and its specified targets were not always clear. It could therefore not be fully utilized as a basis for project monitoring. More emphasis should therefore be put on the development of a consistent and unambiguous results framework and its application as a guidance document throughout project implementation. Furthermore, any ex-post changes to the results framework need to be justified and documented.
- UNDP as the implementing agency has the responsibility that project operations remain within the scope of interventions foreseen by the project documents and approved by the GEF. This requirement has to be enforced, if necessary also vis-à-vis the steering committee / project board.
- Project co-financing requires monitoring and it should be considered to link partner contributions with the provision of services generated through GEF funding. Otherwise there is a risk that a project becomes a one-way process. More guidance should be given by the GEF in this regard.

(TE p. 45)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations:

1. The GEF should reconsider the rating principle for the „relevance” criterion, moving, from a “relevant” to “not relevant” dichotomy, to a finer scale e.g. from “highly relevant” over “partly relevant” to “not relevant”, in order to more appropriately mirror project reality.
2. The GEF should give more guidance on the accounting of co-financing, e.g. on how to identify baseline funding under a business-as-usual scenario and on how to assess in-kind contributions. Without such guidance, monitoring is not possible. There also seems to be a general tendency to over-estimate co-financing contributions.
3. UNDP as the implementing agency should ensure that a project acts within the approved framework and that its activities are confined to those that lead to the achievement of the project objective. If necessary, this has to be enforced vis-à-vis the project board.
4. UNDP should put more emphasis on developing unambiguous results frameworks with clear targets and indicators, which allow for the full monitoring of project progress. For this purpose, the results frameworks should be checked by the quality assurance team before implementation begins, or in case of any modification, within the adaptive management framework.
5. UNDP should make sure that any substantial change in the project design is communicated to the GEF for endorsement.
6. The Ministry of Sustainable Development and Tourism (MSDT) and the EPA should develop a concept on how to develop an update of the State of the Environment report, which is a follow-up measure that emerged from the project and will be due in 2017.
7. The MSDT, the EPA, and the other participating institutions should start to work on solutions for overcoming the current barriers to the interlinking of their information systems.
8. The MSDT and EPA should link the environmental information management system, installed with the assistance of the EU, with the database management system installed by the project.
9. The MSDT and EPA should conduct an analysis on the availability and quality of environmental data. Presently, the environmental indicators identified by the project are used for environmental monitoring based on available information. A gap analysis is needed to identify the required additional information, in order to allow for meaningful and comprehensive environmental monitoring.

(TE pp. 45-46)

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 an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence presented in the report appears complete and is generally convincing in substantiating the ratings, but there are isolated instances of internal inconsistency.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report assesses project sustainability along its four dimension and briefly discusses the project exit strategy.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned appear supported by the evidence presented, but could be more comprehensive.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not include a definitive estimate of total project costs, since the government contribution could only be estimated.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's assessment of project M&E systems is not very comprehensive and its provided ratings are inconsistent.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No additional sources were used.