

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		499	
GEF Agency project ID		1204	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Creating a Community Co-Managed Park System for Belize	
Country/Countries		Belize	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP3: Forest ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		The Protected Areas Conservation Trust (PACT)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency	
Private sector involvement		Not involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		November 11, 1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 1999	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		April 2002	
Actual date of project completion		April 2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.75	0.75
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		0.75	0.75
Total Co-financing		0.23	U/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		0.98	U/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		October 2002	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Virginia Ravndal	
TER completion date		October 2014	
TER prepared by		Joshua Schneck	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Brief (PB), the Global Environmental Objectives of the project were to strengthen effective protection of existing protected areas in Belize that are known to harbor globally significant biodiversity. PB states that these areas are increasingly under threat from land conversion driven by population growth in rural areas of Belize. The PB identifies four protected areas (PAs) for developing community co-managed systems: Manatee Forest Reserve, 113,388 acres; Aguacaliente Wetland Complex, 8,650 acres; Five Blues Lake National Park, 4,250 acres; Freshwater Creek Forest Reserve, 73,191 acres.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objectives of the project, as stated in the PB, are *“to improve the effective protection of existing protected areas by encouraging community co-management of these areas”* (PB, pg 1). PB states that community co-management has the potential to alleviate many of the problems facing protected areas in Belize, including lack of resources and effective management. The project seeks to address barriers to implementation of community co-management of PAs, through capacity building initiatives and by developing ways for communities to realize livelihood benefits from PAs, through ecotourism in particular.

The PB defines the following six activities by which project objectives are to be achieved:

1. Develop co-management plans and operations – project will focus on 4 protected areas defined in the PB. (\$420,000)
2. Strengthen the communications and information-sharing network (\$85,000)
3. Build capacity within PACT for network oversight (\$100,000) – PACT, Belize’s national conservation trust fund, is charged with overseeing the entire park co-management system.
4. Create a framework for protected area management on private-public lands (\$140,000)
5. Capacity building within local communities to ensure sustainability (\$195,000)
6. Explore the expansion of the network of co-managed parks (\$40,000)

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

Yes. TE states that twice during the three-year project, "...significant and substantive changes were made to the project objectives and activities. Consequently, end of project expectations were also significantly modified during the project" (TE, pg 7). However, no revised PB was available at the time of TE review, nor does the TE provide a complete listing of changes that were made to the logframe matrices. TE does comment on the overall nature of the changes, which appear to be a downscaling of project ambition. TE states "the number and extent of changes and lack of clarity in the project documents make it extremely difficult to evaluate the project on the basis of these documents. In many cases, the original expected end result has nothing to do with the modified one. For example, in the original document, one of the expected end results of the project was 'increased number of NGOs participating in co-management of parks.' This changed to the seemingly unrelated end result, 'The project is collaborating with the communities within the pilot areas to prepare an infrastructure development plan for their area and to mobilize the resources to implement the infrastructure development plan.' This is only one of many possible examples of how the project documents were flawed." (TE, pg 17). Unless otherwise noted, evaluation of project outcomes in this TER and in the TE is against the original project objectives found in the PB, under which the GEF funding was promised.

4. GEF EO 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 project is relevant to the GEF and to the Government of Belize. For the GEF, the project's objectives are in-line with those of GEF Operational Program 3: Forest Ecosystems, which seeks to conserve globally significant biodiversity found in forest ecosystems. As stated in the PB, Belize's forests and waters are known to harbor high levels of biodiversity, including many endemic and threatened/endangered species. At the same time, these resources are under increasing threat from land conversion and unsustainable exploitation. For Belize, PB states that project objectives are in-line with the National Five-Year Plan, which strongly emphasizes the need to improve living standards of rural people while limiting detrimental environmental impacts (PB, pg 2). Moreover, the government of Belize has indicated its intention to pursue a co-management model for its protected areas, which covers some 37% of the country (PB, pg 2). This project will provide a means of testing one approach to

co-management – that of using CBOs in partnership with the national government – to managing protected areas.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-------------------	-------------------------------

TE finds that the project was unsuccessful in achieving its principle objectives, and at project’s end, the management of the four PAs included in the project has not significantly improved from the pre-project situation (TE, pg 7). Some limited success was made in the project’s environmental education and leadership development components. However, TE finds that “severe” weaknesses in the project’s design, including insufficient time; overly ambitious project scope; insufficient budget; poorly articulated objectives; flawed theory of change that that did not identify critical barriers to project success; and a flawed choice for an executing agency contributed to project shortcomings (TE, pg 17-21).

Progress along each of the six project activities defined in the PB is detailed below:

1. *Develop co-management plans and operations* – No PA management plans were developed during the project. TE states that the reasons provided by the Project Manager for this shortcoming are that Local Management Teams (LMTs) lacked the capacity to become involved in PA management. Instead, the project focused on enhancing the organizational and leadership skills of the LMTs. TE finds that while the organizational and leadership training was helpful and needed, emphasis should have been placed on preparing LMTs for actual PA management, which was not accomplished (TE, pg 18).
2. *Strengthen the communications and information-sharing network* – This project activity appears to have been changed to capacity building efforts that included study tours of 8 LMTs to protected areas in the US, as well as participation by two LMT members in a workshop in Mexico on tourism outreach. TE finds both efforts were of limited use as the PAs in the US did not provide an applicable model for Belizean PAs, and the conference in Mexico was at too advanced a level for the participants.
3. *Build capacity within PACT for network oversight* – this activity appears to have changed to establishing co-management agreements. No co-management agreements were signed during the project, and the situation at the end of the project is identical to when the project began. According to the TE, many steps for establishment of co-management agreements with CBOs, including legally registering CBOs, were not fully considered in the project’s design. While PACT likely benefitted from the project’s study tours and experiences that helped to further identify barriers for co-management of PAs (TE, pg 7), the TE gives no assessment on whether capacity development work under this activity grouping was even performed (does not show up as a cost incurred by the project in the TE and it’s possible that activities under this work grouping were dropped during implementation after it was realized that no co-management agreements would be established during the project implementation period).
4. *Create a framework for protected area management on private-public lands* – The TE is not clear on whether or not this activity changed over the course of the project. The PB defines this

activity as work “to create and formalize a new type of protected area on landscapes comprised of both private and public lands,” which currently lack a formal management system (PB, pg 6). However, TE describes work under a related activity as consisting of review and acceptance (by the Belize Forest Department) of existing PB management frameworks. TE finds that work under this activity was largely unnecessary as robust frameworks already existed and the framework chosen did not, in the TE’s assessment, represent any improvement.

5. *Capacity building within local communities to ensure sustainability* – TE finds that while some helpful activities were undertaken and some useful equipment provided, efforts were insufficient to significantly enhance the capacity of CBOs to manage PAs, and “much more attention should have been placed on this aspect of the project” (TE, pg 19).
6. *Explore the expansion of the network of co-managed parks* – no work was undertaken under this activity, and no reason is provided in the TE.

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

While TE does not provide a rating for project efficiency, TE cites several examples of inefficiencies in project’s approach and execution. These include:

- Study tour of 8 LMT members to PAs in the US was not cost-effective. According to the TE, “it would have been less costly and more helpful to visit more PAs in Belize instead of visiting Yellowstone, Grand Teton and other PAs in the US. Those PAs, with more than a million visitors a year and enormous budgets compared to the budgets available to even the best funded PAs in Belize, do not provide a realistic model for the 4 PAs involved in this project” (TE, pg 21).
- Work on developing a framework for developing PA management plans was unnecessary, as robust frameworks already existed and the framework chosen did not, in the TE’s assessment, represent any improvement. While the exercise of developing a framework may have helped those participating in the workshop to better understand PA management plans and increase ownership, TE finds this might have been accomplished by reviewing existing frameworks (TE pg 18).
- TE finds that LMTs were, at the end of the project, still unaware of many of the tasks involved in PA management, throwing into question the efficacy of training expenditures (TE, pg 19).
- TE finds more effort and funding should have been directed to preparing LMTs to actually manage PAs, instead of general leadership training. Moreover, while leadership training was translated into action on community development, it does not appear to have been translated into action on biodiversity conservation (TE, pg 24). Finally, TE states that the two leadership training sessions, which cost some \$27,000 each, should have been combined into one single session, and funding for the second session instead directed to activities more directly related to preparing communities for PA management (TE, pg 25).

- Training was providing for 4 community members near Five Blues National Park to become spelunking tour guides. However, none of those trained ended up working for the LMT as tour guides.
- TE finds that “in general, goods and services were not delivered on a timely basis. This is mostly due to re-orientation of the project twice during three years” (TE, pg 28).

For these reasons, project efficiency is rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

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

TE finds that overall, insufficient attention was given to ensuring sustainability of project outcomes, and that several factors limit the likelihood that project outcomes will be sustained following project closure (TE, pg 20). Key factors include failure to secure funding for follow-on activities or finding a way to achieve financial self-sufficiency; and failure to ensure that the government entity with the mandate for protected areas management, the Forest Department, was a key partner in the project. TE finds that the Forest Department should have been the executing agency and that PACT, which had neither the mandate nor the experience in project implementation, was chosen principally because of “financial flexibility” (TE, pg 30). TE finds that “by not making the Forest Department an intimate partner, benefits in terms of capacity building and sustainability were sacrificed for financial flexibility – flexibility that could have otherwise been secured” (TE, pg 30).

Risks to sustainability of project outcomes are further assessed along the following 4 dimensions:

- *Environmental (U/A)* – TE does not assess environmental risks to sustainability.
- *Financial (U)* – TE finds that financial risks to sustainability of project outcomes are significant. The few PA management staff hired during the project have all been terminated for lack of funds (TE, pg 31). Moreover, no funding mechanism for supporting follow-up activities was identified, and government funding for PAs in Belize, according to the TE, faces chronic shortfalls. PD does note that PACT has been entirely self-financed from its inception, and it likely benefitted from its involvement in this project in terms of capacity building, networking, and raising its profile, which may serve to facilitate access to additional finance going forward. However, its ability to address the critical funding shortages noted above appears limited.
- *Socio-Political (U/A)* - TE does not assess socio-political risks to sustainability
- *Institutional (U)* – Project failed to incorporate the Forest Department into the project in a significant way, and this absence limited the prospects for both capacity building and sustainability of project outcomes, according to the TE. Moreover, no PA management plans were developed during the project, and no new co-management plans were signed during the 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?

TE does not report or discuss actual co-financing, or the importance of co-financing to outcomes and sustainability.

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?

Project was extended by four months and TE notes that "in general, goods and services were not delivered on a timely basis. This was mostly due to re-orientation of the project twice during three years" (TE, pg 28). At the same time, TE states that the expected duration of the project, three years, was too small considering the scope of the project. TE does not state whether or not the presence of delays and an extension affected outcomes and 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 is not assessed in the TE. TE states that the project, by not involving the Forest Department as a key partner in the project, missed opportunities for sustainability, capacity building. While additional support from the Government in terms of financing and other forms of assistance not promised in the PB may have helped project outcomes and sustainability, the project did not experience any resistance from the Belizean government.

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: Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	-------------------------------

TE finds significant weaknesses in M&E design at entry. These include indicators and targets that were not adequately defined in project documents. As stated in the TE, the "...often ill-defined expected results detracted significantly from achieving greater success in the project" (TE, pg 30). Examples of

poorly defined indicators lacking targets include the overall objective indicator: “Increase in the area of designated PAs that is brought under effective community co-management,” which, while possibly an intermediate step towards improved biodiversity conservation in PAs, is not the same as conservation of biodiversity in PAs. Moreover, it’s not clear what is meant by “effective community co-management.” Similarly, indicators for project outcomes include “receipts from ecotourism,” and “trained local PA management staff,” both of which are vague and lack any targets or baselines. The description of the M&E plan in the PB is limited to a single paragraph which states that PACT will be responsible for overall fiscal monitoring of the program and broad project oversight. CCC, a US-based NGO working with communities to promote conservation, is charged with evaluating the co-management program as a whole. No dedicated budget for M&E is provided in the PB, nor timetable for when project components will be evaluated.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-------------------------------

Weaknesses in M&E design noted in section 6.1 above were not improved upon during implementation, and in some cases, indicators and targets were made even less clear. As TE states, “the project underwent frequent, extensive changes in its objectives and expected end results. This constantly moving target made it difficult at times to even understand what the project objectives were” (TE, pg 30). Additionally, TE states that “TPRs and PIRs tended to be overly generous in their assessments of the project, sometimes indicating satisfactory progress when this was not the case. This in the end, is not helpful to the project” (TE, pg 32). Finally, TE notes that there was inadequate diffusion of information amongst the key stakeholders and the Project Steering Committee was ineffectual (TE , pg 32).

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: Moderately Unsatisfactory
--	--

Quality of project implementation had several weaknesses, including significant weaknesses in the project design which are discussed above in sections 4.2 and 4.4. In addition, while the TE does not provide a rating for quality of project implementation, TE does state that more backstopping by UNDP would have benefited the project (TE, pg 29). TE states that PIRs overstated project success, which may

indicate that senior management of UNDP was not alerted to problems with the project in a timely manner.

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

Project execution was hampered by frequent, extensive changes to the projects objectives and poorly defined expected results which, according to the TE, "...detracted significantly from achieving greater success in the project" (TE, pg 30). In addition, TE notes that the Project Manager lacked experience in PA management, and that this "may have detracted from achieving more of the PA management objectives of the project" (TE, pg 32). Finally, TE states that the Project Steering Committee (PSC) was ineffectual. Reasons given include lack of clarity of PSC members regarding roles and responsibilities; and lack of project management experience by many of the PSC members and by the Project Manager. For all these reasons, in addition to poor M&E implementation discussed above in section 6.2, quality of project execution is rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

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 below that this is indeed the case. 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.

No changes in environmental change or status occurred by the end of the project. The project was unsuccessful in changing any management practices or arrangements at the four PAs targeted by the project, nor did the project put into place any monitoring that would have allowed for an assessment of environmental changes.

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.

TE cites as the project's biggest success, training provided in leadership to 29 community members. The training has not translated into any action on biodiversity conservation, but TE cites some examples of how the training has contributed to community on action, including for example, mobilizing community

members to bring about a needed school extension and renovations of a community center TE, pg 23-24).

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 – Changes include training provided in leadership to 29 community members described above. The training has not translated into any action on biodiversity conservation, but TE cites some examples of how the training has contributed to community on action, including for example, mobilizing community members to bring about a needed school extension and renovations of a community center TE, pg 23-24). In addition, the project had an environmental education component that included training 15 elementary school teachers in environmental education, and development of additional training materials and programs (TE, pg 25).

b) Governance – no changes are reported to have occurred in governance as the project was unsuccessful in bringing about any new co-management regimes at the 4 PAs targeted by the project. Principle reasons for lack of progress are the failure of the PB to correctly assess all the critical barriers to adoption of co-management regimes and design an effective approach to addressing these barriers (TE, pg 7).

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

No unintended impacts are reported to have occurred 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.

No adoption of GEF initiatives at scale occurred by project end. The project was unsuccessful in establishing piloting of co-management by CBOs at the 4 PAs targeted by the project, and that would have provided a possible basis for scale-up if favorable results were found.

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.

TE provides the following lessons:

- Unless critical barriers are clearly identified and described early on (preferably during the project design stage), they are unlikely to be addressed by the project. If not addressed, this will negatively affect a project's chances of success, and may also negatively affect chances for further funding.
- Inappropriate selection of project sites can significantly curtail a project's chance of success. Clear criteria for selection of sites should be spelled out and adhered to. Once a project begins, it is difficult to modify project sites, even when these are found to be inappropriate. It is far better to do the necessary homework regarding site selection during project preparation.
- UNDP needs to ensure that any Project Steering Committee (PSC) fully understands its role at the outset of a project, and that at least some persons experienced in project management are on the PSC.
- Avoid the combination of an inexperienced PSC and an inexperienced Project Manager.
- Much more monitoring from UNDP/GEF is required to ensure that projects are well designed and that these stay on track. The PIR is not necessarily the best tool to use to gauge whether a project is in need of help. External mid-term evaluations are normally more effective and should be planned for even in shorter projects.
- Overstatement of project success is not helpful.
- Clear, concrete and detailed description of expected outputs is extremely important. If appropriate outputs are not clearly described, the project cannot expect to get them.
- Good indicators greatly facilitate project evaluation. Nevertheless, if appropriate outputs are not described, even good indicators will not help.
- Unless impact-oriented indicators, linked to benchmarks, are defined and pursued, a project may not achieve its objectives, or may achieve its stated objectives, but have no real impact.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

TE provides the following recommendations:

- The forest Department, and in particular the Protected Areas Program, should be intimately involved in any future UNDP or UNDP/GEF biodiversity conservation related projects. In the case of those projects specifically directed at communities (and not at government), such as is the case of the GEF/SGP, the Forest Department should still be involved as much as possible.
- Criteria for selection of areas to be included in projects should be clearly spelled out and adhered to in all future GEF projects.
- Especially in projects where local communities are key stakeholders, Project Development Funds (PDF) should be sought to help ensure adequate consultations and appropriate project design.

- The influence of media is often greater than that exerted by any one project. In future conservation-related projects, a small amount of project funds should be allocated to allow for a group of media representatives (radio, TV, newspaper) to tour project areas both at the mid-term and toward the end of the project, and report on the good and the bad. This is a good way of helping to keep a project on track, sharing lessons learned, and provides an additional incentive for people to strive for impact, not just achievement of project activities.
- At the first PSC meeting of any project, UNDP should clearly spell out the role and responsibilities of the PSC, Project Manager, Project Director, Executing and Implementing Agencies, and of UNDP itself.
- Strive for more interchange of information between relevant projects/initiatives in the country at the outset of a project to learn from existing initiatives, and continue this interchange of information regularly throughout the project life.
- Pay more attention to mechanisms to promote sustainability of project-initiated and project-supported activities after project end. Especially in cases where project funds exceed the budgets of those organizations/entities they are intended to assist (as is the case in this project), sustainability should be a key concern in project design.
- Place greater importance on understanding factors that motivate stakeholders to be involved in a project.
- Clearly define impact-oriented indicators and time-bound benchmarks for monitoring their progress throughout the project life.
- Whenever significant changes in the objectives and/or activities of a GEF project are considered, these should be brought to the attention of UNDP/GEF before proceeding.
- UNDP/GEF should more closely monitor GEF projects to help ensure lessons are shared between GEF projects, actual experiences and products and shared between projects, and that sufficient familiarity with GEF exists in UNDP country offices to enable them to effectively support projects.
- UNDP/GEF should send a “problem solver hotshot” to resolve problems when red flags are raised, especially in those projects for which external mid-term evaluations have not been planned.
- In future project mid-term and final evaluations, include a UNDP Country Office representative (an unpaid member of the team), someone from the country with relevant expertise, and an external evaluator on the team. The external evaluator normally acts as the Team Leader.
- In future project evaluations, compile the following documents for the evaluation team before arrival: All TPR and PIR reports, all project manager reports, all audit reports, copies of all products produced during the project, a list of all relevant ongoing, recently completed and planned projects in the country, the UNDP CCF, an organogram of government, and , where available, an organogram of the Ministry in which the project is located, a list of all committees that exist for the project and the TOR for each.

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 EO 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?	Report does a good job of assessing relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and achievement of the objectives. Report should have included revised logframe matrices for comparison with original objectives and activities, as it was difficult to trace reporting on TE back to PB activities in some cases.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Report is internally consistent, evidence is complete. Ratings were not provided as they were not a GEF requirement at the time.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Report does a good job of assessing project sustainability, and points out weaknesses in project's approach and choice of executing agency that undermine sustainability of project outcomes.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	TE is a good example of best practices in this regard, with a very extensive, well-supported list of recommendations and lessons.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Report does not report on actual project costs for many activities nor actual co-financing. Report states that an audit is ongoing by UNDP, but this should not substitute for reporting on project financing.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Project does a good job of assessing weaknesses in both design and implementation of project M&E. TE should have included revised logframe matrices for comparison with original objectives and activities, as it was difficult to follow some parts of TE's critique of revised logframe.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

Overall TE rating: $(0.3 * (5+5)) + (0.1 * (5+6+2+5)) = 3 + 1.8 = 4.8 = S$

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