

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5110	
GEF Agency project ID		130783	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Applying Knowledge Management to Scale up Partnership Investments for Sustainable Development of Large Marine Ecosystems of East Asia and their Coasts	
Country/Countries		China, Indonesia, Philippines, and Vietnam	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		International Waters	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		IW Objective 3, Outcome 3.3	
Executing agencies involved		Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not available	
Private sector involvement		Not available	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 24, 3013	
Effectiveness date / project start		December 2, 2013	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		February 28, 2017	
Actual date of project completion		Not available	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	Not available	Not available
	Co-financing	Not available	Not available
GEF Project Grant		1	Not available
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	.44	Not available
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
	Other	.8	Not available
Total GEF funding		1	Not available
Total Co-financing		1.24	Not available
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.24	Not available
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Not available	
Author of TE		Not available	
TER completion date		2/6/2020	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Sohn	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was to “promote the scaling up and replication of KM [knowledge management] best practices and lessons learned on ICM [integrated coastal management] for sustainable development of coastal and marine resources in LMEs [large marine ecosystems] in the EAS [East Asian Seas] region” (TE pg. 7).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s goal was to “to establish a regional knowledge platform that facilitates: the integration of investments in sustaining ecosystem services into national and regional development policies, processes and plans; strengthens linkages to the sustainable development agenda adopted by countries of the region and enhances the capacities and services of central and local governments for developing and implementing investment projects” (TE pg. 1).

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

The TE indicates that the Philippine Climate Change Adaptation Project (PhilCCAP) was not included in the original project design but its inclusion was “triggered by the selection of SIPLAS [Siargao Protected Landscape and Seascape] as a PhilCAPP’s demonstration site, which is an important seascape within the SEA region.” The TE notes that an agreement was signed with PEMSEA to collaborate on ICM knowledge sharing and support services in 2015 (TE pg. 21).

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

The TE does not provide a rating for project relevance, which this TER assesses as **Satisfactory**. The project's objective is consistent with GEF-5 International Waters Objective 3: *Support foundational capacity building, portfolio learning, and targeted research needs for ecosystem-based, joint management of transboundary water systems*. In particular, the project's goal of establishing a regional knowledge platform is consistent with Outcome 3.3: *International Waters portfolio performance enhanced from active learning/knowledge management/experience sharing*. The project's objective is also consistent with the regional Sustainable Development Strategy for the Seas of East Asia (SDS-SEA) Implementation Plan 2012-2016, which aims to protect coasts and oceans of the regions while building an ocean-based blue economy (TE pg. 7). Additional regional agreements adopted by the participating Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA) countries (The Philippines; China; Indonesia; and Vietnam) included the Haikou Partnership Agreement (2006); the Manila Declaration (2009); and the Changwon Declaration (2012) (PD pg. 11).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
-------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for project effectiveness, which this TER assesses as **Satisfactory**. The project was designed to promote the scaling up and replication of knowledge management best practices and lessons learned on integrated coastal management (ICM) for sustainable development of coastal and marine resources in large marine ecosystems in the East Asian Seas region. By the time of the TE, the innovative knowledge management products and tools were available on a knowledge-sharing portal. Additionally, communities of practice (COPs) and support services were developed, creating more interaction with potential investors and policymakers. The project also targeted six existing Global Environment Facility/World Bank investment projects in the Philippines, China, Indonesia, and Vietnam, for scaling up their knowledge products, tools, and services (TE pg. 5). By the time of the TE, the knowledge sharing platform had been launched at one investment project Coastal

Resources for Sustainable Development Project (CRSDP) in Vietnam, with plans to launch the platform at the remaining five projects (TE pg. 37).

A summary of the project's achievements, by component and outcome, is provided below:

### **Component 1: A Regional Coastal and Ocean Ecosystem Governance e-Library and Knowledge Sharing Portal**

*Outcome 1: Informed national policy makers and local chief executives interacting via a regional e-network and serving as advocates for integrated management of coastal and marine areas and scaling up of multi-sectoral partnerships and investments.*

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Electronic knowledge library/portal for channeling the latest information on lessons learned, best practices and other information materials on ICM, partnerships and investments; (2) Policymakers, local chief executives, planners, implementers and investors interact during site visits/seminars organized and conducted at the 6 GEF/WB project sites. By the time of the TE, the expected results were largely achieved. An ICM e-library and knowledge-sharing portal for countries in the EAS region was built and operational (SEAKnowledgeBank.net). 25 ICM Solutions knowledge products were produced and available in the portal. The portal was also linked to other knowledge sharing networks and integrated into the PEMSA Network of Local Governments website, as expected (TE pgs. 9-10). Additionally, over 300 stakeholders participated in site visits and seminars, and five new local governments joined PEMSA (TE pg. 11).

### **Component 2: Innovative Tools and Best Practices**

*Outcome 2: Time bound priority projects in the brown and blue agenda identified and promoted for mainstreaming into national and local government medium- term development and investment plans*

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) State of the Coasts reporting system integrated into the planning and M&E processes of selected local government units, particularly in areas where GEF projects are occurring, to map trends and impacts derived from the investments; (2) Collaborative planning workshops covering the brown and blue agenda that are priorities of national and local governments; and (3) Priority coastal and watershed area projects incorporated in medium-term investment plans at the national and local levels. By the time of the TE, the State of Coasts reporting system was set up and tested, and at least 20 local governments were implementing the system, exceeding the expected targets (TE pgs. 11-12). As expected, collaborative planning workshops, consultation meetings, and other forms of planning assistance took place (TE pg. 19). The dissemination of investment plans online and through COPs, as well as presentation of synthesis reports, had yet to be achieved by the time of the TE. Additionally, the incorporation of priority coastal and watershed area projects into investment plans was planned but not yet achieved by the time of the TE (TE pg. 13).

### **Component 3: Communities of Practice and Support Services**

*Outcome 3: Tri-level and cross-sector partnerships on the brown and blue agenda translate political commitments into action*

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Networks and COPs set in place and providing advice and support to government planners and policymakers; (2) Experience-sharing seminars and training workshops organized and conducted with local chief executives, planners, and policymakers focused on the transition of economic policies and strategic plans into blue economy investments; and (3) Finance and investment support service developed and initiated for local governments to plan, develop, replicate, and scale up good practices for investments under the brown and blue agendas in priority sites. By the time of the TE, a regional network of COPs was fully in place, including two new COPs: The PEMSEA Network of Learning Centers and the East Asian Seas Sustainable Business Network (TE pg. viii). The project was also monitoring the requests for technical assistance from government planners and policymakers (TE pg. 14). Additionally, the project met its targets for experience-sharing seminars (TE pg. 15). By the time of the TE, investment proposals had been developed and projects were being implemented for the Philippine Climate Change Adaptation Project (PhilCCAP) and Philippine Rural Development Project (PRDP). New investments and partnerships were planned for the remainder of the project (TE pg. 15).

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

The TE does not provide a rating for project efficiency, which this TER assesses as **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE does not indicate when the PEMSEA project was actually completed, however it was expected to end on February 28, 2017, after approximately four years. A significant component of the PEMSEA project was its engagement with the six existing Global Environment Facility/World Bank investment projects in the region, requiring extensive coordination with these projects. However, implementation of the PEMSEA project began before most of the investment projects. The TE indicates that the PEMSEA project delayed planned activities under Outcomes 2 and 3 in order to accommodate the investment project's timelines. Ultimately however, the PEMSEA project was unable to demonstrate and test the knowledge platform at all six investment projects (TE pg. 17). The TE also notes that the PEMSEA project experienced delays because most of the investment projects did not include the sharing of information and cooperation with the PEMSEA project in their project design documents. The TE indicates that the World Bank Country Offices and Task Team Leaders were able to intervene, but it did cause delays in implementation (pg. ix).

4.4 <b>Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Likely</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for project sustainability, which this TER assesses as **Likely**, with the caveat that the TE does not provide enough information to properly assess financial and environmental sustainability.

#### **Financial Resources**

The TE does not provide evidence regarding the sustainability of financial resources.

### **Sociopolitical**

The TE indicates that stakeholder involvement in the project was strong, particularly at the national and local government levels. The Governments of China, Indonesia, Philippines, and Vietnam demonstrated their support of the PEMSEA project through consultation meetings to identify investment projects and other areas of collaboration. Although the knowledge management platform had only been demonstrated in Vietnam by the time of the TE, there were plans in place to demonstrate the platform in the other participating countries (TE pg. 37). Additionally, the TE indicates that 10 other countries that adopted SDS-SEA actively participated in activities organized by the PEMSEA project (pg. 6). Lastly, support for the PEMSEA Network of Local Governments was strong, as evidenced by the five new local governments joining the network during the project implementation period (TE pg. viii).

### **Institutional Frameworks and Governance**

The TE indicates that the executing agency, PEMSEA, had a strong history of collaborating with the national and local governments on ICM prior to this project (TE pg. ix). The TE notes that “The decision to build the platform within an existing sustainable regional institution ensures the coordination, functional effectiveness and sustainability of the SEA Knowledge Bank for the future” (pg. ix).

### **Environmental**

The TE does not provide evidence regarding environmental sustainability.

## **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?

The TE does not provide co-financing information or indicate how co-financing affected the project’s outcomes or 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?

The TE indicates that the PEMSEA project experienced delays because the investment projects had not started yet or were in the preparatory stage when the PEMSEA project began. As a result, the PEMSEA project was unable to demonstrate and test the knowledge platform at all six investment projects by the time of the TE (TE pg. 17). Additionally, the project experienced delays because most of the investment projects did not include their engagement with PEMSEA project in their project design documents (TE pg. ix).

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 indicates that country ownership over the project was strong. The TE notes that the executing agency, PEMSEA, had a strong history of collaborating with the national and local governments on ICM prior to the regional project (TE pg. ix). The national and local governments of the countries in which the investment projects were implemented actively participated in consultation meetings to identify investment projects and other areas of collaboration. Additionally, the TE indicates that 10 other countries that adopted SDS-SEA actively participated in activities organized by the PEMSEA project (pg. 6).

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

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E design at entry, which this TER assesses as **Satisfactory**. The project's results framework is logically sound and hierarchical. Additionally, the indicators provided in the results framework are generally SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, and timely). The M&E plan included in the Project Document outlines specific M&E activities, responsible parties, and timeframe for implementation. The Project Document indicates that the day to day monitoring of the project is the responsibility of the PEMSEA Resource Facility, with oversight from the Project Steering Committee and the World Bank (pg. 6). The Project Document also includes a \$70,000 budget for M&E, although the bulk of the budget is reserved for midterm and final evaluations rather than monitoring activities (pg. 7). Overall, the M&E plan is appropriate for the size and scope of the regional project.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E implementation, nor enough information for this TER to assess this M&E implementation.

## 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: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
---------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The implementing agency for the project was the World Bank. The TE does not provide enough information to fully assess the quality of project implementation. The TE does indicate that project design was very relevant to the countries in the EAS region. Additionally, the TE notes that the World Bank Country Offices and Task Team Leaders played a key role in promoting engagement between the PEMSEA project and the six investment projects (pg. 18).

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The executing agency for the project was Partnerships in Environmental Management for the Seas of East Asia (PEMSEA). The TE does not provide enough information to fully assess the quality of project execution. The TE does indicate that PEMSEA's 20 years of experience working on ICM in the region significantly contributed to the successful implementation of the project (TE pg. 17).

## 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 does not indicate any environmental changes that took place by the time of the TE.

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 does not indicate any socioeconomic changes that took place by the time of the TE.

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

a) Capacities

By the time of the TE, a new ICM e-library and knowledge-sharing portal, SEAKnowledgeBank.net, was developed and operational (pg. vi). Additionally, a regional COP network was in place, including two new COPs: The PEMSEA Network of Learning Centers and the East Asian Seas Sustainable Business Network (viii). A State of Coasts reporting system was also set up and tested, and at least 20 local governments were implementing the system (TE pgs. 11-12).

b) Governance

The TE does not indicate any changes in governance that took place by the time of the TE.

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 does not indicate any unintended impacts that took place by the time of the TE.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to

these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

By the time of the TE, there were plans to scale up the knowledge-sharing platform, SEAKnowledgeBank.net, to all the countries in PEMSEA (pg. vi).

## **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 learned (pgs. 17-19):

1. The high level of interaction and collaboration built by PEMSEA with selected national and local governments in ICM projects and initiatives for more than 20 years, prior to the project design, has considerably improved the capacity of the project to facilitate the implementation of the planned activities through PEMSEA's existing and emerging COPs and networks, regional centers of excellence, and learning centers. This is an important reminder that the investments made by GEF in the region over the years have been able to institutionalize support networks that are effective and efficient, not only in delivering project outputs but in sustaining and scaling up project outputs to larger impacts. The decision to build the platform within an existing, sustainable regional institution ensures the coordination, functional effectiveness and sustainability of SEA Knowledge Bank for the future.
2. The EAS knowledge platform was designed and developed in collaboration with the six GEF/WB investment projects as well as ICM project managers, local governments and investors in the region. The six investment projects are now poised to use the features and services of the SEA Knowledge Bank. Unfortunately, the six projects were unable to take advantage of the knowledge platform and fully test the services within the timeframe of the MSP. This provides a lesson in project design and development. When designing interrelated projects of this nature, it is critical to ensure that the timing of expected inputs to, and outputs from, such projects are well-coordinated and well-scheduled. In this case, the KM platform has been designed and operationalized, but cannot be fully demonstrated among the six GEF/WB investment projects, which are at different stages of development and implementation.
3. Engagement plans and cooperation among the six World Bank/GEF investment projects and the KM project ultimately determine the extent to which the KM project could adequately and effectively gain the cooperation and resource commitment from the investment projects. With the exception of the CCRES project, the project documentation of the investment projects did not include sharing of information and cooperation with the KM project. The lack of engagement requirements between the projects caused delays in the MSP delivery. This was overcome through interventions by the World Bank Country Offices and the Task Team Leaders. However, in the future, the potential role of the SEA Knowledge Bank platform in identifying and promoting good practices and investment partnerships among development and investment

projects can be clarified at the planning stages of such projects. This will ensure efficient and effective use of resources.

4. The PEMSEA project team noted the above risks at the start of the project. The following countermeasures were implemented to minimize the impact of these risks:
  - a. The potential risk of lack of cooperation and funding commitment from other projects under GEF/WB Framework Program was identified early. A countermeasure taken was to plan and promote value-added cooperative activities with the respective investment projects. Activities such as KM Road Shows and site visits to explore opportunities for strengthening investible projects were undertaken in 2015 and the first half of 2016. The Road Shows, which were designed to orient stakeholders on the design and operation of the KM platform and the available services, also involved selected national and local policymakers, managers, planners and project managers. The resulting support for the KM platform, and the interest in developing investible projects using the platform services are evidence that the proactive countermeasures worked.
  - b. A potential lack of political attention and priority given to ICM initiatives and investments by some national or local governments was another risk identified for the project. As a countermeasure, the project carried out the following activities: (i) organize/conduct site visits and seminars for national policy makers and/or local chief executives to selected ICM projects/sites (Output 1.2); (ii) promote and support the integration of SOC reporting system into the planning and M&E processes of selected local government units hosting GEF/WB investment projects (Output 2.1); (iii) conduct evaluative scanning of PEMSEA partner countries' national and local governments' capabilities towards mainstreaming ICM investment projects (Output 2.2), and (iv) conduct collaborative planning workshops, consultation meetings and other forms of planning assistance appropriate for the needs of partners at various maturity stages of piloting and up scaling of investments in the blue economy (Output 2.2).
  - c. The third risk was associated with the challenges of the GEF/WB investment projects to generate lessons learned, best practices, etc. within the MSP timeframe, for transferring and sharing among stakeholders in the region. To overcome this risk, the MSP gave priority to capture knowledge products (lessons learned, best practices and other informative materials) from completed and nearly completed projects under GEF/WB Strategic Partnership Investment Fund for Pollution Reduction in LMES of East Asia (2005-2015), and existing and emerging KM networks at the national, regional and global levels, for packaging and dissemination in the first year of implementation via the regional knowledge platform.
  - d. The fourth risk for the MSP was the sustainability aspect of the established ICM e-library and regional knowledge-sharing portal, networks including COPs and support services beyond the current project. The establishment of PEMSEA as “a self-sustaining regional partnership mechanism for SDS-SEA implementation” in 2006, and as “an international organization” in 2009, as ratified by the countries of the SEA region, including the signing of headquarters agreement by PEMSEA with the Government of the Philippines in 2012 as further ratified by the Philippine Senate in 2015, provided an assurance for

the sustained operation of such KM tools and mechanisms through integration into the operating arrangements of PEMSEA for sharing and dissemination to governments, sponsors, donors, the private sector and other stakeholders who are committed to the implementation of SDS-SEA.

## 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pgs. 19-20):

The SEA Knowledge Bank and the knowledge management products and service are developed and ready for use. The challenge is the lack of demonstrated benefit of the platform, including the KM products and services that are available to other projects being developed or in operation in the region. It is therefore recommended that The World Bank and PEMSEA explore the possibility of preparing an MSP proposal that will allow the full testing, demonstration and marketing of the KM platform and the delivery of the developed knowledge products and investment partnerships to the six GEF/WB investment projects and to national and local governments in the region. In particular:

- a. Demonstration and testing of the knowledge platform should be continued, including the 6 GEF investment projects;
- b. User feedback is needed for enhancement and improvement of the knowledge platform prior to its full launch;
- c. Translation of the knowledge platform to languages of non-English speaking partners (e.g. Vietnam, Indonesia, and China) should be considered;
- d. Technical skill training needs of partners need to be further assessed and addressed so that access and use the platform reaches its full potential and applicability;
- e. More effort is needed to coordinate and work with local government for mainstreaming potential community level investments in respective provincial and or municipal medium-term development and investment plans in order to achieve project outcomes; and
- f. Opportunities for private-public partnerships must be further developed and nurtured, until such time as local governments and the investment community are confident and capacitated in the process.

## 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 adequately assesses the relevant outcomes and impacts, as well as the achievement of objectives.	<b>S</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and evidence is available to adequately assess project relevance, effectiveness, and efficiency. Overall, however, the evidence is incomplete. There are significant gaps in regard to project implementation and execution, as well as M&E and sustainability. No ratings are provided.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	This TER was able to find some evidence of sustainability throughout the report, but it was not directly addressed.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidence presented.	<b>S</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not include actual project costs and co-financing.	<b>HU</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report does not assess M&E design or implementation.	<b>HU</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MU</b>

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