

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		54	
GEF Agency project ID		2893	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Bwindi Impenetrable National Park and Mgahinga Gorilla National Park Conservation	
Country/Countries		Uganda	
Region		Region	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		NA	
Executing agencies involved		Trust Management Board of the Mgahinga Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation; CARE/DTC; International Gorilla Conservation Project	
Private sector involvement		Not specified	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		January 24, 1995	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 12, 1995	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 31, 1999	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2000	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.43	.43
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4	4
Co-financing	IA own	1.42	1.42
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	.89	.89 ¹
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		4.43	4.43
Total Co-financing		2.31	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.74	UA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 28, 2001	

¹ In addition to the \$.89 million provided by USAID, the TE indicated that the Netherlands Government provided an additional grant of \$2.7 million to support the Mgahinga Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT) (see page 3). However, this is not accounted for in the project financing table in the TE (see Annex 2). It should also be noted that this period (1997-2002) extends beyond the project completion date. For these reasons, co-financing from the Netherlands Government is not included here.

Author of TE	Nathalie Weier Johnson (Team Leader)
TER completion date	May 9, 2016
TER prepared by	Laura Nissley
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	HS	MS	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		HL	L	ML
M&E Design		NR	NR	MU
M&E Implementation		NR	NR	U
Quality of Implementation		HS	S	MS
Quality of Execution		HS	HS	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	U	U

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not directly state the Global Environmental Objectives of the project. However, the main objective of the project was to support biodiversity conservation in the Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (BINP) and the Mgahinga Gorilla National Park (MGNP). At the time of the project design, the BINP and the MGNP in southwestern Uganda were among the most biologically diverse tropical forests in East Africa and served as critical water catchments and sources of forest products for local communities. However, due to the exploitation of forest products, the total numbers and population structures of numerous plant and animal species had deteriorated significantly. The Project Document noted that in the absence of an effective program to conserve the forest ecosystems and biological resources it was highly likely that this trend would continue and worsen to the point of total loss (PD pgs. 2-3).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not directly state the Development Objectives of the project. However, the Project Document notes that the project will support biodiversity conservation “by providing incremental support for park management and related research activities, and indirectly, by funding grants to help local community groups develop economic activities which will provide alternative means of meeting needs which were traditionally met by harvesting forest resources (e.g. timber, poles, meat, cash income).”

Under these objectives, four components were identified (TE pg. 2):

- **Institutional Structure and Function of the Mgahinga and Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT):** to establish a multi-tiered management structure to support the

implementation of the MBIFCT's activities.

- **Community Development Activities:** to support community development activities, such as alternative income-generating activities and social infrastructure projects for local communities surrounding the parks, consistent with biodiversity conservation.
- **Research Activities:** to support research activities to improve park management and park/community interactions through research on ecological and socio-economic indicators, ecosystem quality and forest resources.
- **Park Management Activities:** to help meet the incremental costs of implementing management plans for BINP and MGNP.

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

There were no changes to the project's objectives or components during implementation.

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

This TER provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project relevance.² The project was designed during the pilot phase of the GEF Partnership, and therefore, the GEF Operational Programs were not yet applicable. However, the project's objectives are consistent with the biodiversity focal area, as conceived under the pilot phase. As the Project Document notes, the project responds to GEF criteria by (1) supporting conservation of natural areas that are rich in biodiversity; the benefits of which are expected to be global in nature, (2) helping to protect the only existing population of a highly

² The TE, or Implementation Completion Report, does not provide individual ratings for project relevance, effectiveness, or efficiency.

endangered species, the Mountain Gorilla, and (3) providing economic benefits to communities to help balance negative impacts and opportunity costs arising from their proximity to national parks (pg. 8).

The project’s objectives are also consistent with Uganda’s National Environmental Action Plan (1994), which outlined priority areas for investment, including conservation of biodiversity, capacity building, and environmental awareness (PD pg. 3).

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

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project effectiveness. The project successfully established the Mgahinga and Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT), which financed grants to community-proposed employment, income generating, social infrastructure, and conservation initiatives (ICR Review, pg. 2). However, the extent to which these grant-funded activities contributed to biodiversity conservation in the Bwindi Impenetrable National Park (BINP) and the Mgahinga Gorilla National Park (MGNP) is unclear (PPAR pg. 13). Additionally, the project fell short of achieving its objective of implementing management plans for the parks.

It should be noted that the Project Document does not clearly articulate the expected results of the project (see “M&E Design at Entry”). This TER therefore relies on the loosely defined results in the TE in its analysis.

A summary of the project’s achievement, by component, is provided below:

- **Component 1: Institutional Structure and Function of the MBIFCT**
Under this component, it was expected that a multi-tiered management structure would be established to support the implementation of the MBIFCT’s activities (TE pg. 2). The TE notes that by project end, a well-functioning management structure was established with sound internal regulations and rules. Relevant institutional bodies, such as the Trust Management Board and Trust Administration Unit, were established as scheduled. Additionally, the MBIFCT effectively involved local stakeholders. For example, the project established a Local Community Steering Committee that had the authority to approve grants below \$1,000, improving community input (TE pgs. 3-4).
- **Component 2: Community Development Activities**
Under this component, it was expected that the project would support community development activities, such as alternative income-generating activities and social infrastructure projects for local communities surrounding the parks, consistent with biodiversity conservation (TE pg. 2). By project end, the MBIFCT financed 50 grants totaling \$400,000 (ICR Review, pg. 2). However, these projects focused on social infrastructure (i.e. schools and clinics) rather than income-generating activities with a clear conservation goal. The first grant cycle lasted four years (1996-

2000), and 43 of the 50 grants were completed (TE pg. 4).

- **Component 3: Research Activities**

Under this component, it was expected that the project would support research activities to improve park management and park/community interactions through research on ecological and socio-economic indicators, ecosystem quality and forest resources (TE pg. 2). Five biologically focused studies were designed by the Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC) and approved by the Trust Management Board. On the recommendation of the Midterm Review, the MBIFCT integrated research activities on a broader range of disciplines into the Ecological Monitoring Program of the ITFC (TE pg. 5). By project end, the institutional research objectives were largely achieved (ICR Review, pg. 2).

- **Component 4: Park Management Activities**

Under this component, it was expected that the project would help the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA) meet the incremental costs of implementing management plans for BINP and MGNP (TE pg. 2). Specifically, it was expected that the MBIFCT would support planning and capacity building activities such as improved boundary demarcation and expanded patrols of the parks. However, in 1996 the UWA faced a financial crisis. The MBIFCT agreed to finance basic operating costs when it became clear that implementing management plans was untenable under the circumstances (TE pg. 5).

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

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project efficiency. The Project Performance Assessment Report (PPAR)³ notes that in the beginning of the project the ratio of operating costs to grants was high. Over time, the MBIFCT gained greater control over these costs, and the World Bank's supervision mission in June 2000 found that the administrative costs for the program were an acceptable proportion given the rate of disbursements (PPAR pg. 20). On the other hand, the project did experience delays in identifying, preparing, and supervising community development activities. The TE notes that these delays were in large part due to high staff turnover within the Trust Administration Unit and an insufficient number of community program officers to appraise and supervise projects. The TE also noted that the Trust Management Board prolonged performance appraisals, financial projections, and the annual audit (TE pg. 7). The project was extended to allow the World Bank to continue to supervise the MBIFCT's activities for an additional year (TE pg. 8).

³ The PPAR, prepared by the World Bank Independent Evaluation Group, assesses the programs and activities of the World Bank to ensure the integrity of the Bank's self-evaluation process and to verify that the Bank's work is producing the expected results. The PPAR for this project was prepared in 2007.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Likely** for project sustainability, which this TER adjusts to **Moderately Likely**. The TE does not indicate any sociopolitical or institutional risks that could undermine the continuation of project benefits, including the continuation of the Mgahinga and Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT). However, there are moderate risks to financial sustainability, including the high operational costs of the MBIFCT and uncertain co-financing after 2002.

Financial Resources

This TER provides a rating of **Moderately Likely** for financial sustainability. The TE estimates that the MBIFCT will have reserves of \$.8 million to support community development activities for at least twenty years after project end. Additionally, the MBIFCT was able to leverage funding from USAID (1995-1997) and the Netherlands Government (1997-2002) to cover operating costs for the first seven years of the Fund (TE pg. 8). However, the ICR Review notes that the overhead costs remained high, and without additional financing it was unclear if the MBIFCT could sustain the community development grants in the long-term (pg. 2).

Sociopolitical

This TER provides a rating of **Likely** for sociopolitical sustainability. The TE does not indicate any political risks that could undermine the sustainability of the project's outcomes. The TE notes that the community development activities increased awareness of the project and efforts to conserve the parks (TE pg. 8). Additionally, the establishment of the Local Community Steering Committee (LCSC) ensured a degree of community ownership over the project. In addition to their authority to approve community development plans less than \$1000, the LCSC has three voting seats on the Trust Management Board (TE pg. 4).

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

This TER provides a rating of **Likely** for the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance. The TE does not cite any deficiencies in the legal frameworks and policies that could affect the sustainability of the project's outcomes. The TE does note that the MBIFCT has the appropriate institutional frameworks and technical know-how in place to sustain itself (TE pg. 4).

Environmental

The TE does not provide enough information to assess the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance.

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?

It is likely that actual co-financing exceeded expected co-financing. This TER is unable to confirm actual co-financing during the period the project was open (1995-2000). USAID did contribute the expected \$.89 million to cover the Mgahinga and Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust's (MBIFCT) operating costs from 1995-1997. The MBIFCT also secured an additional \$2.7 million from the Netherlands Government to cover operating costs from 1997-2002, extending beyond the life of the project. Documentation is unavailable to confirm what portion was contributed during project implementation.

The TE does note that by financing the costly start-up of the project, the co-financers allowed the MBIFCT to build-up its capital by reinvesting its income. The capital raised by the MBIFCT should ensure the sustainability of the Fund (pg. 10).

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 notes that the project experienced moderate delays in project implementation in large part due to high staff turnover within the Trust Administration Unit and an insufficient number of community program officers to appraise and supervise projects (TE pg. 7). However, there is no indication that these delays affected the project's outcomes or sustainability. The project completion date was extended from December 31, 1999 to December 31, 2000 to allow the World Bank to continue to supervise the MBIFCT's activities for an additional year (TE pg. 8).

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 does not directly address country ownership in its analysis, however there is evidence that the affected communities played a key role in the execution of the MBIFCT. A Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), comprising academics, lawyers, government officials and other experts, was established to review community development and research activities. Additionally, a Local Community Steering Committee (LCSC) was established, with members from the three administrative districts adjoining the parks, as well as NGO partners and the Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation (ITFC). The LCSC had the authority to approve community development plans less than \$1000 and three members also had seats on the Trust Management Board (TE pg. 4).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E Design at Entry, while this TER provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The PPAR notes that at the time of the project design, neither the World Bank nor the GEF required the development of a results framework (pg. 25). However, the Project Document does not clearly articulate the expected outputs, outcomes, and impacts. Notably absent are the expected biodiversity conservation outcomes, in addition to indicators of change. The Project Document does outline a general plan that includes key M&E activities such as implementing a baseline study, developing and monitoring key performance indicators, and conducting a midterm and final review. The Project Document even notes that the monitoring of indicators “should feed into the day to day decisions on park management and into the process of screening proposals for the use of Trust funds” (Annex 7, pg. 5). Overall however, the M&E plan is too general and a dedicated budget is not provided.

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

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E implementation, while this TER provides a rating of **Unsatisfactory**. The PPAR notes that a formal M&E system was not in place to collect data on indicators and track causal linkages to explain the project's impacts (pg. 27). The ICR Review goes so far as to note that M&E was “absent” during project implementation (pg. 2). The PPAR and the TE provide some evidence that ad hoc M&E activities were conducted, including the monitoring of biodiversity trends in the Mgahinga and Bwindi parks through the Ecological Monitoring Program (PPAR pg. 26; TE pg. 13). Additionally, a Midterm Review was conducted in 1998 and the project used some of its findings to address shortfalls in project implementation (TE pg. 9). Overall however, M&E implementation had significant shortcomings and the project was not able to adequately track changes in biodiversity. The TE attempted to retrofit a results framework to the project, however as the PPAR notes, this retrospective framework was a “self-fulfilling prophecy” (pg. 25).

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 Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for the World Bank’s performance. This TER adjusts this rating to **Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation. The TE and the PPAR both indicate that the project preparation phase was extensive, and that the design was innovative and well-defined (TE pg. 8; PPAR pg. 22). However, the project design did not clearly articulate the expected results, particularly the expected biodiversity conservation outcomes. Additionally, the proposed M&E plan was weak, and did not provide indicators and targets for assessing project performance. On the other hand, the World Bank’s supervision of project implementation was satisfactory. The TE notes that the World Bank undertook ten official supervision missions, in addition to many informal supervision visits and consultative meetings (pg. 8). The PPAR also notes that the World Bank’s reviews of the project’s administration and operations were thorough, and produced recommendations that “reflected a flexible and realistic understanding of the factors affecting the project” (pg. 23). The high caliber of project supervision justifies a rating of Moderately Satisfactory for quality of project implementation.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for borrower performance. This TER adjusts this rating to **Moderately Satisfactory** for quality of project execution. The executing agency for this project was the Trust Management Board (TMB) of the Mgahinga Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT), which was established as an independent body under Ugandan Law (Final Executive Project Summary, pg. 3). Government agencies, such as the Uganda Wildlife Authority (UWA), were represented on the TMB. The TE notes that the TMB, with support of the Trust Administration Unit (TAU), executed the project in a professional manner. In particular, the TE notes that the TMB performed its procurement, financial management, and reporting functions well (pg. 9). The project did experience delays in implementation due to high staff turnover within the TAU, affecting the appraisal and supervision of community development activities (TE pg. 7). Additionally, an M&E system for tracking project performance was largely absent. As a result, it is difficult to ascertain the biodiversity conservation outcomes (if any) of the project.

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 cite any environmental changes that occurred by project end.

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 cite any socioeconomic changes that occurred by project end. The Mgahinga and Bwindi Impenetrable Forest Conservation Trust (MBIFCT) financed 50 community development grants focused on social infrastructure (i.e. schools and clinics), however the project did not have an M&E system in place for tracking any socioeconomic changes resulting from these grants.

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 project end, the MBIFCT had the appropriate institutional frameworks and technical know-how in place to sustain itself (TE pg. 4). Additionally, the MBIFCT contributed to strengthening the Ecological Monitoring Project of the Institute of Tropical Forest Conservation (TE pg. 5).

b) Governance

The TE does not cite any changes in governance that occurred by project end.

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 cite any unintended impacts that occurred by project end.

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

The TE does not cite any GEF initiatives that have been adopted at scale by the end 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 outlined the following lessons learned (pg. 10):

- **Conservation Trust Fund.** A well-designed conservation trust fund, such as the MBIFCT, can provide a stable and permanent source of funds for the parks management applied research and community development projects. The success of the MBIFCT to attract additional donors; increase its capital through investments; establish a permanent presence in and around the parks; and address park management research and community development issues through the provision of reliable and continuous financing can be considered a model for best practices. However, the complexity of trust funds requires that sufficient technical assistance be provided to guide the process.
- **Decentralized decision-making process.** The decentralized decision-making process of the MBIFCT allowed for genuine stakeholder participation and integrity in governance. The division of power between the Local Community Steering Committee and the Trust Management Board expedited the implementation of community-based projects, while still allowing for careful financial management of the trust.
- **Start-Up Funds/Donor Support.** The co-financing of the project's administrative costs by USAID and DGIS allowed the project to build-up its capital by reinvesting its income and not depending

upon the initial investment income to finance the costly start-up of the project. The co-financing for the first 7 years provided the necessary window to buildup enough capital to hopefully maintain the trust in perpetuity.

- **Phased Community Development Activities.** Dividing the community development activities into distinct granting phases allowed for different thematic approaches, adequate preparation and implementation time, and was consistent with the absorptive capacity of recipient groups. Restricting the application process also helped control recipients and avoided an influx of migrants seeking funds.
- **Innovative Partnership.** The cooperation of Government and non-government organizations, including the private sector, in an innovative partnership arrangement was essential to the political neutrality and longevity of the MBIFCT. The partnership helps to diversify the stakeholder basis for conservation of the parks and allowed for different stakeholders to work together to identify and achieve common objectives.
- **Project Preparation.** The investment in both time and resources, which were dedicated to the participatory preparation process of the project, allowed the team to fully develop the institutional structure for the Trust including the detailed Trust Administration Manual. The clear direction for the project that was established during preparation contributed to the ultimate success of the project.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE did not provide recommendations.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE provides a general description of the community development, research, and park management activities that were executed under the project. However, it does not adequately assess the outcomes and impacts of these activities. Not enough attention is paid to the biodiversity outcomes (or lack thereof) of the project.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Although the TE is internally consistent, the evidence provided is incomplete and the ratings are not well-substantiated.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE provides limited information regarding financial and sociopolitical sustainability.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the (limited) evidence provided. Recommendations should have been provided, especially given the innovative nature of MBIFCT.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE does provide the actual project costs by component. However, it does not provide complete co-financing information (i.e. Netherlands Government).	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE provides misleading information regarding M&E. Other sources confirmed that there was not an M&E system in place. The TE does provide some information regarding the Midterm Review.	U
Overall TE Rating		U

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

Project Performance Assessment Report (World Bank Independent Evaluation Group, 2007)

Implementation Completion Report Review (OEDST, 2001)

Final Executive Project Summary (World Bank, 1993).