

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5525	
GEF Agency project ID		1163	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Global Project on the Updating of National Implementation Plans for POPs	
Country/Countries		Cook Islands, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Tonga, Yemen	
Region		Global (Africa and Asia and the Pacific)	
Focal area		POPs	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CHEM-4 Enabling Activity	
Executing agencies involved		Cook Islands: National Environment Service; Marshall Islands: Not indicated; Nauru: Department of Commerce, Industry and Environment; Papua New Guinea: Conservation and Environment Protection Authority; Pakistan: Ministry of Climate Change; Sierra Leone: Environment Protection Agency; Tonga: Ministry of Meteorology, Energy, Information, Disaster Management, Environment, Climate Change and Communications; Yemen: Not indicated	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not applicable	
Private sector involvement		Not applicable	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		November 2013	
Effectiveness date / project start		Varies by country ¹	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		May 2016	
Actual date of project completion		Varies by country ²	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1.32	.65
Co-financing	IA own	.15	
	Government	.84	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
	Other		
Total GEF funding		1.32	.65

¹ **Cook Islands:** June 2014; **Marshall Islands:** June 2014; **Nauru:** January 2015; **Papua New Guinea:** March 31, 2014; **Pakistan:** November 2014; **Sierra Leone:** January 2016; **Tonga:** June 2014; **Yemen:** Not indicated (activities cancelled).

² **Cook Islands:** December 31, 2018; **Marshall Islands:** May 31, 2017; **Nauru:** March 31, 2019; **Papua New Guinea:** May 31, 2018; **Pakistan:** March 31, 2019; **Sierra Leone:** December 2018; **Tonga:** June 30, 2018; **Yemen:** Not indicated (activities cancelled).

Total Co-financing	.99	Unable to Assess ³
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	2.31	Unable to Assess
Terminal evaluation/review information		
TE completion date	June 2019	
Author of TE	Cristóbal Vignal; Suman Lederer; Petr Sharov; and Katim S. Touray	
TER completion date	May 4, 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	--	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	--	UA
M&E Design		S	--	MS
M&E Implementation		MS	--	MS
Quality of Implementation		--	--	MS
Quality of Execution		--	--	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	HS	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is to “Assist countries to review and update the National Implementation Plan (NIP) in order to comply with reporting obligations (Article 15) and updating of National Implementation Plans (Article 7) under the Stockholm Convention” (PD pg. 1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not indicate Development Objectives separate from the Global Environmental Objective.

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

The project design did not change during implementation, however activities in Yemen were suspended due to “a lack of progress or response” (TE pg. 26). The TE also notes that a “Global Component” was “conceived retroactively as a quality assurance mechanism to ensure that documents prepared by the countries would be reviewed prior to their submission to the Secretariat of the Stockholm Convention” (pg. 67).

³ The TE provides inconsistent co-financing information.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project relevance. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project was designed as an add-on to the GEF umbrella project “Global Project on the Updating of National Implementation Plans for POPs [Persistent Organic Pollutants]” (GEF FSP 5307), which provided 27 countries with assistance in reviewing and updating their National Implementation Plans (NIPs) in order to comply with their obligations under the Stockholm Convention. The GEF add-on project allowed for support to an additional eight countries: Cook Islands, Marshall Islands, Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Tonga, and Yemen. The umbrella project and the add-on project were both implemented under the GEF-5 Chemicals Enabling Activities modality, specifically Outcome 4.1: *NIPs prepared or updated or national implications of new POPs assessed* (TE pg. 11). The projects’ objective was also consistent with the national development priorities and strategies of the participating countries. Specifically, the TE indicates that the projects “built on the momentum of the national coordinating mechanisms established during the NIP development process and contributed to strengthening countries’ established capacities for the sound management of chemicals” (pg. 41).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. It should be noted that the TE evaluates project effectiveness across the umbrella project countries and add-on countries, whereas this TER is concerned solely with the performance of the add-on countries. It is also important to note that five of the eight add-on countries were Small Island Developing States (SIDS), whose performance the TE indicates was Moderately Satisfactory compared to non-SIDS countries which were rated as Highly Satisfactory (pg. 50). Overall, there were moderate shortcomings in the achievement of project outcomes in the add-on countries.

The Marshall Islands did not achieve any of the expected outcomes, and activities in Yemen were cancelled due to a lack of progress or response (TE pg. 26).

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

Outcome 1: Institutional strengthening through national coordination

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Key stakeholders and roles identified and agreed; (2) Initial assessment of institutional needs and strengths; and (3) Coordination mechanism for POPs management in place. By project end, expected results were achieved in all countries, with the exception of the Marshall Islands, which reported no progress (TE pgs. 48-59).

Outcome 2: Comprehensive information on current POPs control measures, management practices, use and impacts, provides the basis for identifying POPs issues of concern and planning sound actions to address them

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Comprehensive overview of national infrastructure and regulatory framework to manage POPs available; (2) Quantitative and qualitative inventories covering all 22 POPs available, including updated inventories for POPs covered in the initial NIP and first inventories for newly-listed POPs; and (3) Overview of POPs impacts to human health and the environment available. By project end, expected results were fully achieved in four of the target countries (Cook Islands; Papua New Guinea; Pakistan; and Sierra Leone). Nauru and Tonga completed assessments of the regulatory and institutional frameworks for POPs and developed inventories, however they did not deliver a report on POP impacts. The Marshall Islands reported no progress under this outcome (TE pgs. 48-59).

Outcome 3: Sound and cost-effective actions to address POPs issues of concern are facilitated by the availability of well-prepared and costed action plans

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) National progress made on original POPs management analyzed and available to all stakeholders; (2) Action Plans for all POPs developed and/or updated and validated by all stakeholders; and (3) Gap analysis report available to all stakeholders. By project end, expected results were achieved in two countries: The Cook Islands and Sierra Leone. The TE indicates that Nauru, Papua New Guinea, and Pakistan completed more than half of the expected results, although this is not sufficiently elaborated in the TE. The Marshall Islands and Tonga reported no progress under this outcome (TE pgs. 48-59).

Outcome 4: Improved understanding of all POPs for cost-effective actions to address priority POPs issues allows each country to develop national and coherent strategies to reduce POPs risks in the country and to meet the obligations of the Stockholm Convention

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Revised national objectives and priorities for POPs, including new POPs; and (2) Draft revised NIP available to all stakeholders. By project end, The Cook Islands was the only country to complete all expected results. The TE indicates that progress was made in Nauru, Papua New Guinea, Pakistan, and Sierra Leone under this outcome, although the NIPs were not available by project end. The Marshall Islands and Tonga reported no progress under this outcome (TE pgs. 48-59).

Outcome 5: NIP endorsed by key stakeholders for transmission to the Secretariat confirms government's commitment to implement Stockholm Convention at all levels

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Outreach strategy report- includes consultations with key national stakeholders; and (2) NIP endorsed by the Government. By project end, no country had successfully achieved all of the expected results under this outcome. The TE indicates that more than half of the results were completed in The Cook Islands, Nauru, and Pakistan, although this is not fully elaborated. In Sierra Leone, an outreach strategy was developed but the NIP had yet to be endorsed. In Papua New Guinea, the review of the NIP was initiated but not completed. The Marshall Islands and Tonga reported no progress under this outcome (TE pgs. 48-59).

“Global” Outcome: Enhanced communication and sharing information to enable Parties to compare and harmonize data and identify lessons learned and good practices

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) Lessons learned identified and disseminated; (2) Initial needs and opportunities for exchange of information and expertise identified; and (3) Regional/global training support provided and information exchange encouraged. The TE indicates that the expected results under this outcome were delivered in all project countries, although no additional information is provided (pg. 53).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unable to Assess
----------------	---------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for project efficiency. However, the TE does not provide enough information to assess the efficiency of the add-on project taken on its own. The TE broadly indicates that both projects experienced delays in implementation, in part due to high turnover in the position of UN Environment Task Manager (pg. 47). The TE also indicates that the GEF umbrella project received a one-year extension in order to “allow project objectives to be achieved,” but it is unclear how this affected the add-on project. Overall, the TE notes that the “Evaluation Team was not made aware of any concerns regarding cost effectiveness or costliness and considers that although to date the project has not delivered all of the expected results, those achieved have been delivered at a reasonable cost” (pg. 65).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unable to Assess
--------------------	---------------------------------

The TE assesses the overall sustainability of project outcomes to be **Moderately Likely**. The TE uses data from in-depth country studies to support its sustainability ratings, however none of these countries are from the add-on project. This TER is therefore unable to assess the sustainability of project outcomes in the add-on countries specifically. The TE provides the following evidence for the sustainability of outcomes across both projects.

Financial Resources

The TE rates the sustainability of financial resources as **Moderately Likely**. The TE indicates that the approval of the National Implementation Plans (NIPs) is not dependent on future funding. However, the TE notes that fully addressing the countries' obligations under the Stockholm Convention will require future funding, and that this is unlikely to come from the national governments. The TE indicates that a project was submitted for consideration under GEF-7 funding which would help address this concern (pg. 69). It is unclear which countries would be targeted under the new project.

Sociopolitical

The TE rates sociopolitical sustainability as **Likely**. The TE indicates that there was a "fairly strong degree of ownership" over project outcomes, which are aligned with national, regional, and international priorities (pg. 68). However, it is clear that in at-least two of the add-on countries—Yemen and The Marshall Islands—ownership was low.

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE rates the sustainability of institutional frameworks as **Likely**. The TE indicates that the outcomes have a low degree of dependency on the institutions. The TE notes that "once the NIPs have been approved and streamlined into policies and priorities it is considered likely that this will continue to be implemented as part of the commitments contracted under the Stockholm Convention" (pg. 69).

Environmental

The TE does not assess 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 indicates that the Evaluation Team was not provided with complete co-financing information (pg. 33). However, the TE reports inconsistent levels of co-financing for the add-on project. In the Project Summary Table (pg. 10) actual co-financing is reported as \$.41 million, whereas in the Summary of Co-Finance Table (pg. 78) it is reported as \$.25. In either case, actual co-financing appears to have been lower than the expected \$.99 million. The TE does not indicate the effect of co-financing on 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 does indicate that both projects experienced delays in implementation, in part due to high turnover in the position of UN Environment Task Manager. The TE also indicates that the GEF umbrella

project received a one-year extension in order to “allow project objectives to be achieved,” but it is unclear how this affected the add-on project (pg. 47).

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 there was a fairly strong degree of ownership over project outcomes (pg. 68). However, activities were cancelled in Yemen due to a lack of progress or response (TE pg. 26). Additionally, ownership in The Marshall Islands appears to have been low, given that none of the project’s results were achieved.

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

The TE assesses M&E design at entry as **Satisfactory**, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The results framework includes the project’s goal, objective, and outcomes, however lower level results (i.e. outputs) are missing. Instead, the results framework includes a description of the project’s activities under specific outcomes. This gap in the project’s results chain makes the framework less effective as a project monitoring tool. Additionally, the indicators of change provided in the framework are of mixed quality. For example, “Institutional needs and strengths report” and “Overview of national objectives and priorities” are not SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely) indicators. On the other hand, the TE indicates that the project’s M&E plan specifies the organizational arrangements, responsibilities and structures for monitoring and reviewing/adapting progress of project implementation. The TE does note that the monitoring role of the UNEP Project Manager could have been more clearly defined in the M&E plan. An overall budget is not provided for M&E activities, although budgets per country do include \$2,000-\$4,000 for the TE (pg. 66).

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

The TE assesses the “monitoring of project implementation” as **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE indicates that the monitoring systems were put in place by the executing agencies and as such, were in

line with their individual standards. The TE assesses the monitoring of project activities as “adequate,” however the report acknowledges that tracking the achievement of project outcomes and the overall project objective was limited by the “inadequacy of indicators”. The TE indicates that the project was only “superficially monitored” by UNEP early on, however following the appointment of new Task Manager in 2015 monitoring improved (pg. 67). Overall, this TER concurs with the TE, and provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for 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: Moderately Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for the overall performance of the project’s implementing agency, the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP). Overall, the project design was highly relevant to the countries’ national priorities and international commitments, despite weaknesses in the project’s results framework. The project did experience delays in implementation due to high turnover in the position of UN Environment Task Manager. However, the TE indicates that project monitoring stabilized after the hiring of the current Task Manager in 2015 (pg. 67). An additional full-time staff person was also hired to closely monitor and follow-up on implementation. The TE notes that “this support helped bring the Project back on track and has contributed to the development of more systematic UN Environment supervision systems” (pg. 67). Overall, this TER assesses the quality of project implementation as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to Assess
----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not address the performance of the project’s executing agencies, and therefore this TER is unable to assess the quality of project execution.

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.

Not applicable as the project is centered on assisting countries with reviewing and updating their National Implementation Plans (NIPs).

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.

Not applicable as the project is centered on assisting countries with reviewing and updating their National Implementation Plans (NIPs).

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

With the exception of the Marshall Islands, coordination mechanisms for Persistent Organic Pollutants (POPs) management were in place in all participating countries by project end (TE pg. 56). The Cook Islands, Papua New Guinea, Pakistan, Sierra Leone, Nauru, and Tonga completed assessments of the regulatory and institutional frameworks for POPs, as well as updating or developing inventories of POPs. The Cook Islands, Papua New Guinea, Pakistan, and Sierra Leone also submitted reports on POPs impacts (TE pgs. 56-57). Additionally, The Cook Islands and Sierra Leone successfully completed action plans for all POPs as well as delivering a gap analysis report to all stakeholders (TE pg. 57). Although progress was made on drafting National

Implementation Plans (NIPs) in most of the countries participating in the add-on project, The Cook Islands was the only country where a draft NIP was available to stakeholders by project end (TE pg. 58).

b) Governance

The TE does not indicate any changes in governance that took place 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 indicate 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 indicate any GEF initiatives that were adopted at scale.

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 (pg. 17):

1. The implementation and long-term mainstreaming of project priorities is greatly improved when a multi-sectoral inter-ministerial Steering Committee takes the wheel and effectively assumes ownership. This is further strengthened when not the government, but civil society and industry are closely involved in the design and implementation of activities, contributing to continuously build stakeholder capacity and increase awareness of POPs.
2. Use of national consultants helps increase the likelihood of the sustainability of the project's intended results.
3. Assumptions regarding capacities were not always correct and this lack of capacities and/or other constraints, in particular among women, leads to not all stakeholders participating at the expected levels, and this is not deemed to be a voluntary lack of participation.
4. Unrealistic project implementation timeframes that are not modified prior to the initiation of activities, contribute to no-cost extensions. In addition, delays in the disbursement of funds from UN Environment as well as other administrative hurdles can further hinder timely

implementation. Budgets that are generally considered low may lead to key activities not taking place (for example, here the low budgets did not allow for thorough field work or laboratory analyses to take place and to support completion of the inventories. Low budgets may also further contribute to delays.

5. Guidelines for carrying out activities using project-led approaches need to be updated and adapted to national conditions (for example, here conducting POPs inventories, and the Toolkit for preparing the NIP were helpful but needed to be updated and adapted to national conditions).
6. The use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) can be very helpful in tracking physical installations (for example, here GIS was useful in monitoring transformers which uses POPs).
7. Guidelines on resource mobilization, and funding mechanisms (including co-financing) available to support project approaches are needed (for example, here such guidelines would have supported the measures to be taken on POPs). In this project co-finance was provided and spent, however, not documented. With guidelines on resource mobilization, and funding mechanisms (including co-financing) available to support measures taken on POPs, the funds available for the project area likely to have been greater and consequently, increased its impact.
8. Financial reporting based on Components supports results based management.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pgs. 17-19):

1. To ensure sustainability of this and other interventions, UN Environment should strongly urge Governments to continue to support the work of Steering Committees by ensuring these are mainstreamed into the respective permanent coordinating structures. Similarly, UNEP should strongly advise Governments to seek to mobilize resources in support of the activities and/or provide additional resources to continue POPs related sensitization activities and implement strategies developed by the project, actively sharing information with stakeholders.
2. UNEP should urge Government and development partners to provide stakeholders (especially civil society sector as well as women and marginalized groups) with training and guidelines in resource mobilization, co-financing and funding mechanisms available to support efforts to eliminate POPs.
3. In future work, the capacities of local staff and consultants involved in all aspects of POPs management should be continuously strengthened, and more nationals should be provided with additional and advanced training in POPs management to mitigate the effects of attrition of trained personnel over time.
4. UN Environment projects aimed at improving POPs management, and sensitizing the public about POPs, should pay particular attention to the needs of women and youths and ways to engage them effectively in nation-wide behavior changing initiatives.
5. Vulnerable groups, and in particular women, should be actively sought out and provided with awareness raising materials and information to support efforts to eliminate POPs and reduce their exposure, thereby protecting their health.

6. UN Environment/Stockholm Convention Secretariat should continue to provide backstopping support to the governments to consolidate the project's impacts.
7. When projects are designed for implementation in countries in conflict or having recently emerged from situations of conflict, UN Environment should ensure that timeframes are adjusted to address national realities and avoid having to obtain "no-cost extensions"; these extensions affect the in-kind contribution of the countries and of the UN Environment from personnel (oversight, meetings, financial), which are likely to end up being more than originally estimated. This information was not captured in the reports provided to the Evaluation Team and in this sense, UN Environment should take a proactive role regarding following-up on pledged co-finance.
8. Furthermore, co-financing should be rigorously tracked and disbursements of funding tranches tied to the availability of reports. Reports (including financial reports and audits) and budgets should be organized according to Components, Activities, and Outputs. In addition, when audits are carried out, Management Responses to these Audit Reports should be provided to Evaluators.
9. Similarly, when projects are designed to be implemented in SIDS, UN Environment should pay particular attention and closely follow up with the Regional Centers of the Conventions as well as UN Environment Regional Representations to ensure and support their full involvement. It is of particular [importance] to ensure UN Environment representation at Inception Workshops (regional or not) to clarify expectations in support of timely implementation. Finally, UN Environment should strongly support the recruitment of a Regional Technical Body, not only to coordinate meetings, but above all to provide technical support to these SIDS, this could also play a significant role in ensuring timely and effective implementation.
10. Given the importance of providing full access to information to Evaluators, it is strongly recommended UN Environment ensure that all efforts are made to evaluate projects only after all activities have been completed and they have been properly and fully closed. This will ensure that financial reports at closure, as well as Final Project Reports, are available at the time of writing of Final Evaluations.
11. Future budgets for this kind of work should be enough to cover the country and required field or laboratory work, or be used for a solidly designed pilot project in a few strategically selected regions.

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?	Given the number of countries covered in this evaluation, the TE does an adequate job of assessing the relevant outcomes. However, the TE does not sufficiently delineate the achievement of results in the initial countries vs. the add-on project. Additionally, the use of the “more/less than half of results completed” scale was not particularly effective at conveying the project’s achievements.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The supplementary material provided in the separate report did not fully address the gaps in information regarding the add-on countries. None of the countries selected for in-depth studies were from the add-on project.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability section is supported with evidence from the country studies, which did not include the add-on countries.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned were comprehensive and consistent with the evidence provided in the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE indicates that the Evaluation was provided with incomplete financial data. However, actual co-financing is reported inconsistently.	MU
Assess the quality of the report’s evaluation of project M&E systems:	The evaluation of project M&E systems was satisfactory.	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

Volume III: Supplementary Material to the Main Evaluation Report (April 2019)