

Terminal Evaluation Validation form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5712	
GEF Agency project ID		-	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		Conservation International (CI)	
Project name		Improve sustainability of mangrove forests and coastal mangrove areas in Liberia through protection, planning and livelihood creation – as a building block towards Liberia's marine and coastal protected areas	
Country/Countries		Liberia	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF 5 Objective 1: Improve sustainability of protected area systems; GEF 5 Objective 2: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/ seascapes and sector.	
Stand alone or under a programmatic framework		Stand alone	
If applicable, parent program name and GEF ID		NA	
Executing agencies involved		CI-Liberia, as the main executing body. Executing partners: Environmental Protection Agency (EPA Liberia) Forestry Development Authority (FDA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		-	
Private sector involvement (including micro, small and medium enterprises) ¹		-	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval (MSP) date		March 17, 2016	
Effectiveness date / project start date		May 15, 2016	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		May 31, 2019	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2019	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.091	0.091
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		0.964	0.964
Co-financing	IA own	1.300	not specified
	Government	2.350	not specified
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CBOs	-	-
	Other	-	-
Total GEF funding		1.055	1.055

¹ Defined as all micro, small, and medium-scale profit-oriented entities, including individuals and informal entities, that earn income through the sale of goods and services rather than a salary. ([GEF IEO 2022](#))

Total Co-financing	3.650	3.676
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)	4.705	4.731
Terminal evaluation validation information		
TE completion date	July 9, 2020	
Author of TE	The Khana Group (TKG)	
TER completion date	November 30 2022	
TER prepared by	Mariana Vidal Merino	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Neeraj Kumar Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S ²	HS	—	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	—	ML
M&E Design		S	—	S
M&E Implementation		S	—	S
Quality of Implementation		HS	—	S
Quality of Execution		HS	—	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			—	MS

3. Project Objectives and theory of change

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The overall project objective is "to strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of Liberia's globally important mangrove forests through effective participatory land-use planning and establishment of marine protected areas in at least 35% of Liberia's mangroves" (PD, p. 38).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

Neither the Terminal Evaluation (TE) nor the Project Document (PD) indicates any direct project development objectives besides the overall project objective.

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or project activities during implementation? What are the reasons given for the change(s)?

No changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or project activities were reported in the TE and the Final Project Implementation Report (PIR 2017-2019).

3.4 Briefly summarize project's theory of change – describe the inputs and causal relationships through which the project will achieve its long-term impacts, key links, and key assumptions.

In Liberia, mangrove deforestation is widespread. Main threats to Liberia's mangroves include (i) infrastructure development, such as illegal structures for housing; (ii) agriculture expansion, particularly for swamp rice production; (iii) Illegal sand mining; (iv) use of mangrove wood for fuelwood, charcoal, and fish smoking; and (v) unregulated waste disposal (TE, p.11).

To meet these challenges, policy actors and stakeholders need to address constraints related to (i) a weak legal environment; (ii) low capacity at the individual and institutional levels and both national and local levels; (iii) inadequate funding to address key challenges, (iv) community-level poverty and lack of decent employment thereby shifting pressure on the mangrove environment as communities seek opportunities for economic livelihood; and (v) lack of public knowledge and awareness.

² Project implementation report for the period of July 1, 2017 to June 30, 2019.

The project aims "to strengthen the conservation and sustainable use of globally important mangrove forests through effective participatory land-use planning and establishment of coastal protected areas in at least 35% of Liberia's mangroves". This will be achieved by "generating enabling conditions for the establishment of coastal and marine protected areas in 20% of priority mangrove forests" and by "reducing pressures on an additional 15% of priority mangrove areas through integrated land-use planning, improving local community livelihoods and increasing stakeholders' capacity and awareness" (PD, p. 68). In the long term, the project will improve the sustainability of protected area systems (GEF 5 Objective 1) and mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/ seascapes and sectors (GEF 5 Objective 2).

The PD specifies several outcome-level key assumptions for project success. These include the support of local communities to establish new protected areas, the endorsement of plans developed under this project by the Government of Liberia, the support of local authorities to communities participating in land use planning activities, and the interest and engagement of government agencies, among others (PD, pp. 47-48).

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

The outcome ratings (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and overall outcome rating) are on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory. The sustainability rating is on a four point scale: Likely to Unlikely.

Please justify the ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance and Coherence	Rating: Highly Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates the project relevance as **Highly Satisfactory**, and this review concurs.

The project is consistent with GEF 5 Biodiversity, Objectives 1, "Improve sustainability of protected area systems", and Objective 2 ", Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use into production landscapes/ seascapes and sectors".

It is also in line with Liberia's national priorities, such as the Agenda for Transformation (2012 – 2017), Liberia's Protected Areas Network Strategy (2006), National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan (2015 – 2025), and the National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA) (2008), among others (PD, p.28).

The project is consistent with CI's mandate to "implement transboundary ocean management that sustains significant improvements in people's lives while safeguarding a consolidated network of Marine Protected Areas (MPA), well-managed mangrove gulfs, and a sustainable fishery and tourism industry" (PD, p. 25).

The TE notes that the project has excellent logic, is well-targeted and appropriate for delivering the expected outcomes.

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

The TE assesses the project as **Highly Satisfactory**, whereas this review rates it as **Satisfactory**. The TE notes that the project effectively accomplished nearly all its expected outcomes. The project had significant progress towards achieving its long-term objective of strengthening the conservation and sustainable use of Liberia's mangrove forests.

Expected targets under Component 1 were met and exceeded. A total of 24.4% (of an initial target of 15%) of priority mangrove areas were identified, delineated, and management plans to safeguard them were completed. Also, 14.5% (of an initial target of 5%) of priority mangrove forests were safeguarded through community conservation and other legal mechanisms. Only one output level indicator, "Gazettement packages prepared for establishment of two coastal protected areas in Liberia and submitted to Cabinet for endorsement", was partially achieved. The gazettement for the Marshall Proposed Protected Area was not finalized due to the passing of the 2019 Land Rights Act, which added additional requirements that were not anticipated and couldn't be met within the remaining project time (TE, p. 22).

Expected targets under Component 2 were mostly met. By the end of the project, 14.5% (of an initial target of 15%) of additional priority mangrove forest land-use planning was integrated and mainstreamed on the broader landscape (surrounding buffer areas) and subjected to 5-year M&E program for adaptive management. An estimated 14.5% (of an initial target of 15%) of avoided deforestation within the buffer areas surrounding priority sites was secured via conservation agreements with communities. A total of 514 government officials (of an initial target of 50) and 4058 community members (of an initial target of 1000 people) participated in meetings and received training on the key threats to and benefits provided by mangrove forests in Liberia (TE, p. 27).

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

The TE assesses the project efficiency as **Highly Satisfactory**. This review rates the project efficiency as **Satisfactory**.

As of June 30, 2019, the project had spent a total of USD 4.61 million, equivalent to 99.9% of the project budget. The GEF grant of USD 0.934 million was executed at 97%, and the co-financing of USD 3.680 million at 101%.

The project start date was May 15, 2016, and it was expected to be completed by May 31, 2019. The TE notes that CI-Liberia performed execution functions on the project from July 1, 2017, to June 30, 2019. At the time of the TE, the project was in a no-cost extension period to perform the evaluation exercise (TE, p. 9).

The final PIR (2017-2019) and the TE report minor delays in project activities. The proposed activities for the gazettement of the Marshall proposed protected area were concluded as planned. However, a few months before the end of the project, the government requested additional assessments, which could not be done by the project (PIR2017-2019, p. 7).

Project implementation, especially M&E activities, were affected by challenges such as the resignation of the project manager, political transition, and challenges around inadequate transport infrastructure. Furthermore, there was a substantial misalignment between the initial M&E budget and its actual implementation cost. All these factors led to delays and readjustments of the M&E system (TE, p. 43).

4.4 Outcome	Rating: Satisfactory
-------------	----------------------

The TE rates the project outcomes as Highly Satisfactory, whereas this review assesses it to be **Satisfactory**. The project made significant accomplishments regarding its five project outcomes. The TE notes "a transformative impact on communities, policy, national institutions, and local human and technical capacity at all levels" (TE, p. 2). The project and its results framework were relevant and fully consistent with national laws, policies and national development plan. It was also aligned with CI-GEF Agency program focus (TE, p. 2).

Key outcomes related to environment, human well-being, and enabling conditions (Policy, Legal & Institutional Development; Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building; Knowledge Exchange & Learning; Multistakeholder Interactions) are summarized below:

A. Environmental Change. The last PIR (2017-2019, pp. 3-6) reports 3,295 hectares of mangrove forest (11.5% of priority mangrove forests in Liberia) incorporated in areas designated for formal protection. Additional 4,146 hectares of mangroves were protected through community-based conservation agreements (equivalent to 14.5% of the total priority mangrove area).

The project collected substantive information on mangroves' extent, biodiversity and threats, including the identification of six species of mangroves; biodiversity assessments for Marshall and Lake Piso mangrove landscapes; the identification of eight key threats to mangroves; a botanical study on the coastal vegetation, and; an ecological/biophysical assessment and socioeconomic and threat survey in communities within the Marshall Landscape.

B. Socioeconomic change. There were no expectations of socioeconomic changes by the end of the project.

C. Enabling conditions.

- Policy, Legal & Institutional Development. About 3,295 hectares of mangrove forest (11.5% of priority mangrove forests in Liberia) were incorporated in areas designated for formal protection. Additional 4,146 hectares of mangroves were protected through community-based conservation agreements (equivalent to 14.5% of the total priority mangrove area) (PIR 2017-2019, pp. 3-5)).
- Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building. The TE notes that "as a result of training, awareness and other capacity support initiatives, communities have extensive information and awareness on the importance of promoting sustainable use of protected mangrove areas" (TE, p. 42).

The project trained 88 Frontline Conservationists and three staff of the Environmental Protection Agency on forest monitoring and GIS for the development of a Monitoring and Evaluation Programme for mangroves (PIR2017-2019, p. 26).

The project developed community land use plans for each of the ten Conservation Agreements. About 514 government officials, 4,058 community members, and 101 County and community leaders participated in the project. Other participants were Civil Society Organization representatives and 10 Non-Governmental Organization representatives (TE, p. 12).

- Knowledge Exchange & Learning: The TE notes that "as a result of training, awareness and other capacity support initiatives, communities have extensive information and awareness on the importance of promoting sustainable use of protected mangrove areas" (TE, p. 42).

Project outputs include a total of 514 workshops and trainee participants from the government in community meetings, workshops, and the development of a Participatory Land-Use Planning tool kit (TE, p. 27).

- Multistakeholder Interactions. No reported changes in multistakeholder interactions were found.

D. Unintended impacts. No unintended impacts were reported.

4.5 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately likely
--------------------	---------------------------

The TE assesses the likelihood of sustainability of project benefits as **Moderately likely**. This review concurs. The assessment is based on the evidence of the following risks:

Financial resources. The TE makes notes that funding was secured from the Prince of Monaco and the Turing Foundation to complete the gazettment package, which was expected to be finalized within 12 months (TE, p. 22). The final PIR (2017-2019, p. 26) notes that CI-Liberia recently launched the Liberia Conservation Fund aimed to support conservation in perpetuity. It was expected for the Lake Piso and Marshall mangroves to be incorporated into this framework. This review did not find information regarding the type and amount of resources required to maintain the benefits beyond project completion.

Sociopolitical. The TE assesses the overall sociopolitical risk to be low. The sociopolitical risks identified at project inception were mitigated through frequent community and stakeholder consultations, buy-in and high local ownership. The TE notes challenges around the sustainability of alternative livelihood initiatives supported by the project and that if project-supported is discontinued, communities risk returning to previous negative habits (TE, p. 39).

Institutional framework and governance. The TE mentions unresolved conflicts between different community actors over who reports to whom. As an example, community members in Grand Bassa County have registered complaints to the city government about the lack of transparent reporting to the community on the current status of equipment supplied by CI (TE, p. 42). There was a lack of clarity in the accountability system and the structure of ownership of donated materials to communities (TE, p. 41).

Conflicts in Liberia were a persistent but low risk as the country continued to strengthen its democracy and showed political will to address state fragility (TE, p. 39).

Environmental. The TE mentions that the project contributed to mitigating the negative impact of climate change and assesses this risk as low (TE, p. 38).

Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Accurate and reliable data collected during this project, such as the number of sea turtle nesting sites, captures and releases, the different uses of mangroves, and the frequency of unsustainable and illegal fishing in and around the mangroves, can be used as baselines and reference for future mangrove work in Liberia (PIR, p. 26). The Conservation Agreement model used in the project can be replicated in other mangrove sites in Liberia (PIR, p. 26).

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, 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 expected co-financing budget was USD 3.650 million. As of June 30, 2019, the reported level of co-financing implementation was USD 3.676 million, exceeding the expected co-financing budget by 0.7%.

No information on the extent to which co-financing was essential to the achievement of GEF objectives was found in the TE.

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?

At endorsement, the project was scheduled to be completed in 36 months, by May 31, 2019. The actual completion date was six months later, on December 31, 2019. The project experienced delays and needed readjustments. This led to efficiency losses and the plan for a mid-term evaluation had to be canceled. Political transition and challenges around inadequate transport infrastructure aggravated the delay in the project's execution. Additionally, "the M&E execution also experienced challenges because of sharp disconnect between project M&E budget as contained in the approved project document and subsequent cost of implementation" (TE, p. 43). At the end of the funding period, the project requested a no-cost extension to allow the completion of the Terminal Evaluation.

There were no reports that the abovementioned delays affected the project's outcomes or sustainability.

5.3 Stakeholder ownership. Assess the extent to which stakeholder ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE notes that the rights-based and bottom-to-top approaches were valuable and increased the participants' sense of ownership and awareness. A potential statutory overlap of functions between and

amongst government agencies, such as the Forestry Development Authority, Environmental Protection Agency and Liberia Maritime Authority, was significantly mitigated due to sustained stakeholder engagement (TE, p. 52). Community members praised the project team for capturing community participation through all stages of the project design up to implementation and evaluation (TE, p. 37).

5.4 Other factors: In case the terminal evaluation discusses other key factors that affected project outcomes, discuss those factors and outline how they affected outcomes, whether positively or negatively.

The TE notes that the project increased women's participation in community livelihoods by strengthening awareness and building technical capacity for fish drying and selling. This improved community buy-in and allowed communities to harness the benefits and skills of women (TE, p. 41).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	----------------------

The TE assesses the quality of the M&E design at entry as Satisfactory, and this review concurs.

The TE notes that the M&E plan was detailed and assigned clear responsibilities to the Project Management Unit, CI-Liberia. It followed CI-GEF guidelines and was fit for purpose, with strong linkages between the results framework and M&E plan. SMART indicators facilitated the measurement of project impact. Regular data collection and management procedures were adequately specified (TE, p. 43).

The TE documents a misalignment between the initial M&E budget and its actual implementation cost (TE, p. 43).

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

The TE assesses the overall quality of project M&E implementation as Satisfactory, and this review concurs.

The TE notes that monitoring actions throughout the project were largely implemented as planned but implementation faced challenges because of the resignation of the project manager, political transition, and challenges around inadequate transport infrastructure. Additional reported issues include (i) the M&E had to be adjusted due to a significant misalignment between the initial M&E budget and actual implementation cost, which led to delays in the implementation of M&E activities (TE, p. 43); (ii) some of

the M&E team members had low literacy and needed extensive training; and (iii) the midterm evaluation was waived after a CI-GEF monitoring visit determined no compelling need for it (TE, p. 44).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation rating is based on the assessment of the performance of GEF Agency(s). Quality of Execution rating is based on performance of the executing agency(s). In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six-point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	----------------------

The TE rates the quality of implementation as Highly satisfactory, whereas this review assesses project implementation as **Satisfactory**.

The TE doesn't include any direct reference to the quality of implementation but provides information that allows for this assessment. Conservation International was responsible for project identification, concept preparation, preparation of the detailed proposal, project start-up, oversight and supervision, completion, and evaluation. It was also responsible for efficiently utilizing project inputs and delivering project outputs.

The TE notes that the project had a sound theory of change. It was well designed, with SMART indicators and outcomes, although there were issues related to outdated pricing and incorrect expenditure forecast. The M&E design at entry was satisfactory. It followed Conservation International and GEF procedures and was well aligned with the project's result framework, thereby allowing adequate documentation of the performance of the project towards its expected outcome target. The implementation of M&E activities was also satisfactory, although some activities, such as a mid-term evaluation, were waived due to the project budget expenditure problems mentioned above. The utilization of project inputs and delivery of project outputs were assessed to be efficient, with adequate use of tools to facilitate project management and tracking of human and financial resources. Project procurement strictly followed CI's Procurement guidelines.

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

The TE rates the quality of implementation as Highly satisfactory, whereas this review rates it as **Satisfactory**. The TE does not directly describe the quality of project execution but provides some information that allows for this assessment.

The executing agency was CI-Liberia and was responsible for managing and administering the project's day-to-day activities under the overall oversight and supervision of Conservation International. It was responsible for the appropriate use of funds and the procurement and contracting of goods and services following the regulations of Conservation International.

The TE determined that the project effectively accomplished nearly all its expected outcomes with only minor delays in project activities. Project implementation, especially M&E activities, experienced challenges with effectively costing activities under the project budget. The project complied with technical/operational guidelines and project financial management procedures in a rigorous manner.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, including how they could have application for other GEF projects. Lessons must be based on project experience.

The TE (pp. 51-52) included lessons that are summarized below:

- The project had budget constraints and M&E implementation issues caused by price changes between project design and start. It is necessary to improve the quality of project budgeting to allow costs assigned to project activities remain relevant over a 2 to 3-year wait period.
- Sustainability Plan. The project implemented actions to secure medium to long-term sustainability of project outcomes. However, a sustainability plan was not developed. Such a plan would have helped guide, assess and build program resilience, for instance, by identifying adjustments to the annual budgets of key government entities to accommodate funding for the activities created by the project.
- The project's stakeholder engagement approach improved ownership and created a cordial atmosphere for project implementation. It helped reduce the risk of conflicts commonly present in land and natural resource related interventions. CI's foundational Right-based Approach and sustained stakeholder engagement were crucial to avoid potential statutory overlap of functions between and amongst government agencies participating in the project.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE (pp. 52-54) included four recommendations, summarized below:

R1. The Marshall proposed Protected area and the Lake Piso Multiple Use Reserve are potentially suitable sites for ecotourism. Ecotourism can create livelihood opportunities and improve economic conditions for communities in these conservation areas. Government agencies such as the Ministry of Finance and Development Planning and the Ministry of Information, Cultural Affairs and Tourism are important partners to support such an initiative.

R2. Give more design attention to alternative livelihood activities. Community members were supported with alternative livelihood initiatives to discourage them from mangrove deforestation and other harmful practices. However, alternative livelihood strategies needed more sustainability and design attention. For example, some women who engaged in fish drying and sale expected to pay reduced rates for fish caught by fishermen benefiting from equipment and training from the project. These types of ambiguities should be avoided.

R3. Technical and human capacities were the most important resources of the project. Continued engagement and sharing of local knowledge and experience at both community and national levels will help sustain the project's impact.

R4. The project document includes a stakeholder engagement plan and a gender mainstreaming action plan. In addition, it would be useful to have a sustainability plan incorporating concerns and opportunities for maintaining project outcomes.

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/indicators of terminal evaluation quality	GEF IEO COMMENTS	Rating
1. Timeliness: terminal evaluation report was carried out and submitted on time?		HS
2. General information: Provides general information on the project and evaluation as per the requirement?		HS
3. Stakeholder involvement: the report was prepared in consultation with – and with feedback from - key stakeholders?	TE notes the involvement of key stakeholders but does not specify at which specific stages of the evaluation they were involved.	MS
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change?	TE discusses causal links to achieve intended impact, but key assumptions are not presented in the corresponding section, but discussed later in the document as risks	MS

5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology?	TE discusses information sources for the evaluation, gives information on project sites covered for verification, tools and methods used, and limitations of the evaluation. It doesn't provide a list of key stakeholders interviewed.	S
6. Outcome: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes?	TE assesses the project's relevance to GEF and country priorities, relevance of the project design, and reports performance on all outcome targets. It doesn't discuss factors that affect outcome achievement, the timeliness of activities and the efficiency in using project resources at sufficient depth.	MS
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability?	TE identifies risks that may affect sustainability and the overall likelihood of sustainability. It doesn't elaborate on the likelihood of key risks materializing, nor their likely effect in sufficient depth.	MS
8. M&E: Presents sound assessment of the quality of the M&E system?	TE analyzes quality of M&E design at entry and during implementation. It doesn't discuss the use of information from the M&E system for project management at sufficient depth.	S
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing?	TE reports on utilization of GEF resources and provides data on materialized cofinancing. It doesn't provide data on sources of materialized cofinancing nor types of cofinancing. It doesn't discuss reasons for excess or deficient materialization of cofinancing, nor contributions of cofinancing to project results.	MU

10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance?	TE doesn't provide a detailed account of the GEF Agency/ executing agency performances. It doesn't provide an in-depth discussion of factors that affected implementation and execution.	U
11. Safeguards: Provides information on application of environmental and social safeguards, and conduct and use of gender analysis?		HS
12. Lessons and recommendations are supported by the project experience and are relevant to future programming?		S
13. Ratings: Ratings are well-substantiated by evidence, realistic and convincing?	The presented evidence was always credible, but ratings were not always supported by sufficient evidence	MU
14. Report presentation: The report was well-written, logically organized, and consistent?		MS
Overall quality of the report		MS

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