

Terminal Evaluation Validation form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5810	
GEF Agency project ID		-	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		Conservation International (CI)	
Project name		Spatial Planning for Protected Areas in Response to Climate Change (SPARC)	
Country/Countries		Global	
Region		Global	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF-5 biodiversity focal area Strategic Objective 1 "Improve sustainability of protected area systems"	
Stand alone or under a programmatic framework		Stand alone	
If applicable, parent program name and GEF ID		NA	
Executing agencies involved		Conservation International as main executing body. Executing partners: The Moore Center for Science and Oceans at Conservation International (MCSO); University of Leeds; University of Stellenbosch; Catholic University of Chile; Xishuangbanna Tropical Botanical Gardens; CSIRO.	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		-	
Private sector involvement (including micro, small and medium enterprises) ¹		-	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval (MSP) date		December 02, 2015	
Effectiveness date / project start date		January, 2016	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December, 2018	
Actual date of project completion		October 31, 2019	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	-	-
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		1.805	1.673
Co-financing	IA own	0.639	0.603
	Government	0.185	0.185
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	-

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](#))

	NGOs/CBOs	0.350	0.350
	Other	2.483	2.549
Total GEF funding		1.805	1.673
Total Co-financing		3.656	3.686
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		5.461	5.36
Terminal evaluation validation information			
TE completion date		November 12, 2019	
Author of TE		Mr Josh Brann	
TER completion date		November 26, 2022	
TER prepared by		Mariana Vidal Merino	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Ritu Kanotra	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives and theory of change

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

This global targeted research project directly responds to the GEF Biodiversity focal area, Objective 1, "improving the sustainability of protected areas systems". Its main objective is to "provide countries in Afrotropical, Neotropical and Indo-Malayan biogeographic realms with the assessments and data needed to improve planning, design and management of terrestrial protected areas for climate change resilience" (TE, p. 16).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

Neither the Technical Evaluation (TE) nor the Project Document (PD) indicates any development objectives separate from 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)?

Neither the TE nor the Final project report record any changes in the project objectives or project activities during implementation.

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.

While the distribution ranges of many species are shifting in response to habitat changes triggered by climate change, protected areas boundaries remain stationary. Because of this, the likelihood of species' ranges falling outside protected areas systems is increasing (PD, p. 6). Barriers to the adaptation of protected areas include lack of data and resources for a comprehensive assessment of tropical species' response to climate change, the inability to mine large global datasets, country-focused protected areas planning, and the scarcity of Regional Climate Models for the tropics (TE, p. 16).

This targeted research project will provide countries in Afrotropical, Neotropical and Indo-Malayan biogeographic zones with information to improve the planning, design and management of their terrestrial protected areas systems (TE, p. 16). This will help maintain and improve species and ecosystem

representation, now and in the future, under climate change. In the long term, the project is expected to support the sustainability of protected areas as the project's results are integrated into global and national conservation decision-making (TE, p. 23).

The main assumptions for project success are (i) protected managers will be able to understand and use the information on species range shifts and ecosystem movements due to climate change; (ii) uncertainty in global climate model simulations is low enough to permit constructive management decisions about climate change; (iii) national protected areas agencies engage in systematic planning and use conservation planning tools, and ; (iv) sufficient natural habitat remains to have scope for new protected areas and for extension of protection to deal with climate change (PD, p. 45).

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 assesses the relevancy of project outcomes as **Highly Satisfactory**, and this review concurs.

The project outcomes align with the GEF-5 biodiversity Strategic Objective 1, "Improve Sustainability of Protected Area Systems", specifically concerning its Outcome 1.1. "Improved management effectiveness of existing and new protected areas" (TE, p. 22). The project supports global priorities, particularly the CBD objectives concerning Article 6, "General Measures for Conservation and Sustainable Use"; Art. 7 "Identification and Monitoring", Art. 8 "In-situ Conservation", Art 12 "Research and Training", Art. 13 "Education and Awareness", Art. 14 "Impact Assessment and Minimizing Adverse Impacts"; and Art. 17 "Exchange of Information" (TE, p. 23). The project document also notes the alignment of project outcomes with "the Promise of Sydney" declaration, the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), and the national protected areas legislation of most nations in the tropics that have protected areas systems (PD, p. 11-12).

The TE did not elaborate on the project's alignment with the GEF Agency's mandates. The alignment of the project with beneficiaries' needs was well defined in the description of the context and benefits to different stakeholders (TE, p. 19).

This was a Global project that worked with 83 tropical countries. Rather than alignment with national policies, it provided countries with the assessments and data needed to improve planning, design and management of terrestrial protected areas for climate change resilience.

The TE indicates coherence between the project's theory of change, governance structure, activities, and M&E system. However, it is pointed out that, due to flaws in the project design, the implementation of M&E activities did not fully correspond with the planned M&E budget (TE, p. 45).

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

The TE assesses the effectiveness of the project as Satisfactory, whereas this review assesses and rates project effectiveness as **Highly Satisfactory**.

The TE notes that objective-level indicators were not expected to be achieved at project completion, but based on the project's Theory-of-Change and the project results achieved regarding stress reduction/status change, the project "is likely to make a significant contribution to impact level results and global environmental benefits in the future (TE, p.8)."

All eight project outcome indicators and related targets were achieved or exceeded (TE, p. 92). Component 1, "Global data compilation and analysis of protected area vulnerability to climate change", has three outcome indicators: 1.1.: Species and ecosystem change databases and geospatial data available to regional assessment teams, 1.2.: Method for regional conservation planning for climate change available to regional assessment teams, 1.3.: Regional maps of high-risk areas available. Targets for Outcome indicator 1.1. were exceeded, while targets for 1.2 and 1.3 were achieved.

Component 2, "Regional fine scale assessment and research-to-policy briefs", has three outcome indicators: 2.1.: Regional assessment results available and published in the peer-review literature, 2.2.: Number of multi-national and country research-to-policy briefs presented to protected areas agency staff, 2.3.: Decision support tools developed and disseminated. Targets for all three outcome indicators were met.

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

The TE rates the project efficiency as **Satisfactory** and this review concurs.

The project started in January 2016, and at the time of endorsement, it was expected to close by the end of December 2018 (PD, p. i). The actual project close date was October 2019, with no recorded modifications to the GEF grant amount (TE, p. 26).

The TE notes an average six-month delay in project activities due to a slow project start and a lengthy set-up of the grant arrangements. This initial delay was carried forward throughout the project. As a result, activities planned to be executed in the project's final phase, mostly connected to outreach, uptake, and capacity development, did not have sufficient time to be adequately implemented (TE, p. 26-27).

The project budget consisted of a GEF grant amount of USD 1.805 million and a USD 3.66 million co-financing. Co-financing consisted of in-cash and in-kind support and was managed by project partners,

not the project team. The TE reports that, as of September 9, 2019, the project spent USD 1.673 million of the GEF funding, which equals 92.7% of the GEF grant amount. The remaining USD 0.131 million was anticipated to be spent in the remaining project implementation period through October 31, 2019. It also reports that "the expenditure amounts per component were roughly in-line with the planned amounts, with none of the component expenditures exceeding what was originally planned" (TE, p. 30).

The TE notes a co-financing of at least USD 3.67 million as of September 19, 2019, which equates to 101% of the expected cofinancing. The actual co-financing is consistent with anticipated co-financing. However, the former might have been underreported (e.g. no co-financing was indicated concerning unplanned in-kind contributions from project staff) (TE, p. 31).

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

The TE gives the overall project outcome a rating of **Highly Satisfactory**, and this review concurs. The project met all (and exceeded some) expected outcomes targets. Overall, project outcomes were highly relevant and cost-effective.

The overview of key outcomes related to environment, human well-being, and enabling conditions (Policy, Legal & Institutional Development; Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building; Knowledge Exchange & Learning; Multistakeholder Interactions), is presented below:

- A. Environmental Change. This global targeted research project was not designed to achieve impact-level results during its lifetime. The project produced information that can potentially improve the planning, design and management of the terrestrial protected areas systems in Afrotropical, Neotropical and Indo-Malayan biogeographic regions (TE, p. 16). However, this will depend on the future uptake of the project's results into national and supranational protected areas systems (TE, p. 16).
- B. Human well-being: not targeted nor reported.
- C. Enabling conditions.
 - Policy, Legal & Institutional Development: progress on the uptake of project results has been made in Africa (Angola, South Africa, and Zimbabwe), and Asia (Thailand and Indonesia). In the Neotropics, the project had preliminary synergistic exchanges with multiple countries. The project produced country "research to policy briefs" as tools for bridging the science-to-policy interface for 36 individual countries (including in Spanish for Neotropical countries) and six regional clusters of countries, such as Kenya-Uganda-Tanzania, in East Africa (TE, p. 41).
 - Knowledge Exchange & Learning: The project had ambitious inter-regional learning and real-time knowledge-sharing goals. Cross-regional learning among the project's main regional participants was challenging, and the project did not have a specific mechanism to achieve it (TE, p. 53)

In terms of the scientific results, high-level findings were submitted to a forthcoming special issue of Science Advances which aims to come out in advance of the UNFCCC COP in Chile in late 2019. The project has so far resulted in 13 scientific papers prepared and submitted for publication or in preparation (TE, p. 40). The project website, www.sparc-website.org, is a key tool for the outreach and dissemination of project results. The major project outputs were consolidated and posted on the website during the project extension period, from August-October 2019, including (i) SPARC project datasets; (ii) interactive tools and visualizations; (iii) project documentation; (iv) research to policy briefs outputs; (v) scientific publications resulting from the project (TE, p. 43-44).

D. Unintended impacts. Not reported.

4.5 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	---------------------------

The TE assesses the sustainability of project outcomes as **Moderately Likely**, and this review concurs. There are preliminary efforts to continue the work related to the project, but more significant investment is needed to continue outreach and dissemination actions at global, regional and national levels. The project results were not institutionalized in national conservation planning agencies or supra-national biodiversity conservation entities.

Financial resources. The TE assesses financial sustainability as moderately likely. Some preliminary efforts exist to continue the work related to the project. For example, a Principal Investigator of the project has been awarded a two-year grant from the National Science Foundation of the United States to carry on with the work associated with SPARC. Other regional Principal Investigators have also expressed their intention to continue the SPARC project, using the resources available from their academic institutions, including some small-scale funding opportunities. However, a more significant investment is needed to continue outreach and dissemination actions at global, regional and national levels (TE, p. 48).

Sociopolitical. The TE notes that given the nature of the project outcomes, sociopolitical risks to sustainability are low. An underlying assumption for project outcomes and impacts was the political will at the national and supranational level to take up project findings and recommendations and make changes to protected area networks (TE, p. 49). Even though this uptake was not anticipated at project completion, it poses a risk to the sustainability of the project benefits (TE, p. 48).

Institutional framework and governance. The TE assesses the project sustainability concerning institutional and governance risk as moderately likely. At TE, the project results were not institutionalized in national conservation planning agencies or supra-national biodiversity conservation entities. In addition, the TE notes the relevance of developing a community of practice to continue the uptake, replication, and dissemination of project results. At project completion, such a community was still in the early development stages (TE, p. 49).

Environmental. The TE assesses environmental risks to be limited and environmental sustainability to be moderately likely. The TE identified the reliability of the project's climate model outputs as the main environmental risk.

Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. The project was not intended to achieve widespread uptake of the project results at completion. There is great potential for scaling the project results and ensuring that the project findings are incorporated into the national conservation planning strategies of countries in the three targeted regions (TE, p. 44). Project methods and results can also be replicated and disseminated. A good opportunity to promote this is the young community of practice, formed from the regional assessment teams and composed of a dedicated group of experts willing to engage on an intellectual and implementation level. Such space can support the proactive engagement among decision-makers through the project and on a peer-to-peer level (TE, p. 49).

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 project's expected co-financing was USD 3.66 million. As of September 19, 2019, at least U\$3.67 M, roughly 101% of the expected co-financing has materialized. However, the TE notes that co-financing might have been underreported as, for example, no co-financing was indicated concerning unplanned in-kind contributions from project staff (TE, p. 31). The TE further notes that "a large portion of co-financing was in the form of data acquisition and provision, in addition to activities such as staff time for data cleaning and running models".

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 project started in January 2016, and at the time of endorsement, it was expected to close by the end of December 2018 (PD, p. i). However, the actual project close date was October 2019, with no recorded modifications to the GEF grant amount (TE, p. 26).

The TE notes an average six-month delay in project activities due to a slow project start and a lengthy set-up of the grant arrangements. This initial delay was carried forward throughout the project. As a result, activities planned to be executed in the project's final phase, mostly related to outreach, uptake, and capacity development, did not have sufficient time to be adequately implemented (TE, p. 26-27).

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 doesn't elaborate on stakeholder ownership. However, it does note that the project had a strong partnership approach with suitable partners across the three targeted regions. Also, "beyond the main project partners, there were not many stakeholders to be engaged in the project execution, although the project is expected to have a large number of beneficiaries" (TE, p. 27).

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.

--

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: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE assesses the project M&E design as Moderately Satisfactory, whereas this review assesses M&E at entry as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**. The project M&E design meets the overall GEF standards, even though the TE highlights some issues with M&E planning, budgeting and the results framework design.

The TE notes that the project M&E plan specifies the M&E activities, including roles, responsibilities, timeframe and budget. Yet, multiple elements were not relevant to this project, such as field supervision missions and annual visits to the project country, suggesting that the M&E plan was a "generic boilerplate M&E plan for all CI-GEF projects" (TE, p. 32).

The total planned M&E budget was around USD 0.2 million, which is adequate, representing about 10% of the GEF allocation. However, this budget was inconsistent within the project document, with different total costs in three document sections (TE, p. 32-33).

The Results Framework includes four objective-level indicators but doesn't include indicator targets, which makes it difficult to assess progress (TE, p. 33). In addition, some indicators did not entirely align with the "SMART" criteria. For example, the target for Outcome indicator 1.1, "Data on species and ecosystem change is available for regional analysis from a spectrum of methods (...)", doesn't provide any details on the quantity of data or the specific criteria for defining "availability".

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

The TE rates the implementation of the M&E system as **Moderately Satisfactory**, and this review concurs.

Project M&E activities were implemented adequately. Project reports were provided at required reporting intervals, the project had annual financial audits, and Conservation International oversight was appropriate. Some elements of the M&E design were not relevant to this project, such as a mid-term review and field supervision missions. As a result, these activities were not executed, and consequently, neither did the budgeted funds for them (TE, p. 33).

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

Conservation International (CI) was the GEF Agency responsible for the project and carried general backstopping and oversight responsibilities. The TE rates the quality of implementation as **Satisfactory**, and this review concurs. CI adequately supported the project and provided high-quality backstopping and financial management support.

The TE highlights the positive role of CI's regional and country offices and staff in the project outreach components. Minor negative issues identified include (i) the partner institutions' financial and administrative staff had to fulfil the rigorous CI and GEF financial reporting requirements without having had proper training on the subject; (ii) the "appreciable turnover" in the finance and administrative staff both within CI and within the partner institutions; and (iii) the CI procurement and contracting procedures were much lengthier than anticipated by the project participants expected (TE, p. 25-26).

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

The TE assesses the project execution as Satisfactory, and this review concurs. CI directly executed the project, following GEF's direct execution modality. The TE notes that "the project was characterized by excellent internal communication and coordination, good work planning, strong adaptive management, and good reporting and financial delivery" (p. 26).

The Project Steering Committee was also the core project "team". It was formed by principal investigators based primarily at universities and research institutions, regional lead scientists for the three project focus

regions, and additional data providers and computational modelers. The project was further supported by a Science Advisory Panel (SAP), which provided high-level strategic and scientific oversight and guidance.

The TE mentions conflicting opinions among project members regarding project management. Some indicate good communication and clear responsibilities, while others point to inadequately set deadlines and targets (TE, p. 26). Overall, the project was implemented following adaptive management principles. Several operational decisions were taken in reaction to emerging issues, notably regarding insufficient computing power, storage and memory resources required for the planned computer modeling work. Another adaptive management decision was to establish a decision-support group of experts to provide inputs and support for the dissemination and uptake of project results (TE, p. 28).

8. Lessons and recommendations

8.1 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 outlines 14 key lessons (TE, p. 52-55), from which a selection is summarized below:

- The effective uptake of new and innovative biodiversity conservation strategies requires sustained and multi-faceted engagement with target audiences.
- Leveraging the global network of a GEF implementing agency can have great benefits for project results. This project was able to link into conservation International's network of regional and country offices to improve the targeting of project results.
- The sustainability of project results may have benefited from a stronger focus on building the community of practice as a key project output, in addition to other communication and outreach activities.
- There needs to be a specific mechanism designed to foster inter-regional learning and knowledge sharing in real-time that accounts for the challenges of coordination at the global level, in terms of logistics and time zones.
- One operational lesson from the project was that big data science requires very large amounts of computing power - even more computing resources than may be found in many universities and which can mainly be found in the private sector.
- It is beneficial from the very beginning of a project to proactively provide support and initial training to ensure smooth financial reporting procedures, specifically with the finance staff of partner organizations.
- Operating under the financial management requirements and procedures of multilateral organizations requires significant advance planning. The CI-GEF procurement procedures took more time than project participants expected.

- While it is good practice for M&E to be designed as a separate component, it is best if M&E activities are clearly and realistically budgeted and spent rather than having this component serve as a flexible budget line to support non-M&E-specific activities.
- Administering grants of the relatively small size of the "onward grants" (i.e. USD 3,000- 20,000 USD) should be done in a centralized manner to avoid burdensome administrative requirements. The SPARC project onward grants were "nested" within the grants allocated to the regional institutions and required a lot of time to come to fruition.
- Projects should have a clear external communications strategy (at least key elements), discussed with all key stakeholders in advance of project implementation.
- Even when research projects involve some of the leading global experts in a particular topic, having a technical oversight and guidance body can still be useful. The project design included the SAP, which provided valuable strategic guidance in terms of ensuring the project's methodological approach fit (and was constrained to) meeting the project's objectives.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides five recommendations (pages 9-10), which are summarized below:

R1. Conceptualize a follow-up effort to the project to further disseminate and support the uptake of results and ensure that findings are ultimately incorporated into the national conservation planning strategies of as many countries as possible in the targeted regions. In addition, further work is needed on capacity development of national-level practitioners to turn the project results into a highly catalytic resource. [GEF Secretariat, CI-GEF Project agency]

R2. Identify opportunities to apply the project approaches in priority regions outside the tropics, such as biodiversity hotspots, where there is a significant need to improve the understanding of how climate change will impact biodiversity, and what types of geospatial planning should be done to address these impacts. [GEF Secretariat, CI]

R3. Require GEF-funded projects in the GEF-8 funding cycle that address protected area systems to incorporate this project's findings. Conservation International should also take all available opportunities to institutionalize the project findings within CI's full portfolio of work. [GEF Secretariat, CI]

R4. Consider expanding the suite of financial partnership arrangements beyond existing "grant" or "contract" modalities to improve transparency and simplify financial reporting. [CI]

R5. CI-GEF should strengthen its M&E approach for GEF projects. This would involve: i) Tailoring GEF-funded project's M&E plans to the specific project, rather than having a generic M&E plan; ii) Improving the correlation between M&E planned budgeting and the implementation of M&E activities, with consistency in M&E budgeting in all project design documents, and a rough target of 2%-5% of the project budget for M&E activities; and, iii) Designing project results frameworks with indicator targets at the objective level, and improving the "SMARTness" of all indicators and targets. [CI-GEF Project Agency]

R6. Future GEF- CI targeted research projects should include a gender mainstreaming strategy and action plan at the project approval stage, which specifically includes a goal of addressing current gender imbalances in terms of the number of women represented in scientific and technical fields in relation to the scientific topic to be targeted under the project. [GEF Secretariat, CI]

9. 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)

[Select detailed ratings here and fill in higher-level ratings and explanation in next table]

Criteria/indicators of terminal evaluation quality	Rating
1. Timeliness: terminal evaluation was carried out on schedule and its report submitted on time.	HS
1.1 Terminal evaluation conducted within six months before or after project completion	Yes
1.2 Terminal evaluation report submitted at the GEF Portal within 12 months of project completion	Yes
2. General information: Provides general information on the project and evaluation.	HS
2.1 Provides GEF project ID	Yes
2.2 Lists evaluators that conducted the terminal evaluation	Yes
2.3 Lists the executing agencies	Yes
2.4 Specifies key project milestones (start date, first disbursement date, completion date)	Yes
2.5 Lists GEF environmental objectives	Yes
3. Stakeholder involvement in evaluation: Participation of key stakeholders sought and their feedback addressed.	HS
3.1 Key stakeholders of the project were identified in the report	Yes
3.2 Feedback of key stakeholders was sought on the draft report	Yes
3.3 Feedback of key stakeholders was incorporated in finalization of the evaluation report	UA

3.4 If national project, OFP Feedback was sought on the draft report of the evaluation	NA
3.5 If national project, OFP feedback was incorporated in finalization of the report	NA
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change.	S
4.1 Discusses causal links/mechanisms to achieve intended impact	Yes
4.2 Presents the key assumptions of the theory of change	Yes
4.3 Discusses whether the key assumptions remain valid	No
5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology.	HS
5.1 Discusses information sources for the evaluation	Yes
5.2 Provides information on who was interviewed	Yes
5.3 Provides information on project sites/activities covered for verification	NA
5.4 Tools and methods used for the evaluation are described	Yes
5.5 Identifies limitations of the evaluation	Yes
6. Outcomes: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes.	HS
6.1 Assesses relevance to GEF priorities	Yes
6.2 Assesses relevance to country priorities	NA
6.3 Assesses relevance of project design	Yes
6.4 Reports performance on all outcome targets	Yes
6.5 Discusses factors that affect outcome achievement at sufficient depth	Yes
6.6 Reports on timeliness of activities	Yes
6.7 Assesses efficiency in using project resources	Yes
6.8 Discusses factors that affected efficiency in use of resources	Yes
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability.	S
7.1 Identifies risks that may affect sustainability	Yes
7.2 Indicates likelihood of key risks materializing	Yes

7.3 Indicates the likely effects if key risks materialize	No
7.4 Indicates overall likelihood of sustainability	Yes
8. Monitoring and Evaluation Presents sound assessment of the quality of the project M&E system.	HS
8.1 Analyzes quality of M&E design at entry	Yes
8.2 Analyzes quality of M&E during implementation	Yes
8.3 Discusses use of information from the M&E system for project management	Yes
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing.	HS
9.1 Reports on utilization of GEF resources	Yes
9.2 Provides data on materialized cofinancing	Yes
9.3 Provides data on sources of materialized cofinancing	Yes
9.4 Provides data on types of cofinancing (cash, in-kind; loan, grant, equity, etc)	No
9.5 Discusses reasons for excess or deficient materialization of co-financing	Yes
9.6 Discusses contributions of cofinancing to project results, including effects of excess or deficient materialization of co-financing	Yes
10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance.	HS
10.1 Provides account of the GEF Agency performance	Yes
10.2 Provides account of the performance of executing agency	Yes
10.3 Discusses factors that affected implementation and execution	Yes
10.4 Discusses how implementation and execution related challenges were addressed	Yes
11. Environmental and Social Safeguards, and Gender: Discusses application of safeguards and gender analysis.	MS
11.1 Reports on implementation of social and environmental safeguards	No
11.2 Reports on conduct of gender analysis	Yes
11.3 Reports on implementation of actions specified in gender analysis	Yes

12. Lessons and recommendations: based on project experience and relevant to future work.	HS
12.1 Presents lessons	Yes
12.2 Lessons are based on project experience	Yes
12.3 Discusses applicability of lessons	Yes
12.4 Presents recommendations	Yes
12.5 Recommendations specify clearly what needs to be done	Yes
12.6 Specifies action taker for recommendations	Yes
13. Performance Ratings: Ratings are well substantiated by evidence, and are realistic and credible.	HS
13.1 Ratings are supported with sufficient evidence	Yes
13.2 Evidence provided in support is credible	Yes
14. Report Presentation: The report was well written, logically organized, and consistent.	HS
14.1 Report is written in English (as required by the terminal evaluation guidelines)	Yes
14.2 Report is easy to read	Yes
14.3 Report is well-organized	Yes
14.4 Report is consistent	Yes
14.5 Report makes good use of tools that make information accessible (graphs/charts/tables)	Yes

[This is the table that will be made public]

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?		HS
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change?	TE reconstructed the project's theory-of-change but didn't discuss causal links nor key assumptions in depth	S
5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology?		HS
6. Outcome: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes?		HS
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability?		S
8. M&E: Presents sound assessment of the quality of the M&E system?		HS
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing?		HS
10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance?		HS
11. Safeguards: Provides information on application of environmental and social safeguards, and conduct and use of gender analysis?	TE reports on conduct and use of gender analysis and related actions implemented. It also rates environmental and social safeguards but doesn't provide	MS

	information to support the rating	
12. Lessons and recommendations are supported by the project experience and are relevant to future programming?		HS
13. Ratings: Ratings are well-substantiated by evidence, realistic and convincing?		HS
14. Report presentation: The report was well-written, logically organized, and consistent?		HS
Overall quality of the report		HS

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