

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		600	
GEF Agency project ID			
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-2	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Lop Nur nature sanctuary biodiversity conservation project	
Country/Countries		China	
Region		EAP	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP1: Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Chinese State Environmental Protection Agency (SEPA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		06-Nov-1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		March 1999	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		Jan-2002	
Actual date of project completion		October-2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.025	0.025
	Co-financing	0.057	0.057
GEF Project Grant		0.725	0.725 (trustee data)
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government	0.700	0.218
	Other*		0.165
Total GEF funding		0.750	0.750
Total Co-financing		0.757	0.383
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.507	1.133
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Oct-2003	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Yan Xie, UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Siham Mohamedahmed	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Aaron Zazueta	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		10-May-2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Pallavi Nuka	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Joshua Schneck	

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	Satisfactory	Good	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	M (Modest)	Excellent	N/R	MU
M&E Design	NA	NA	N/R	MU
M&E Implementation	Satisfactory	NA	N/R	MU
Quality of Implementation	Satisfactory	NA	N/R	U/A
Quality of Execution	Satisfactory	Very Good	N/R	U/A
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	N/R	U

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the project document, the global environmental objective of the project was to conserve the highly endangered globally significant biodiversity of the Lop Nur Sanctuary, by providing the capital cost for the effective establishment and management of the Sanctuary. The Lop Nur region of Gashun Gobi desert is home for a number of endangered/unique/endemic species, especially the last surviving genetically pure herd of wild Bactrian camels (*Camelus bactrianus ferus*) in the world. Increased human activity in recent years, particularly illegal hunting and mining, and increased diversion of water for agricultural use, was threatening the Bactrian camel's habitat. The project aimed to protect "rare dry-land biodiversity, as well as unique wind erosion land physiognomy and historical relics," and "mainstream biodiversity considerations within economic sectors."

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project was to promote the effective establishment and management of the sanctuary by providing the enabling conditions for preserving its globally significant endangered biodiversity. GEF funding was requested for the establishment and management of the sanctuary.

Expected project outcomes were:

- (a) Establishment of a Sanctuary for the preservation of the Lop Nur arid ecosystem and the species that have adapted to this ecosystem, in particular the highly endangered endemic wild Bactrian camel
- (b) Implementation of the management plan of the Sanctuary developed in close collaboration with local, provincial and national authorities;
- (c) Development of replicable models of community awareness-raising programs in biodiversity conservation and Sanctuary management.

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

No changes were noted in the terminal evaluation.

## 4. GEF EO 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.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project was designed as a short-term, emergency response measure to conserve the highly endangered Bactrian camel. The Lop Nur region of the Gashun Gobi desert, home to the only genetically pure herd of wild Bactrian camels, had recently been declared by the Chinese Government as a Nature Sanctuary. The 107,768 sq. km area set aside for protection had been used as an underground nuclear testing site for 30 years prior. According to the project document, the government sought to establish this Sanctuary to prevent encroachment by illegal hunting and mining activities.

The project was consistent with China’s 1989 Nature Conservation Plan, which developed a comprehensive system of nature reserves and rationalized categories of protection for endangered wildlife. Biodiversity studies had identified the Bactrian camel as an endangered species and the Lop Nur region as a priority for conservation. The Lop Nur region borders Mongolia, where UNEP had helped establish the Great Gobi Reserve (National Park), in part, to protect the Bactrian camel. Creation of a similar protected area on the Chinese side of the border would ensure protection throughout the camel’s grazing areas.

The project was also relevant to the goal of GEF’s biodiversity focal area to preserve globally unique biodiversity and it was aligned with the GEF OP #1 targeting arid and semi-arid ecosystems.

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

The project has achieved important outputs and made progress towards achieving objectives. Principle among these achievement has been that the new Nur Wild Camel Nature Reserve was gazetted as a provincial nature reserve at May 2000, checkpoints set up, and a management plan developed. The regulatory framework for PA management has been created at the provincial level. A biodiversity survey was carried out and scientific research program prepared. Public awareness raising activities have increased stakeholder knowledge and commitment to the conservation strategy.

The Xinjiang Autonomous Region Government formally established the 78,000 sq. km. Xinjiang Lop Nur Wild Camel Nature Reserve in May 2000. The Reserve is now regulated under both the national law on nature reserves and provincial legislation, which is an important achievement, because previously it was only a provincial reserve. A main management center, three management sub-centers and five check points have been established and supplied with transportation and communications equipment to facilitate monitoring and management of the sanctuary. Staff have been recruited to operate all the sites.

The TE notes that although a management plan was prepared, it was not yet operational at the time of the TE. The TE report notes that the management plan “fails to address such problems as the lack of coordination among different departments or to identify the lack of information as one of the problems that needs to be addressed. The activities are listed without any indication how they are to be accomplished and what funding is available, or even whether their goals are long-term or short-term.” Furthermore, the TE report notes that “there is no patrolling at any of these checkpoints” and “there is still no effective control of unauthorized access” to the reserve areas. The problem is that these checkpoints are remote and difficult to access. The TE report also notes, “the nature reserve has not obtained permission from the law enforcement authorities for the conduct of patrols, added to which the environment is too harsh and the distances too great for any effective patrolling.”

According to the TE report the project designed and implemented a very effective public awareness-raising program on biodiversity conservation and sanctuary management. The awareness-raising activities included outreach to local and regional schools in partnership with Jane Goodall’s Roots and Shoots initiative. The project helped organize an international conference--the China-Mongolia International Wild Camel Protection Conference. An outcome of this conference was a joint cooperation agreement between China and Mongolia to protect the wild Bactrian camel. The project also held two workshops on reserve management, which brought together government, environmental NGOs, and the private sector to exchange information and review threats to the integrity of the reserve area.

The project made headway on establishing a scientific research program for the assessment and monitoring of endangered biodiversity. The TE report mentions that while some biodiversity surveys have been conducted, “owing to lack of information, there was no clear perception of threats: [more] scientific surveys and monitoring are needed to identify threats and to take the necessary action to mitigate their impacts.” Moreover, the existing biodiversity data and knowledge is not well integrated into the reserve’s management plan.

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

For a project that was launched as “a short-term emergency measure” for the conservation of highly endangered, globally significant biodiversity, the project has made a significant contribution in formally establishing the Lop Nur Reserve (TE Report). The project closed about 9 months later than expected due to the long process of getting approval for the reserve. Setting up a nature reserve in a military controlled area containing valuable potassium deposits required careful negotiations. The project had to operate in a complex and sensitive institutional environment. While the project made headway on achieving the global environmental and development objectives, it had some serious shortcomings, described above under effectiveness. Overall, the TE report finds that the coordination between relevant government departments (provincial, national, and military) was not strong enough to eliminate or mitigate serious impacts of mining, gas pipeline construction, and agriculture on the Bactrian camel’s habitat.

The TE report does not present total project costs, and information on co-financing and leveraged funding is unclear. It’s not certain what actual costs were, or whether they were above or under appraisal estimates. TE does provide a rating of “Very Good” for “Completion of activities,” which comes closest of the factor rated in the TE to capturing project efficiency. Efficiency is rated as moderately satisfactory with the above shortcomings noted, and poor quality of the TE which provides little information on which to assess this performance dimension.

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unlikely</b>
---------------------------	------------------------------------

**Financial (ML):** According to the TE report the provincial government allocates 325,000 yuan each year to cover management centre staff salaries, however funding for checkpoint operations is not secured. As a national reserve, the Lop Nur Nature Reserve is eligible to apply for funds from the Ministry of Finance; however, success in getting these funds depends largely on the quality of the proposal, and the potential for attracting international cooperation is one of the criteria applied however, the TE does not mention if there is any support or effort to build capacity to develop a proposal. The reserve is expected to receive a lump-sum compensation for the West East Pipeline Project being built by Shell-China. There is no specific plan for the appropriate use of compensation funds.

**Socio-political (ML):** The TE reports that the project’s awareness raising programs “have proved very successful, especially those targeting local communities.” The workshops and international conferences were also reportedly effective in securing national and provincial government support for conserving the camel’s habitat. The support of the military, which controls core areas, including testing sites and potassium deposits, within the reserve, is not guaranteed. The TE report also finds that the project failed to effect a strong involvement of the provincial and local government departments in sanctuary management, which is required to mitigate the two major threats (in the opinion of TE) of mining and lower groundwater table impacts.

**Institutional (ML):** The project has resulted in the strengthening of international cooperation for the conservation of wild camels, along with the adoption of a number of resolutions and the signing of a letter of intent on the protection of wild Bactrian camels between NEPA and the Ministry of Nature and Environment of Mongolia at the International Wild Camel Conference. The project established a management center with the capacity to conduct managerial and monitoring tasks. Another achievement is the establishment of the scientific research program to ensure monitoring of sanctuary biodiversity. Two out of the three management sub-centers and two out of the five check points are inadequately staffed and patrolling has not yet been authorized. There is no control of access to the park at the checkpoints. Effective monitoring and control of the reserve area will require stronger cooperation and commitment from the Chinese military, which is already controlling the potassium mines in the reserve area.

**Ecological (MU):** According to the TE report, the national and provincial investment in the Nature Reserve, along with its management system and relevant legislative system, has raised the awareness and kept the species from extinction. However, some major threats have still not been mitigated. The TE report argues that agricultural activity is lowering the water table and diminishing the salt-water ponds used by camels. The TE reports that “mining activities in the nature reserve are much more intensive than suggested by project reports and are continuing to expand. The construction work under way for potassium mining in Lop Nur lake within the so-called “prohibited military area”, constitutes a grave threat to wild camels and biodiversity in the region (see section E of chapter VIII below for more details). The evaluator is also aware of several mining sites within the core area of the nature reserve or at the western edge of the prohibited military area, which are also important distribution areas of wild camels.” The road to the potassium mines cuts through the camel’s grazing areas. Another threat is the Shell-China natural gas pipeline and service road construction. Although Shell-China agreed to move the pipeline farther north, the TE report suggests that construction activity will disturb the camel habitat.

## **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?

Cofinancing commitments at project appraisal totaled US\$ 0.7 million with a 0.35 million (0.1 million in-kind) contribution from the national government, 0.2 million from Cable & Wireless UK, 0.1 million from Shell-China, and 0.05 million from various other sponsors.

The TE reports that total actual cofinancing was about US\$ 0.383 million, with 0.218 million (cash and in-kind) from the Govt. of China, 0.085 million from Cable & Wireless UK, 0.06 from other sponsors, and 0.02 of leveraged funding.

Shell-China agreed to move its pipeline farther north outside of the camel habitat at an additional cost of US\$ 11 million (borne by Shell China) (final PIR). And Shell-China has agreed to compensate the reserve an unspecified amount.

**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?

According to the TE report “siting of the checkpoints was delayed due to the long process for the approval of the establishment of the new Nature Reserve. Due to the delays of establishment of the Nature Reserve, the project was extended from February 2002 to September 2002 to ensure the appropriate implementation of project activities by the end of the project term.”

No other delays were mentioned in the TE report.

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:

Country ownership of the project has been mixed. On the one hand the State Environmental Protection Administration and the Xinjiang Environmental Protection Bureau have been strong advocates for the reserve at the national and provincial levels respectively. Local governments have been slow to move in granting authorization for patrolling of reserve areas meaning that the reserve management have not consolidated control of the protected areas. The TE report notes that “efforts conducted through government channels have secured strong government support at all levels and a high degree of sustainability, although there could be more support from the Turpan and Bayingolin prefectures.” Government commitment has been evidenced through support for the public awareness program and participation international conference (2000) on the protection and conservation of wild camels in China and Mongolia. The conference led to the adoption “of a number of resolutions and the signing of a letter of intent on the protection of wild Bactrian camels between NEPA and the Ministry of Nature and Environment of Mongolia.” The West-East Pipeline Project has also supported project aims and worked with Shell-China to adjust the plan for pipeline construction and provide compensation funds for the management and conservation of the nature reserve.

On the other hand, the military has not expressed much interest in the project or the establishment of the reserve. Military support is critical to reducing threats from mining activity and to patrolling the reserve areas. Also, the scientific research program was cut down due to the lack of resources. The national government decided not to establish a scientific research center and instead focus more on the assessment and monitoring of status and trends of biodiversity in the Nature Reserve with a special emphasis on the wild camel.

## 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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
The M&E plan at entry included only a list of outcomes, activities, and indicators, without a logframe matrix or any clear linkages between activities, outcomes and indicators. There was no baseline information because biodiversity surveys were to be conducted as part of project implementation. The M&E system also included an implementation timeline and basic arrangements for project oversight by UNEP as well as an independent terminal evaluation. There was no separate budget for project M&E activities.	
<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>

The TE report does not contain an assessment of project M&E. Based on the reporting in the TE, there was no project M&E system implemented beyond regular reporting to UNEP. The project did conduct several scientific surveys to serve as baselines, but these were never incorporated into an impact monitoring system.

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to assess</b>
--	---------------------------------

The project was implemented through UNEP. The TE report does not include an assessment of the technical, administrative and financial support provided by UNEP. The TE report only mentions UNEP oversight of the project to note: “UNEP has played a very good role of supervision on quality and progress of the project. FECO [Foreign Economic Cooperation Office] is the connection between international organizations (UNEP and WCPF) and the local management agencies. As a centre coordinator, it has played an important role in making sure that Environmental Department channel is straightforward. More efforts should be made to coordinate with other government departments at center government.”

Based on information in the report, it seems that UNEP was providing adequate supervision of the project, albeit from a distance. The TE report refers to monitoring reports submitted to UNEP, which were reviewed in the course of preparing the terminal evaluation. UNEP also facilitated the 9-month extension for the project. Based on the information in final PIR, the project provided regular 6-month progress reports to UNEP and underwent an annual audit.

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

The project was executed by the National Environmental Protect Agency (NEPA), through its provincial office, the Xinjiang Environmental Protection Bureau (XEPB) based in Urumqi, the capital city of the Xinjiang Province/ Autonomous Region. NEPA was responsible for daily coordination and management of the project. NEPA collaborated closely with the Wild Camel Protection Foundation (WCPF) ) and the Chinese Environmental Journalists’ Association (CEJA). The TE report does not assess the quality of project management and execution by NEPA.

## **8. Assessment of Project Impacts**

**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.

There is no evidence of environmental change in the TE report.

**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.

There is no evidence of environmental change in the TE report.

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

The project built up the infrastructure need to manage the reserve through construction of checkpoints, procurement of vehicles and communications equipment. The project also recruited and trained a number of new staff, which has greatly enhanced the management capacity of the reserve. A management plan was designed for the reserve and the basis for a biodiversity monitoring system was established. The project’s outreach campaign effectively increased public awareness and improved public knowledge about biodiversity conservation.

#### b) Governance

At the national level legislation was adopted formally establishing the Lop Nur reserve at both national and provincial levels. A Management Action Plan was put in place and regulations governing the Reserve were established by both the national and the provincial (Xinjiang Uyghr Autonomous Region) governments. At the regional level the project supported a signed agreement between Mongolia and China to protect the wild Bactrian camel in both countries and to share scientific information on the species and its habitat.

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.

No unintended impacts were noted in the TE report.

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.

Based on the information in the TE report, there is no evidence of adoption of GEF initiatives 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.

1. Working through government channels and with government officials at national, provincial, and local levels is essential for continuing government support, which will result in both improved sustainability and increased public awareness and publicity.
2. Accessibility problems and lack of local support at two remote check points are a reminder of the importance of planning and building capacity before starting construction work.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

1. Future public awareness activities should involve explorers, road construction workers, and tourists.
2. Training and capacity-building should be increased to create a better understanding of environmental principles, survival techniques for living in the wild, and monitoring procedures and skills.
3. Funding resources for research and monitoring should be clearly indicated in the revised management plan.
4. Many of the suggested conservation measures, for example, public awareness, should be taken for the region as a whole, and not merely focused on the nature reserve.
5. More intensified inter-sectoral coordination is needed in order to combat the major threats posed by mining activities and the lowering of the groundwater table.
6. The environmental protection bureau or the management centre of the nature reserve should cooperate with local government in planning mining activities.
7. Efforts should be made at the provincial level to develop a Xinjiang biodiversity strategy and action plan.
8. An assessment should be made of the potential threats posed by potassium mining, with a view to reducing the negative impact of this activity on the survival of wild camels and the range of local biodiversity.
9. Scientific surveys and monitoring activities should be strengthened, including involving visitors in these activities; check points and patrols should be made more effective; and sanctuary staff should be trained in identifying wild animals and plants, which can be achieved simply by preparing a booklet on the flora and fauna of the region. Among the necessary actions are strengthening infrastructure and assisting in the implementing of a scientific program, which will include field surveys to identify water points as well as a full survey of all the endangered flora and fauna in the protected area.

## 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 EO 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?	Most of the TE is written as if it were assessing factors that affect the viability of the Bactrian camels in general, rather than an assessment of whether or not the project achieved what it set out to do. The assessment is focused more on completion of activities and attainment of outputs rather than outcomes. There is insufficient consideration of whether activities and outputs led to the expected outcomes.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is unclear in some areas, particularly in reporting on the scientific research programme for the assessment and biodiversity monitoring. More specifics on which studies were carried out, how they were done, and how the findings are being used would have been useful. The	U

	ratings are not well substantiated and the rating system is questionable. For example 'Monitoring and Evaluation' is rated as 'Very good' and justified by noting: "Monitoring and evaluations from UNEP and FECO to The Project is quite satisfactory in supervising the project progress and make adaptive management of the project. "	
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report does assess project sustainability and provides several recommendations for follow-up.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations are supported by evidence presented on project implementation. Some of the evidence presented under lessons learned should have been included in the assessment of project outcomes and performance.	<b>MS</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not present total costs, and incomplete information on co-financing.	<b>U</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	There is no assessment of the project M&E system.	<b>U</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>U</b>

**Overall TE rating: (0.3 \* (2+2)) + (0.1 \* (4+4+2+2)) = 1.2 + 1.2 = 2.4 = U**

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

1. Original GEFO TER prepared by Siham Mohamedahmed