

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

| 1. PROJECT DATA | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|--|--|---|
| GEF Project ID: 613 | | Review date: | | 03/28/09 |
| IA/EA Project ID: | RLA/99/G31 (PMIS 1433) | GEF financing: | 5.68 | 6.01 |
| Project Name: | Environmental Protection of the Rio de la Plata and its Maritime Front: Pollution Prevention and Control and Habitat Restoration | IA/EA own: | - | 0.005 |
| Country: | Argentina, Uruguay | Government: | 0.8 | 2.06 |
| | | Other*: | 2.39 | 1.32 |
| | | Total Cofinancing | 3.19 | 4.09 |
| Operational Program: | 8 | Total Project Cost: | 8.87 | 10.1 (expected as of June 2007) |
| IA | UNDP | <u>Dates</u> | | |
| Partners involved: | Comisión Administradora del Río de la Plata (CARP) - Comisión Técnica Mixta del Frente Marítimo (CTMFM) | Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began) | | 11/22/99 |
| | | Closing Date: | Proposed: 05/2003 | Actual: 12/2007 |
| Prepared by: Ines Angulo | Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi | Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 42 | Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 87 | Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 45 |
| Author of TE: | José Manuel Cabral and Luis Garcia | TE completion date: Nov 2007 | TE submission date to GEF EO: April 2008 | Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 5 months |

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

| Performance Dimension | Last PIR | IA Terminal Evaluation | IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews | GEF EO |
|--|----------|------------------------|---|--------|
| 2.1a Project outcomes | S | S | - | S |
| 2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes | N/A | HS | - | L |
| 2.1c Monitoring and evaluation | - | - | - | MU |
| 2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution | NA | NA | NA | MS |
| 2.1e Quality of the evaluation report | N/A | N/A | S | S |

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

Yes, with the exception of M&E. The evaluation is based on a clear and robust methodology, and provides in depth assessment of both project design and implementation. The report is well structured and logical, although, some parts have redundant information. It includes conclusions, recommendations and lessons learnt for each section.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds,

mismanagement, etc.?
No.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

The ProDoc does not specify a GEO, but it mentions that the project will “focus on the identification and resolution of transboundary environmental problems affecting an area of regional and global significance”.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

According to the ProDoc, the project DO was to “prevent and, when necessary, mitigate the degradation of the Transboundary environmental resources of the Rio de la Plata and its Maritime Front and enhance the sustainable use of these resources by the inhabitants of both countries”.

The project had a three-pronged strategy with the following objectives:

- “Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA): complement the national focus of baseline programs by addressing transboundary issues through joint binational programming.
- Development of a Strategic Action Program (SAP) of policy, legal, and institutional reforms and priority investments to prevent and mitigate the priority Transboundary environmental concerns identified in the TDA.
- Strengthening and sustaining the SAP implementation framework by development of regional co-operation and co-ordination mechanisms to deal with complex Transboundary problems, e.g. pollution loads from sources internal and external to the Rio de la Plata and its Maritime Front.”

There were no changes during implementation.

| Overall Environmental Objectives | Project Development Objectives | Project Components | Any other (specify) | | |
|---|--|--|--|---------------------|--|
| | | | | | |
| If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change | | | | | |
| Original objectives not sufficiently articulated | Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives | Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious | Project was restructured because of lack of progress | Any other (specify) | |
| | | | | | |

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

The Rio de la Plata watershed supports a number of important economic activities, including commercial fisheries, tourism, and transportation. Both countries have sustainable development programs that recognize the importance of the Rio de la Plata and were taking a number of initiatives to improve the management of this waterbody and particularly the problems of pollution. This project was relevant to both countries priorities because strong co-ordination of policies, strategies and control programs between both countries was needed in order to improve the environmental protection of the river.

(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?

The project was relevant to the Treaty of the Rio de la Plata and its Maritime Front, signed in 1973 by Argentina and Uruguay, which established the legal framework for the bi-national management of the waterbody. According to the treaty, CARP and CTMFM are responsible for the preservation, conservation and rational use of living resources and the prevention and elimination of pollution in these areas.

In addition, the Environmental Action Plan approved by Uruguay (1992) and the Environmental Report drafted by

| |
|---|
| Argentina (1992) include several targets, actions and programs that place a top priority on conserving and rehabilitating the coastal ecosystems of the Rio de la Plata and the Atlantic Ocean and the strengthening of the management of common resources and boundary areas. |
| (iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate? |
| The Rio de la Plata and its Maritime Front are part of the Southeast South American Shelf Large Marine Ecosystem (LME) which houses globally outstanding biodiversity and has been included under the WWF Global 200 programme that identifies the richest, rarest and most endangered natural areas of the planet. |
| (iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives) |
| Both countries have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and are Parties to the Convention on Migratory Species, the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES) and the Ramsar Convention on Wetlands of International Importance. Therefore, project results such as the development of the TDA, SAP and the Bi-national Biodiversity Strategy for the Rio de la Plata and its Maritime Front (complementing the National Biodiversity Strategies), were very relevant to the countries obligations towards the conventions. |
| A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership¹ |
| According to the TE one of the main achievements of the project was the strengthening of cooperation and coordination between all institutions involved; both at the national and at the international level. FREPLATA cooperated with 9 other regional and national projects (particularly during the preparation of the SAP), as well as collaborating with other bi-national commissions like the Comisión Administradora del Río Uruguay (CARU) and the Comisión Técnica Mixta de Salto Grande (CTMSG), and signed a cooperation agreement with the Comité Intergubernamental de la Cuenca del Plata (CICP). |
| b. Effectiveness Rating: S |
| The Project results, as a whole, are satisfactory. Among specific satisfactory results are : - The level at which Specific Objective 1 was achieved, including the high quality of the TDA, and the significant participation of national technicians and scientists in its development, - Objective 2: the endorsement given by the governmental institutions to the SAP and the way in which the SAP is related to the TDA, - The quality of the activities performed for reaching Specific Objective 3, and the way in which the Project contributed to the bi-national understanding, collaboration and cooperation in and between the governmental institutions of both countries. In addition, the Project produced a series of highly positive unanticipated impacts. An example is the 70 km ² of coastal-marine area at Cerro Verde (on the Atlantic coast of Uruguay) that was declared a Natural Protected Area following a joint initiative with CIDKARUMBE (NGO). Among the weak points of the Project are the low level of representation in the SAP of actions and projects presented by some of the stakeholders and a lack of specific commitments about meeting quantitative objectives in the SAP, as well as a relative weaker participation of municipalities and other civil society stakeholders in the support and strengthening activities of Specific Objective 3 of the Project. |
| c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) Rating: MS |
| The TE mentions that it is difficult to calculate the cost-effectiveness of this type of project (elaboration of TDA, and SAP). That being said, it concludes that based on the interviews with stakeholders, there is a subjective agreement that this project was efficient, particularly considering the small size of the PIU (and therefore small administrative costs). However, it also informs that there were considerable delays at project inception that had a negative effect on the cost-effectiveness. |
| d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) |
| This project focused on the elaboration of a TDA and SAP; the implementation of these programs will be done in the following phase of the project, so no trade-offs are mentioned. |

4.1.2 Results / Impacts² (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

This project was envisioned as a 2-phased process. As such, the first stage generated largely intangible domestic benefits such as enhanced scientific knowledge, awareness of systems dynamics, management capacity, and joint

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

² Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

programming. It is expected that over the longer term, the removal of barriers to joint waterbody management and the implementation of the SAP in the second phase will provide tangible global benefits.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

| | |
|--|-------------------|
| a. Financial resources | Rating: L |
| The project has started the needed actions to request further funding for the second phase of the project (implementation of SAPs and NAPs). These actions include the formal request of funding from the GEF. The budget needed for the second phase has been calculated at \$15 million, including co-financing from the governments (\$3.27 million), and private sector (\$1.5 million) among others. Information available in the GEF-PMIS (as of April 2009) indicates that project #3519 “Reducing and Preventing Land-based Pollution in the Rio de la Plata/Maritime Front through Implementation of the FREPLATA Strategic Action Programme” was included in the GEF Working Program in April 2008. | |
| b. Socio-economic / political | Rating: L |
| Political risk is minimal since the SAP has been endorsed by the governments, and the strong political commitment is evidenced by the more than 37 commitments made by different public entities at the federal, national, provincial and local levels. | |
| c. Institutional framework and governance | Rating: L |
| No institutional/governance risks are mentioned in the TE (capacities of involved institutions were improved and the awareness-raising component of the project resulted in a significant buy-in from all stakeholders). | |
| d. Environmental | Rating: L |
| Although the issue of fisheries is essentially off-limits, there has been a willingness to engage in limited discussions on the matter, and it is possible that the SAP may provide a small window of opportunity for making some progress towards more sustainable fisheries over the coming years. | |
| e. Technological | Rating: NA |
| Not applicable | |

4.3 Catalytic role³

| |
|--|
| a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to catalyze changes in stakeholders |
| No incentives are mentioned, but it is important to mention that this is the first phase of a two-phased project. This phase focused on creating the TDA, SAP and NAPs, while the later phase would focus on implementing them. |
| b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities changed institutional behaviors |
| A bi-national system was already established before the project start for the assessment and management of shared fishery resources in the Rio de la Plata and its Maritime Front and is implemented through CARP and CTMFM. But according to the TE, the project has contributed to the establishment of a new culture of interdisciplinary, inter-institutional and bi-national work which will provide a sound basis for the SAP implementation. There is greater integration among the scientific institutions / services in each country and among key governmental agencies both nationally and bi-nationally. |
| c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities led to policy changes (and implementation of policy)? |
| FREPAP contributed to the elaboration of plans, strategies and protocols both at the national and bi-national level. A proposal for investment plans and legal and institutional frameworks was prepared and approved by both governments. Strategies for biodiversity and for pollution control were agreed upon during this process. Also criteria for measuring and determining water quality were approved. |
| d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project led to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing) |
| Although the PIR2007 indicates that there are “very significant investments programmed in both countries to address water and sanitation issues that are of high priority for the project area and which total over \$1.7 billion”, there is no indication that this financing is a result of the project. |
| e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)? |
| According to the PIR2007, the decision in 2005 to hire two facilitators, one from each country, who would spearhead the positioning of the project and the SAP with key government stakeholders in a range of agencies; greatly |

³ Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.

contributed to enhanced visibility for the project, and gradual buy-in by important sectors, including those responsible for water resources and sanitation matters.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE found that the disbursement of the co-finance experienced delays, particularly at the beginning of the project, but it mentions that all planned co-financing was expected to be disbursed before the end of the project. The project budget experienced several changes due to various reasons, but despite these changes the project was able to adapt and adjust accordingly and therefore project implementation was not affected.

The TE specifically mentions that the delay in disbursement of the approx \$1 million from the French Environmental Fund affected the completion of the TDA since some of the research components had to be delayed or eliminated.

b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project experienced some delays when it started because it took longer time than expected to set up the Implementation Unit (staff, budget, equipment and infrastructure), and it was only in Sep 2001 that the CARP-CTMFM consortium passed resolution #01/7 which gave the Unit the needed authority and autonomy they needed to effectively perform its role.

The formulation of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis required more time than anticipated, especially in terms of negotiating and establishing the framework agreements with the more than thirty institutions that participated in its work. However, according to the TE, the strong networks and outputs that resulted from this have amply justified this delay. In addition, the TDA elaboration process, which called for the active involvement of a comprehensive bi-national interdisciplinary structure of working groups involving a large number of research institutions, hydrographical services and governmental agencies also proved more time consuming than expected. Finally, external factors that affected implementation include the economic crisis experienced in both countries in 2002 and the changes in government following national elections (a serious problem in the case of Argentina which had 4 different administrations from 2001-2003).

c. Country Ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability highlighting the causal links.

The Rio de la Plata watershed is considered a priority area for both countries. This was evident in both the level of participation and consultation achieved and the degree of ownership reached in the formulation of the Project. FREPLATA has become firmly institutionalized within the bi-national, national and sub-national environmental management systems.

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry **Rating (six point scale): MS**

The Project follow up and evaluation mechanisms are considered satisfactory, since they include a series of reports, meeting and evaluations properly programmed and budgeted, although there is no specific requirement for the Executing Unit to have internal tools for the management and control of project implementation.

In contrast, the indicators, means of verification, and risks and assumptions defined are rated unsatisfactory by the TE in the sense that the majority of performance indicators are formulated in a generic and imprecise manner, and are not expressed in such a way to allow their qualitative or quantitative measurement, to a large extent the means of verification are not pertinent, no risks are specified and all assumptions are formulated in favorable terms for the development of the Project. Nevertheless, it is important to mention that the ProDoc specifies that indicators would be developed in more detail by the Project Implementation Unit during the first semester of the project; and that further indicators would be added to the monitoring system as the set of 'indicators' for international water projects is developed under output 3.4 of the project.

b. M&E plan Implementation **Rating (six point scale): MU**

The monitoring, control and evaluation of FREPLATA faced deficiencies. The TE concludes that there was no evidence about the existence of a formal project management and control system in the Executing Unit and the logical framework indicators were not used for monitoring Project activities. Project indicators were changed in 2002 but it is not clear whether they were used in a consistent manner.

The Program monitoring and evaluation schedule was partially fulfilled, although the results and recommendations of the Midterm Evaluation (September 2003) and Technical Assistance for Project Management Mission (March 2005) played a relevant role in bringing about needed adjustments in Project execution. The monitoring and activity reports were made with the required regularity by the Executing Unit, UNDP, and GEF.

b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?

The budget included in the ProDoc calculated \$300,000 for M&E activities, but the total amount destined for M&E cannot be specified from the information presented because items such as travel and salaries are budgeted separately.

| |
|---|
| <p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? There is no mention of any problem or shortage regarding the budget for M&E activities.</p> |
| <p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? The TE mentions that Mid-term review (in 2003) and the 2005 Technical Assistance to the Project Management resulted in overall improvement of the project implementation and achievement of goals. Feedback from these 2 documents contributed to the finalization of the TDA, implementation of some pilot projects, more involvement of NGOs, and better communication between the executing unit and the UNDP office in Uruguay, among others.</p> |
| <p>b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. This Project provides a good example of the usefulness of independent reviews. All project changes and adjustments were a result of either the independent Mid-term review or the external technical assistance provided by GEF/UNDP. As mentioned earlier, these changes resulted in the increase in effectiveness of project activities and were instrumental in the achievement of project objectives.</p> |

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

| |
|--|
| <p>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS</p> |
| <p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MS <i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</i></p> <p>According to the TE, the technical proposal designed by the IA satisfactorily identified appropriate objectives and activities that need to be taken up to achieve those objectives. On the other hand, the omission of the experiences and lessons learned from similar projects affected the quality of project design, particularly with regard to aspects of management and control on the time periods estimated in the work plan for the implementation of some of the activities. Periods allocated for the implementation of some specific activities were clearly inadequate, in particular those relating to: i) identification and contact with key actors and institutions, and the process of design, negotiation and agreement on the formation and operation of working groups for implementation of the TDA; ii) developing the framework for cooperation and coordination for the management of transboundary problems, and iii) designing and implementing the training plan. In addition, the ProDoc did not clarify the specific roles and responsibilities of each of the institutions involved in project implementation, which led to some confusion and resulted in delays particularly at the beginning of the project.</p> <p>Regarding project supervision, the TE specifies that it was the supervision and reviews conducted by UNDP that led to the adjustments that facilitated achievement of the project objectives. On the other hand, the TE found that the PIRs ratings were not very candid as they rated project implementation as satisfactory even for the period when the project was experiencing serious delays.</p> |
| <p>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale): MS <i>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.</i></p> <p>The TE concludes that, overall, the CARP-CTMFM consortium proved to have the capacity to successfully achieve project objectives. The PIU complied with all the reporting requirements, and was able to make the necessary adaptations to deal with the variations of the project budget during implementation. Nevertheless, the consortium did show some weakness in project management, as they failed to follow the original work plan and concentrated all their initial efforts in elaborating the TDA leaving the other two project components aside. As a result, the duration of the project had to be extended considerably.</p> |

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

| |
|---|
| <p>a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects</p> |
|---|

⁴ Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

The following lessons learned deserve mention:

- i) Given prevalent conditions existing in most participating countries, projects should not be overly optimistic and ambitious regarding what can be achieved and the time-frame in which the goals and objectives could be achieved.
- ii) It would be convenient to have all the necessary organization that is required for the execution of this type of projects in place well in advance of the initiation of the Project proper. Its consolidation might take some time.
- iii) When there is limited clarity and overlap regarding the jurisdictional definition and functions of the executing agencies involved, as well as rivalries, it is important to have a direction-setting organization operating in a neutral plane that is well respected by everybody involved and with high capability for conflict resolution and negotiation.
- iv) The organization for Project execution must be flexible and adaptable although staying within the basic rules of the financing institutions and the national policy guidelines of participating countries.
- v) In this type of projects it is convenient to have from the beginning a check and balance entity (commission or committee) to steer and provide the right direction and to balance interests and activities within the Project.
- vi) The way in which the execution of the TDA was set encouraged the interest and empowerment of national technicians and scientists, but not those of civil society or population in general.
- vii) The development of this type of diagnostics, as an integral part in the preparation of a SAP, needs a clear definition of its fundamental purpose right from the very beginning. Otherwise, there will be a risk of unnecessary prolongation of research activities, expense overrun, gathering of information irrelevant for the SAP and omitting information that the SAP needs in order to be effective.
- viii) The way, in which the SAP was prepared with ample national institutional participation from the very beginning, encouraged empowerment and involvement from those institutions. An important contributing factor was the figure of the National Coordinators and their participation which achieved a better communication between the Project Executing Unit and the national institutions of both countries.
- ix) The interest of the civil society and the private sector in this type of Project is not spontaneously generated. It has to be promoted from the very beginning of the Project. A way to achieve their interest is by allowing them to participate in decision-making regarding the role that they see themselves playing in Project execution.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The following recommendations are made regarding the SAP:

- i) The comprehension and usefulness of the SAP document would be greatly enhanced by a revision of some parts of the text in the report and its annexes. Some portions originate mainly from the National Plans and their relation to the text in the SAP report is not always evident.
- ii) It would be convenient to clearly specify what is the situation expected at the end of the SAP execution, as compared with the original situation or baseline.
- iii) During the interviews, it was evident that the number of projects submitted by the institutions for inclusion in the SAP was greater than the number actually selected and included. It would be convenient to explicitly state the prioritization and selection criteria.
- iv) The SAP document states its objectives and action guidelines, but does not include the Project themselves. These can be seen only in the National Plans. It would be convenient to summarize them also within the SAP text. By finding them only in the National Plans, the reader may get the erroneous impression that they represent only a shopping list from the national institutions portfolio. This erroneous impression must be eliminated by a more explicit linking of the actual actions and projects with the strategic guidelines of the SAP.
- v) It would be convenient to include within the SAP document an implementation plan as well as specific monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.
- vi) During SAP discussions, specific and valuable strategies for biodiversity and pollution control were discussed and adopted. It would be convenient if these strategies were reflected in the SAP document as well as the ways in which they contributed to the SAP integration.
- vii) The SAP elaboration process is a rich experience full of lessons learned that could be used in other projects. It is important to document these lessons. It is also important to present a time-line detail of the different steps that were followed for the elaboration of the SAP until reaching the endorsement of the national institutions of both countries.
- viii) If the SAP is to be used as the basis for requesting additional funds from GEF, it would be necessary to revise the fulfillment of the incremental-cost concept.

Regarding the activities for strengthening the SAP implementation framework, the following recommendations are made:

- i) These activities include a variety of courses and training activities, meetings, workshops, seminars, and gatherings, the organization of drawing and Photo contests, exhibitions, samples, round tables, excursions and the participation and/or sponsoring of activities of other related organizations. These are included and can be found in the well constructed FREPLATA Integrated Information System. However, its usefulness and diffusion would be greatly

enhanced if, like the TDA and SAP, these activities were cohesively presented in a report showing a coherence of actions, participants and beneficiaries, as well as expected and obtained results.

- ii) The FREPLATA database is very good and is being used by several national organizations. The idea of integrating it with the data bases of the national environmental organizations in both countries is worthwhile to enhance its benefits.
- iii) It would be convenient to strengthen the participation of the municipalities and civil society entities in the SAP implementation activities. One way to achieve this, although by no means the only one would be to promote projects favoring the strengthening of the RIIGLO as well as projects generated by civil society entities in collaboration with national and/or provincial institutions.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

-

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

| 6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report | Ratings |
|--|---------|
| <p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The TE includes a detailed assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts, and achievement of project objectives. It follows a very consistent analytical methodology which makes this an easy document to follow/understand. The TE focuses on presenting ratings for every issue it analyzes, but it does not present overall ratings.</p> | S |
| <p>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps? Assessment of the achievements is based on a thorough analysis, although not much quantitative data was used. This was because the TE concluded that the indicators described in the ProDoc were not SMART. No major evidence gaps.</p> | HS |
| <p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Assessment of project sustainability is mainly focused on the political and institutional criteria. Since this is a 2-phase project, analysis of the exit strategy is focused on the financial needs.</p> | S |
| <p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons learned are included for each section of the evaluation. They are comprehensive and in general supported by the evidence presented in the TE, although some of them are repetitive (no difference between lessons and recommendations).</p> | S |
| <p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Project costs (planned and actual) are included, as well as an assessment of the financial planning and implementation of the project.</p> | HS |
| <p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? TE includes an assessment of M&E design (with a strong focus on the analysis of indicators) and implementation, including information on the usefulness of supervision on the adaptive management of the project.</p> | S |

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

-

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)

