

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:		640	Review date:	
			<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P035917	GEF financing:	6.75	6.75
Project Name:	Mulanje Mt. Biodiversity Conservation Project	IA/EA own:		
Country:	REPUBLIC OF MALAWI	Government:	1.27	0
		Other*:	0.50	10
		Total Cofinancing	1.77	10 ¹
Operational Program:		Total Project Cost:	8.52	16.75
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Mulanje Mountain Conservation Trust	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		08/15/2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2008	Actual: 06/30/2008
Prepared by: Tommaso Balbo di Vinadio	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 82	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 82	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 0
Author of TE: Cary Anne Cadman		TE completion date: March 6, 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in 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	UA	MS	MS	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	Significant risks	Significant risks	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	UA	UA	Modest	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?

No. Although the TE is clear and evidence-based, it does not give ratings on M&E related performance parameters.

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

As of January 6, 2009, a balance of \$17,063.34 remained in the Special Account and is expected to be returned to the Bank in March 2009. However, no follow up is required.

¹ Norway and USAID commitment to the project was made during the final year of project implementation and is going to last until 2012.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the project document, “the global environmental objective of the project is to preserve the globally significant biodiversity and unique ecosystems of the Mulanje massif, at a level beyond what could be expected based on the management objectives of watershed protection and sustainable use of forest products.”

The global environmental objective was not revised during the life of the Project.

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 project appraisal document the development objectives of the project are “to maintain the vital watershed (headwater for nine rivers) and to benefit local communities by establishing sustainable management of the forest resources through cooperation between the Forest Department (FD) and local authorities and communities.” The Annex 1 of the project appraisal document unpacks this further into four sub objectives (the annex refers to them as global objectives):

- “1. Maintain Mulanje Mountain ecosystem, including globally significant biodiversity and vital ecological services.
2. Increase awareness, understanding and appreciation of the value of the Mulanje Mountain ecosystem at local and national levels.
3. Improve sustainability of biological resource use and enhance the value of the Mulanje Mountain ecosystem to local communities.
4. Establish long-term income stream and institutional capacity to ensure continuation of 1-3; Mulanje Mountain Conservation Trust (MMCT) appreciated and respected by stakeholders at local, national and international levels. Demonstrate the appropriateness of Conservation Trust Fund as financing mechanism for biodiversity conservation”.

The above objectives were not revised during project implementation.

Annex 1 of the PAD, which summarizes project design, however, presents a more specific statement of the "Global Objective." This version is also reproduced verbatim in the ICR, which refers to "four" Global Environmental Objectives to the TE the objectives mentioned above are referred to as global environmental objectives.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)		
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)					
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	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	Rating: S
<p>The project is consistent with the GEF Operational Strategy for Biodiversity Conservation and specifically with O.P.4 (Mountain Ecosystems) and is also consistent with COP guidance in that it seeks to encourage conservation and sustainable use of threatened habitats and endemic species within a vulnerable mountain ecosystem.</p> <p>The project’s objectives also remain relevant to current country priorities as they are in line with the Malawi Growth and Development Strategy.</p>	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: MS

In terms of achievement of the objectives listed above, the overall picture appears to be mixed. Overall, the project demonstrated progress in eradicating some of the invasive species from the mountains in the project area. It also illustrated innovative ways of allowing a conservation endowment fund to increase its capital base and paved the way for future pro-active community involvement in the mountain's conservation with the signing of several co-management agreements. Yet, as explained below, neither of the expected objectives was fully accomplished:

1. According to the TE, the project was able to initiate work to begin addressing threats to the ecosystem but establishing viable systems to maintain the Mulanje Mountain ecosystem and biodiversity over the long-term will require a much more concerted effort by MMCT and the Forestry Department (FD) at both the national and district levels. In fact, there are still important challenges (i.e. the absence of sufficient law enforcement to halt illegal logging and poaching) that are yet to be addressed.
2. To assess the progress on the second objective the indicator "community awareness and appreciation of ecosystem improved and valued" was to be assessed through surveys continually during project implementation. This was, however, not tracked with the expected intensity – the last community attitude survey was conducted in 2006. This survey found that the level of awareness of Mulanje Mountain Forest Reserve (MMFR) and the need for its conservation had significantly improved since Project inception. Yet, the extent to which the project has been able to increase awareness, understanding and appreciation of the value of the Mulanje Mountain ecosystem was not established nor has it been measured since 2006. According to the TE, continued efforts are needed to increase awareness and appreciation of the mountains, particularly to decrease the incidence of wildfire and poaching.
On a positive note, it looks like there is a growing local tourist industry at the mountain and visitor records to the mountain, in addition to the growing body of Mulanje Mountain-based scientific publications by renowned national and international institutions.
3. The target of 7000 ha under co-management and 12 co-management agreements was not reached and when the TE was conducted only 1160 ha were co-managed and 6 agreements signed. However, the TE argues that it is likely that the other agreements will be signed in the future. Moreover, 134 community structures were established against the target of 75, which shows that communities are giving great importance to the Mulanje mountain ecosystem.
4. The objective to establish an endowment fund that would generate sufficient income to cover MMCT costs was not achieved due to several reasons (for example DFID decision not to support the fund). Nonetheless, towards the end of this project MMCT was able to raise more than US\$15 million in financing for continuation of project related activities and some of these funds will help MMCT meet its costs. One problem that should be taken into account in this regard is the volatility of global financial markets and the inability to donors to fund directly the endowment fund.

Even though the objectives were only partially met, the achievements reached given the difficult institutional context should be acknowledged.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: MS

The Project was expected to be of 7 years duration. However, despite a year long delay in the start of actual implementation, the project management kept up with the original expected end date. Consequently, the project's actual duration for implementation was curtailed by one year.
The TE considers the project to have been somewhat efficient as it was effective in establishing a near term financing stream for biodiversity conservation activities in the project area. GEF support catalyzed the provision of additional funding and technical assistance from a range of stakeholders. Moreover, even if not all expected outcomes were achieved completely the TE argues that the original targets set for most indicators may be achieved in the long-term if the persistent institutional and financial challenges faced by the project are overcome.

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

According to the TE, the project did generate positive impacts on the socio-economic status of local communities, in particular women. In fact, more than 60% of all livelihood initiatives financed by the Project directly benefited women that remain the main stakeholders in all beekeeping, mushroom cultivation and small-scale irrigation activities as well as fish farming supported by the Project. Moreover, the Project acted as a catalyst to attract a significant number of expert agencies, universities, research organizations and NGOs to work on conservation related matters in and around Mulanje Mountain.

An unintended result of the project was that Mozambican authorities approached MMCT to share Project

expertise and knowledge of the Mulanje montane ecosystem and biodiversity. They also requested MMCT's assistance to incorporate Project activities in Mozambique. Another unintended result of the project was the establishment of a number of legally registered resource-based user associations (beekeepers, tourism-related ventures).

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: 3
<p>The financial risk is considered to be moderate for the following reasons.</p> <p>During the last year of implementation, Norway and USAID confirmed funding for the post-closure period through to 2012, which will meet the expected US\$10 million in order to cover MMCT's running costs as well as the full set of conservation activities.</p> <p>External support seems to be of crucial importance to guarantee the stream of funding as MMCT's endowment is not adequate to generate an income stream sufficient to support critical conservation and co-management activities. Yet, the situation is not clear especially once the Norwegian and USAID grants end, unless other sources of external funding are found. Another consideration that should be made is that the Public Public Private Partnership (PPP) agreement that appears to be the only solution to overcome the institutional problems has not been signed and consequently the plan for financing that has not been implemented yet.</p> <p>On the other hand, it should be acknowledged that MMCT's efforts have been extraordinary in terms of tripling the amount used to establish the endowment fund (US\$15 million).</p> <p>It should be noted that the TE considers the financial risk to be substantial as it does not mention the additional USAID commitment of 5 million.</p>	
b. Socio political	Rating: 3
<p>The appreciation of Mulanje Mountain among stakeholders increased because of the project and Mulanje Mountain is now recognized nationally and internationally as a unique mountain with important biodiversity. The tourism sector supports the GEF project activities as they are perceived to have a positive effect on tourist arrivals to the area.</p> <p>On the other hand, there were some tensions between the communities and MMCT because the former thought that the project did not meet their expectations in terms of providing employment opportunities. Moreover, there were several misconceptions throughout the project that might persist as locals thought that the FD had sold Mulanje Mountain to MMCT.</p> <p>The lack of clarity with respect to FD and MMCT's roles and responsibilities might represent a problem in the future.</p>	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 2
<p>The institutional arrangements for the projects to be sustainable are considered to be a substantial risk. At mid-term review, it became clear in fact that the institutional arrangements for management of the MMFR were faulty and unlikely to improve. The main problem is related to the roles and responsibilities of MMCT and FD. Moreover, the FD did not have the capacity or the resources to properly manage the reserve and there was some overlap between the two in terms of roles and responsibilities for managing the protected area. The PPP agreement would, in effect, permit MMCT to formally manage the MMFR with support from FD staff seconded to MMCT. It was agreed by all Project partners that the PPP approach would function to improve day-to-day management of the Reserve, affording sufficient capacity and resources through MMCT, Public Private Partnership (PPP) unsigned</p> <p>Even though the TE underlines several times how a signed PPP would permit an effective institutional arrangement, it then argues that FD will continue to manage the MMFR once the PPP is signed. It is not clear how this arrangement will be institutionalized.</p> <p>Another problem was the working relationship between FD and MMCT. The TE states that the conflict between the two institutions was evident from the outset. After the current FD Director came on board during the final year of implementation, the working relationship among Project stakeholders improved dramatically. This bodes well for the post-closure operations.</p>	

d. Environmental	Rating: 2
<p>As a result of the project, community awareness and appreciation of the ecosystem improved. On the other hand there are still enormous environmental challenges such as insufficient law enforcement to check illegal logging and poaching, continued unsustainable harvesting of Mulanje Cedar, and the risk of bauxite mining activities, that threaten the integrity of the ecosystem. When the TE was conducted these challenges remained unaddressed and the PPP yet to be signed.</p>	

4.3 Catalytic role

<p>a.. Production of a public good The project generated a number of important scientific results such as the regeneration studies that investigate whether or not natural regeneration of Mulanje Cedar occurs on the mountain. This has added to the knowledge base that will support biodiversity conservation.</p>
<p>b.. Demonstration The project was trying to pilot a new institutional and financial structure for forest management and biodiversity conservation for high biodiversity status areas. Yet, the objective to establish an endowment fund that would generate sufficient income to cover MMCT costs was not achieved and the institutional arrangements for management of the MMFR turned out to be faulty and created several problems.</p>
<p>c.. Replication The aim of the project was also to replicate the new institutional and financial structure to other high biodiversity status areas in Malawi and elsewhere. However, the TE does not mention any efforts in that direction. It is known that Mozambique requested MMCT's assistance to incorporate Project activities in Mozambique.</p>
<p>d.. Scaling up</p>

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

<p>a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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?</p>
<p>GEF funds supported activities to incorporate biodiversity conservation objectives effectively into reserve management (i.e. monitoring populations and distributions of targeted species and other ecological indicators, identifying high priority conservation sites and the activities required to protect their biodiversity, including co-management of forest resources). GEF funds also helped raise awareness of the importance of biodiversity and healthy ecosystems, and strengthen the capacity of the FD and communities to implement conservation activities, through environmental/conservation education.</p> <p>There were several changes in the planned co-financing. First, Government financial commitments for the Project (US\$1.27 million) never materialized. According to the TE, this had a significant impact on project implementation, in particular, on MMCT's ability to deliver on agreed outputs. In fact, throughout Project implementation, FD district staff (both districts combined) received less than US\$10,000 in financial resources for management of MMFR. Second, also DFID financial commitment US\$500,000 never materialized. The latter was meant to support forest co-management and livelihoods component. This aid was to help consolidate the poverty alleviation elements of the Reserve management plan and complement support provided via the Forest Sector program. DFID decision not to support the project was due to government's lack of commitment to implement its policy with respect to community management of forests. This decision affected the achievement of objectives under the co-management and sustainable livelihoods component. According to the TE, given the significance of this component to the overall success of the project's global environmental objectives, it would have been prudent to have allocated additional resources to this component in project design. To compensate for these significant gaps in funding, MMCT reallocated project funding towards management activities of the Forest Reserve (salaries for MMFR field labor), thus reducing funds earmarked for MMCT administrative costs by up to 20%. On a positive note, in the final year of Project implementation, the Royal Norwegian Embassy provided significant resources (US\$5 million) to co-finance the project through to 2012 to enable the endowment capital to grow thereby enhancing its long-term conservation financing potential post-closure. Moreover the IEG review</p>

notes that another US\$ 5 million grant was awarded to MMCT by USAID in May 2009 to support community livelihood activities over the next five years.
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's original implementation schedule was affected by the delays in implementation during the startup phase due to delays in the establishment of a special account. Therefore, even though the project was initially designed for duration of seven years, it was eventually curtailed by one year. The TE states that the project's original implementation schedule was affected by the extended delay in project implementation post-effectiveness. However, it is not clear how this delay affected the project in terms of achievement of expected results.
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.
Country ownership and commitment to the project was not satisfactory. First government financial commitment to the project never materialized. Second, the TE notes that all key actions on project's institutional arrangements that the project partners (including the government) agreed on after the MTR had not been adopted even two years after the MTR. However, a positive note is the new working relationship between MMCT and FD.

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): 3
There were two major shortcoming related to M&E system at entry. The TE states that the project proponents overlooked the Project's Monitoring and Evaluation framework when designing the project. The evaluation mentions that the results framework prepared for the project suffered in terms of utility because the indicators were qualitative rather than quantitative in nature. Moreover, the funds for M&E activities were insufficient. In fact, MMCT had less than US\$150,000 per year available to finance all Project activities, including M&E reporting by third parties.	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): 3
To cope with the problem of unclear indicators MMCT prepared a refined results framework in 2006 reflecting a new set of quantitative indicators. According to the TE, this facilitated accurate measurement of progress on key parameters. Between 2006 and Project closing, the proxy indicators were systematically measured by MMCT. However prior to 2006, the results had not been monitored in a systematic manner. According to the TE, even though MMCT produced Annual Work Plans and budgets, designed a refined quantitative Results Framework and contracted Wildlife Conservation Society (WCS) to design an ecological monitoring system to collect annual data, these tools were not used to systematically inform management. The lack of adequate funding was also a problem that affected the implementation of a M&E system, and no additional funding was granted through implementation	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? No	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? No	
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 results were not monitored in a systematic manner prior to 2006. Moreover, MTR provided an insightful feedback and key recommendations on addressing several problems. Yet, even after two years of MTR (the time when terminal evaluation was conducted) the key actions proposed by it on project institutional arrangements had not been adopted.	
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.	
No. There were major shortcomings at entry, some of which were corrected too late.	

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): 4
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): 4

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.

Although QAG had considered the quality at entry to be highly satisfactory it seems clear that there were major project design weaknesses that affected the achievement of objectives. Some of them relate to underestimation of risks. First the project underestimated the risk related to the performance of the trust fund that in fact underperformed for 2 years affecting the ability to MMCT to deliver on a series of activities. According to the TE, even though the World Bank was aware that the endowment would not generate sufficient resources to finance the Project's running costs. It did not mitigate it adequately during implementation by trying to raise funds.

Another shortcoming was that the Biodiversity Challenges of socio-economic origin were not emphasized sufficiently in project design. In particular, the need to adopt a sustainable livelihoods approach. The Project's co-management and sustainable livelihoods component was originally allocated US\$860,000 but due to lack of co-financing, the component received only US\$64,115 by Project closing.

During project implementation, the Bank provided relevant training to MMCT with respect to Bank financial management and procurement procedures. Yet, MMCT complained that some of the internal Project management challenges faced by MMCT from MTR to closing may have been mitigated had the Bank provided additional support to MMCT staff that lacked adequate knowledge and experience. In terms of supervision, the Bank seems to have sought ways as to how to improve the project during implementation and it identified some problems and suggested possible solutions. For instance, some of the fundamental Project constraints were addressed at mid-term review when it proposed the creation of a PPP.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies² (rating on a 6 point scale) 4

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.

The executing agency for this project was an NGO, Mulanje Mountain Conservation Trust (MMCT).

The TE lists a series of positive actions taken by MMCT to overcome some problems. For instance, it secured more than three times the funds allocated through the trust (it should be noted though that this happened during the final years of project implementation). Moreover, during implementation as it became clear that Biodiversity Challenges of socio-economic origin were not emphasized sufficiently MMCT shifted their focus to address this challenge so as to achieve the expected outcomes under Component 2.

However, a problem that doesn't seem to have improved is MMCT poor management performance on procurement issues (i.e. MMCT was not operating with a procurement plan).

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

According to the TE, the main lessons learned from this Project can be organized in three categories: institutional, technical and community involvement.

• Institutional

A key lesson learned from this Project is that the institutional framework and supporting policies should be designed such that accountability is clear to all stakeholders and lay where there is sufficient capacity. In other

² 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.

words, this Project created an asymmetry between government and a semi-private organization. It created an NGO with the capacity to finance conservation of MMFR, but for which it was not accountable. Conversely, the FD was accountable for management and conservation of MMFR, but experienced decreasing capacity and resources to manage and conserve the MMFR. The conflict between MMCT and FD only served to exacerbate an already frustrating and dysfunctional working relationship, partially caused by these asymmetries. Despite these difficulties, MMCT did achieve some results (e.g. fire breaks, clearance of invasive species). However, it was unable to address the major ecological challenges faced in the Reserve.

o A second related institutional lesson is that not only do the roles and responsibilities of all implementing partners need be clear from inception, the institutional capacity and commitment to carry out those roles and to deliver on the respective responsibilities is a critical element necessary to ensure project success. This project did clarify roles and responsibilities early on during project preparation, but it failed to ensure that each entity held sufficient capacity and commitment to deliver on its responsibilities.

o Third institutional lesson is that an endowment fund approach to ensure sustainable financing of conservation objectives can be successfully used as a tool to secure additional investments and attract strategic partnerships related to core conservation goals if it is embedded within a strong institutional structure.

o A fourth lesson is that future operations should consider an M&E system critical for planning and also as an early-warning system for management.

o A final lesson learned was that for this type of operation (small scale, innovative district-level implementation model), project supervision would have been more effective at addressing day-to-day management issues had it been based out of the resident mission. Direct resident mission support on a regular basis is preferable to biannual Washington-based supervision missions.

• Technical

The primary research financed by this Project generated a number of important scientific results that warrant further investigation and can be used to refine strategic biodiversity conservation approaches on the mountain. For example, with respect to the question as to whether or not natural regeneration of Mulanje Cedar occurs on the mountain, comparison of four years of data suggest that natural regeneration does occur but that micro-environments affect germination and survival rates with significant variation between sites. Fire is noted to cause the greatest loss of new recruits. The artificial regeneration studies also show some trends that can be of use in the consideration for the planting of the species. Lessons learnt from these studies have been applied on the Lichenya Plateau where seedlings planted under canopy have shown a 95% rate of survival. Other scientific findings of significance are described in detail in the published literature as well as MMCT's project completion report in addition to the summary presented in Annex 2.

• Community involvement

Local community involvement was a critical element in ensuring progress toward achieving the project's GEOs. Provision of viable livelihood alternatives, coupled with pro-active engagement of local communities in reserve management work and mountain conservation activities were essential ingredients affording MMCT and FD the success witnessed in several of the Project's investments. Had local communities not been involved in Project preparation and Project implementation, it is unlikely that the Project would have achieved as many results as documented at ICR. Early, intensive and continuous engagement of local communities is a core element of any future operation that will be carried out under similar circumstances (high population density, growing population pressure on natural resources, lack of livelihood alternatives, etc) to Mulanje Mountain.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

UA

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 project makes a good assessment of the achievement of objectives</p>	5
<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? The review is evidence-based</p>	5
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The project assesses project sustainability</p>	5
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons learned are comprehensive</p>	5
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes, it does,</p>	5
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? Although there is a section on M&E, the TE does not rate the quality of it</p>	3

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

IEG review.