

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		69	
GEF Agency project ID		8689	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Danube Delta Biodiversity	
Country/Countries		Romania	
Region		ECA	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP2: Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority (DDBRA); Danube Delta Institute; Ministry of Water, Forest and Environmental Protection	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Secondary executing agency	
Private sector involvement		One of the beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		04/01/92	
Effectiveness date / project start		02/06/95	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		06/30/00	
Actual date of project completion		06/30/00	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.200	0.197
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		4.500	4.300
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.300	0.200
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		4.700	4.497
Total Co-financing		0.300	0.200
Total project funding		5.000	4.697
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		12/21/00	
TE submission date		12/21/00	
Author of TE		N/A	
TER completion date		10/13/14	
TER prepared by		Sean Nelson	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	N/R	S	S	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/R	L	L	ML
M&E Design	N/R	N/R	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation	N/R	N/R	N/R	S
Quality of Implementation	N/R	S	S	S
Quality of Execution	N/R	S	S	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	S	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the project's GEO is to protect the biodiversity within the Romanian section of the Danube Delta. The Danube Delta boasts the largest bird population of all southern European wetlands, numbering 2 million in the winter across 320 species. The majority of the remaining population of the endangered pygmy cormorant live within the Delta. While the smew, red breasted pochard and the ferruginous duck are not endangered, these local species had seen their populations drastically plummet around the time of the PD. The Delta's biodiversity had been threatened by decades of poor planning with little concern for their environmental impacts, including upstream canal and dam building, fertilizer runoff, the use of heavy machinery within wetlands and intensive agricultural, fishing and forestry development. The Romanian government had turned their section of the Danube Delta into the Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve in 1990. The Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority (DDBRA) manages the Reserve. The Reserve made up over half of Romania's protected lands at the time. The following year, the DDBRA was declared a UNESCO World Heritage site.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The main DO is to strengthen institutional capacity at the DDBRA and its associated research institute, the Danube Delta Institute (DDI). This will allow the DDBRA to better monitor, protect and restore Reserve lands. Decades of unsustainable practices had hurt the local economy, such as leading to plummeting fishing catches and a falling population. The project was made up of the following 6 components:

- 1) Institutional Strengthening of the Ecological Wardens Department
- 2) Monitoring
- 3) Pilot Polder Restoration to Natural Conditions, and Reed Restoration Research
- 4) Ecosystem Restoration
- 5) Public Awareness and Community Involvement
- 6) Regional Initiatives, Coordination and Management Assistance

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

There were no changes to the GEOs or DOs.

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.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	-----------------------------

This project was relevant to the GEF's goals under OP2: Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems. In addition, the GEF also supported 3 related projects as of the PD's writing. One was a Ukrainian Danube Delta parallel project. Another was the Danube River Basin Environment Program, which aimed to enhance basin environmental management. The final project was the Black Sea Management Project, which was relevant because the Black Sea and the Danube River "are closely related ecosystems" (PD, p. 2). The project was also relevant to the Romanian government, which had recently founded the DDBRA, which made up the majority of Romania's reserved lands. The DDBRA had recently become a UNESCO World Heritage site. The Romanian government and the World Bank had also finalized the Romania Environment Strategy in 1992, which made protecting the Danube Delta's biodiversity a priority.

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

Note: This document rates project effectiveness slightly lower than the TE does, which rated project effectiveness as "Satisfactory." This is due to lower than expected polder restoration results and an ineffective public awareness campaign.

Summary: The project appears to have been successful in using training and collaboration to raise institutional capacity. Both improved monitoring and research studies/surveys have improved the understanding of the Danube's biodiversity issues. The project has experienced some success in reclaiming and restoring natural lands along the Danube, but the polder reclamation part of the project has met delays over land ownership. Note that the TE offers little information on the quality of the project's outputs, focusing instead on whether or not outputs were achieved.

Progress along each of the six project components is detailed below:

1) Institutional Strengthening of the Ecological Wardens Department, **Satisfactory**

The project hired a training specialist who developed a training manual and specialized training program for DDBRA. The courses were taught at multiple levels (foundation courses for newer staff, refresher and specialized courses for experienced staff), as well as English and French language training. The training manual also included specialized information for each of DDBRA's 12 sub-districts. The training program also organized 2 study tours to reserves in the UK, France, the Netherlands and Ukraine. The TE does not go into detail regarding the quality of the training program or staff information retention.

In addition, this component also supported DDBRA improving its infrastructure and buying vehicles (including boats) relevant for carrying out reserve management work. This helped to improve communication capabilities and to engage the public. This component expanded to include 2 new outputs: 1) Creating a new fishing boat licensing system to reform Delta capture fishery management and 2) To start evaluating development proposals based on their expected economic impact. The TE states that undertaking these 2 initiatives helped to both increase DDBRA staff effectiveness and engagement with local communities.

2) Monitoring **Satisfactory**

The project helped to improve monitoring through 3 main initiatives:

A) Monitoring Reserve species and ecosystems

This component consisted of conducting baselines surveys of both species and ecosystems. The ecosystems were then assigned into different zones based on their differing features. Species surveys helped to identify vulnerable populations. The project then created an ongoing monitoring program to track target species. The DDNI also conducted research on sustainable fishing and reed harvesting levels.

B) Creating a Geographic Information System (GIS)

The project supported exchange program, equipment purchases and international training programs to help DDNI develop the GIS. Once it was operational, DDNI used the GIS to analyze data and prepare maps, including a Delta vegetation map created with help from Ukrainian partners.

C) Carrying out Danube Delta hydrological studies

The project created a hydrological model of the Danube Delta in partnership with the Dutch government. This model will help to better manage and monitor water flow and water quality in the Delta. In turn, this has allowed the Romanian government to map and monitor the Delta's wetlands.

3) Pilot Polder Restoration to Natural Conditions, and Reed Restoration Research **Moderately Satisfactory**

This component aimed to turn artificial polders back into natural wetlands. The project originally aimed to restore 37,765 ha of polders, but legal ownership of all the polders was too unclear to proceed in a timely manner in many cases. The project has restored about 7,000 ha at the Babina, Cemovka, Enisala and Popina polders. These sites continue to be monitored, though the TE gives little detail on the quality of these restorations. Studies assessing the best means and socioeconomic impacts of restoring the remaining polders were underway. Local stakeholders have been engaged when writing these studies. As a result, the TE believes that completing the remaining polder restorations will be locally popular due to the socioeconomic benefits. The TE also asserts that restoring the remaining polders will likely be achieved.

4) Ecosystem Restoration **Satisfactory**

The project built off of the hydrological studies to lower sedimentation, degradation and biodiversity losses at the Fortuna Lumina site, in addition to other project sites. This was accomplished via dredging and water changes. The project has also undertaken a sustainable woodlot program that has improved communication and collaboration with local communities. The small grants program has also promoted sustainable resource use through support to a new fishing association, eco-tourism and medicinal herbs enterprises.

The fishing sector in particular was a focus of this component due to sturgeon fishing, which was mostly done illegally. Using Rapid Rural Appraisal (RRA) techniques and local monitoring, the project was able to get a better understanding of the scope of the issue. Collaboration with Ukraine, Bulgaria and the Republic of Yugoslavia led to a regional sturgeon conservation strategy. This initiative helped spur the Danube River Commission (DRC) to meet for the first time in 10 years. One of the Commission's local arms will implement the sturgeon conservation strategy.

5) Public Awareness and Community Involvement **Moderately Satisfactory**

The project helped to build 2 new visitors centers. In addition, the project also forged partnerships with local, Romanian and international NGOs to promote local environmental awareness. The project also created a targeted and comprehensive public education strategy. However, "during implementation it became apparent that public awareness activities financed under the project were insufficient to achieve significant impact" (TE, p. 7). The World Bank Resident Mission thus helped the project write a DDBRA public communications strategy. The TE does not state if this strategy was ever implemented.

6) Regional Initiatives, Coordination and Management Assistance **Satisfactory**

The most important result of this output was a stronger collaborative relationship between DDBRA and the Danube Plavny Reserve in Ukraine. Exchange visits and study tours helped to create this relationship. It was being further cemented through a joint training course as of the TE's writing. This collaboration has also led to joint management of an area that crosses international borders, including working together to monitor and manage bird and fish habitats and populations. The project also helped to found the lower Danube green corridor. Environment ministers from Bulgaria, Moldova, Romania and Ukraine have agreed to work together to preserve this region.

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

Summary: The project came in slightly under budget and on time with minimal delays. The one delay that mattered, which was regarding legal issues surrounding the rights to polder lands, was caused by an uncertain legal environment, not the project team itself.

Delays: The polder restoration output met with delays due to unclear land ownership rights. While carrying out this output, the project also failed to adequately engage local stakeholders. These factors helped to delay polder restoration. As a result, the project only restored 7,000 ha of the nearly 38,000 ha of land the project had originally targeted. The lack of a Project Management Unit (PMU) meant that a “lack of clearly assigned responsibility for project tasks had led to delayed follow up on agreements and next steps” (TE, p. 10). The project experienced no financial disbursement delays.

Finances: The project came in slightly under budget (US\$65,720) with regards to GEF funding. This was partly caused by the SDR depreciating against the US\$. During execution, spending was sometimes directed from low-need components (such as polder restoration) to high-performing components where a greater potential for a positive impact existed (increasing DDNI ecosystem monitoring institutional capacity).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

Summary: The project has been mainstreamed into DDBRA and DDNI processes. Their institutional capacities and knowledge bases have also been raised. The Romanian government has promised ongoing financial support. The DDBRA’s legal status was also in the process of being clarified and enhanced.

The project’s sustainability rating is assessed along the following 4 risk factors.

Environmental: **Unable to Assess**

The TE does not provide information on environmental risks to project sustainability.

Sociopolitical: **Likely**

The Ministry of Waters, Forests and Environment Protection (MWFEP), with GEF support through the Biodiversity Conservation Management Project (BCMP), was in the process of making its policies and legislation consistent. This would help the DDBRA operate in a clearer legal environment. The Romanian government has also helped to strengthen the DDBRA’s legal authority by passing Ordinance 112/2000, which harmonized and clarified the duties and powers of DDBRA and local Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA). In addition, the Romanian government had recently ratified international conventions that would aid in protecting the Danube Delta’s biodiversity. The project also helped foster international cooperation for protecting the Delta’s biodiversity. Increased public engagement and the small grants program also helped to drum up public support and awareness of the importance of protecting local biodiversity and sustainable resource use.

In addition, changes in fish market regulations are likely to improve support for Delta biodiversity protection, according to the TE. Community-based fishery resource management organizations have replaced the old state-run fishing enterprises. Regulation changes now allow these fisheries to use market prices for fish instead of government controlled prices.

Financial: **Moderately Likely**

The Romanian government remained committed to supporting the DDBRA. For instance, the government had allocated US\$500,000 towards polder restoration through 2000. The project helped raise DDNI's international profile, which helped it to secure international contracts. The TE claims that the MWFEF's legal review would help ensure better and easier DDBRA funding. The DDBRA had also expressed interest in exploring revenue streams from fines, taxes on natural resource use and issuing tourism permits, but this was just theoretical as of the TE's writing.

Institutional: **Likely**

Project activities and processes had been mainstreamed into DDBRA and DDNI. In addition, the training programs and the training manual's use were ongoing, helping to ensure continuing capacity building. The project has raised both the DDBRA's and DDNI's international profiles, helping them to be seen as biodiversity leaders within Europe. The GIS, the hydrological models, the ongoing monitoring programs and the baselines surveys have all helped to increase DDBRA's and DDNI's ability to make informed decisions and to adapt their management techniques based on empirical evidence.

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?

The Romanian government provided US\$200,000 in co-financing, which was two-thirds of its initial US\$300,000 pledge. This came out to about 4.25 percent of the total project cost. The TE does not address why this number was lower than the original pledged amount or what effect this different level of co-financing had on the project.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The polder restoration output met with delays due to unclear land ownership rights. When carrying out this output, the project also failed to adequately engage local stakeholders. These factors helped to delay polder restoration. As a result, the project only restored 7,000 ha of the nearly 38,000 ha of land the project had originally targeted. The lack of a Project Management Unit (PMU) meant that a "lack of

clearly assigned responsibility for project tasks had led to delayed follow up on agreements and next steps” (TE, p. 10). The project experienced no financial disbursement delays.

The project finished on time. The TE makes no mention of any extension requests.

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:

The passing of Ordinance 112/2000 shows that the government had made Danube Delta biodiversity protection a priority. In addition, the Romanian government had pledged to fund continuing project work, such as polder restoration. The government had also mainstreamed the project’s operations and processes into DDBRA and DDNI activities.

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.

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

The project design made monitoring a priority, as it was the project’s second main output. The indicators are well defined and often quantifiable. (For instance, the PD expects that 20 new wardens would be hired every year from the local population.) The indicators are in-line with best practices (i.e., they are SMART – Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, Timely). The schedule is moderately well-defined, including holding the Mid-Term Review (MTR) 2-and-a-half years into the project, but the PD could have provided a table of exact dates for each monitoring missions for greater clarity. However, the PD does not include a dedicated M&E budget.

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

Both the TE and the QAG review found M&E implementation to be satisfactory. The TE notes no problems with the M&E process. The teams appear to have had a good mix of skills and backgrounds for carrying out their tasks, along with boasting a high level of M&E team retention throughout the project. The MTR was submitted in November 1997.

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.

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

PRIF funding appears to have been successfully used to create a well-designed project. Relatively little alteration was required for each project output as the project moved from implementation to execution. The Bank worked closely with the Romanian government during the project design phase, building off of other related project’s experiences. The M&E design was also strong. The Bank also worked proactively and in a collaborative manner with the Romanian government when shifting funding between project outputs based on results on the ground. The main negative aspect of the Bank’s performance was that the project design did not have a thorough understand of polder land ownership issues. In retrospect, this issue could have been better addressed during the project design phase.

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

The DDBRA and the DDNI carried out work on all project components. In addition, the executing agencies showed a willingness to adapt to M&E findings, such as emphasizing DDNI ecosystem monitoring capacity over polder restoration. Hiring a former minister with both administrative experience and local experience to run DDBRA shortly before the start of project execution also aided this project in reaching its goals. On the negative side, the Romanian government could have better defined polder land ownership before project execution. The decision to not form a PMU initially left some project roles undefined, but the TE claims this also helped to mainstream the project’s approach after the project’s end.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

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.

The project helped to restore about 7,000 ha of polders back into wetlands (TE, p. 6). The project built off of the hydrological studies to lower sedimentation, degradation and biodiversity losses at the Fortuna Lumina site, in addition to other project sites. This was accomplished via dredging and water changes (TE, p. 7).

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.

The TE does not quantify the economic or financial impact of project activities. However, several actions likely helped the local economy, even if the exact amount of economic impact is unknown. These include a rise in fish catches in reclaimed polders and the Small Grants Program's support for eco-tourism, handicrafts and fishing (TE, p. 8).

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 training program and training manual have increased the DDBRA's institutional capacity. In addition, the project also supported buying boats and other vehicles, field and office equipment and building or upgrading visitors centers, watch towers and field posts. In addition, the baseline surveys and hydrological studies have all increased the DDBRA's and the DDNI's knowledge base. The project also supported NGO collaboration and public education programs that engaged local stakeholders and schools (TE, pp. 6-7).

b) Governance

The GIS has increased DDBRA and DDNI information access and information sharing (TE, p. 6). The Romanian government has also helped to strengthen the DDBRA's legal authority by passing Ordinance 112/2000, which harmonized and clarified the duties and powers of DDBRA and local Environmental Protection Agencies (EPA). In addition, the Romanian government had recently ratified international

conventions that would aid in protecting the Danube Delta's biodiversity (TE, pp. 10-11). The project also helped foster international cooperation for protecting the Delta's biodiversity (TE, p. 7, 11).

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.

The TE does not mention any unintended consequences.

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.

Project management activities became part of regular DDBRA processes (TE, p. 10).

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.

The following are from the "Lessons Learned" section of the TE:

- Entrusting existing local agencies to carry out the project instead of creating a PMU helped to guarantee institutional sustainability. Decentralization of project tasks to personnel at particular sites also ensured that these staff claimed ownership of project processes and results, along with building up their own capacities.
- The high quality level of project supervision made sure that the project's design was high, despite the design phase being relatively cheap. If the project had been prepared when the GEF was more mature, project processing would likely have been more time-consuming and expensive.
- A high level of Bank supervision and M&E staff retention helped to ensure a good working relationship between the executing agencies and the Bank that was built up over the project's lifetime.
- When projects can potentially benefit from related activities outside the project's purview, such as related (but separate) projects, the project design should only build on these related activities' results when it is certain these activities will be executed. For instance, this project's design assumed an EBRD loan would go through for a separate Danube Delta socioeconomic development project, but the loan did not materialize.

- A well-designed public communications and stakeholder engagement strategy needs to be ready early in a project’s lifecycle. This can help to build early public support and understanding for the project.
- Baseline studies and surveys need performance indicators. Project execution should be measured on the basis of impact indicators.
- Independent projects that share major similarities can help forge international cooperation and partnerships.
- Pre-existing Bank teams and new Bank teams can collaborate to create better project designs.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

While the TE lacks a section outlining the TE author’s recommendations, it does include DDBRA recommendations:

- Continue to build the wardens department institutional capacity
 - Engage local communities for management and monitoring
 - Ensure the wardens collect data for the database
- Ecosystems monitoring
 - Build on this project’s experience when carrying out similar projects in Romania and on the Danube
 - Allocate funding for ongoing monitoring
 - Supply an improved telecommunications infrastructure to ensure better collaboration between DDBRA and DDNI
 - Allow the Apele Romane SA access to the hydrological database, along with writing a protocol for sharing this information
- Polder restoration
 - Finish restoration activities in the Fortuna, Dunavat and Holbina areas
- Ecosystem restoration
 - Replicate the project’s experience with woodlot plantations, eco-tourism, fishing associations and other sectors to make sure local development is sustainable and economically beneficial
 - The Danube Fishery Commission should carry out the sturgeon conservation plan
- Public awareness

- Improve school curriculums in and near the DDBRA to emphasize the importance of environmental protection
- Engage local NGOs to have them active in schools, such as organizing field trips
- Discover where the funding needs are for carrying out such public education campaigns, then secure that funding.
- Management and coordination
 - Create a working group to write the Biosphere Reserve Romania-Ukraine bylaws
 - Technical and research cooperation and coordination should be ongoing
 - Take a part in the Danube Green Corridor Project
 - Ratify the Ramsar, Bonn and Berne Conventions
 - Figure out which international funding sources are viable

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?	The TE mentions the work carried out on all components mentioned in the PD. However, information was at times incomplete. For instance, the TE does not mention which international conventions by name Romania had joined during the project's execution, only that it had ratified some conventions	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE does not go into a great level of detail over each components' quality of execution. For instance, the TE includes no information on the quality of the training program or the state of the polder sites where restoration work had been carried out. The TE instead just notes if work had been carried out or not.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability section is consistent with the evidence and the ratings are reasonable.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are evidence-based. However, some of the issues brought up were barely addressed beforehand, such as the failure of the EBRD loan for a related project to materialize.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	A budget with line items for project components is included in Annex 2, "Project Costs and Financing." However, multiple expenditure categories are labeled "Miscellaneous" without explanation, though these items represented a small portion of total spending.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE did a fine job of describing the Monitoring project output. However, the TE was not as helpful in describing the quality of the M&E missions overseeing the project itself. The TE could have fleshed out its description of the quality of M&E design and implementation. The TE mostly praised the quality of the M&E mission without giving a good sense of what happened when the MTR and other missions were carried out and what their reports said.	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

Overall TE rating: $(0.3 * (4+4)) + (0.1 * (5+4+4+2)) = 2.4 + 1.5 = 3.9 = \text{Moderately Satisfactory}$

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

Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority Progress Reports 1-10

Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority Public Awareness Strategy

Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority Public Awareness Strategy Financing Plan

Developing Self-Sustainability of the Danube Delta Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Authority

The Danube Delta-Home for People and Nature

Danube Delta Biosphere Reserve Research Institute