

## Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		77	
GEF Agency project ID		34080	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Biodiversity Collections	
Country/Countries		Indonesia	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-3: Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Research and Development Center for Biology (PPPB) of the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI), Herbarium Bogoriense and Museum Zoologicum Bogoriense	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NGOs such as BirdLife International and Wetlands International collaborated on some publications.	
Private sector involvement		Not involved.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		4/1/1992	
Effectiveness date / project start		7/25/1994	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		10/31/2000	
Actual date of project completion		3/31/2001	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		7.2	7.07
Co-financing	IA own	0	0
	Government	4.2	2.77
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		7.2	7.07
Total Co-financing		4.2	2.77
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		11.4	9.84
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		9/17/2001	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Henrik Balslev & Maurice Kottelat	
TER completion date			
TER prepared by		Shanna Edberg	
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	S	S	MU	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	ML	L	L	ML
M&E Design	n/a	n/a	n/a	MS
M&E Implementation	S	n/a	n/a	UA
Quality of Implementation	n/a	S	S	S
Quality of Execution	n/a	S	S	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	n/a	n/a	S	MS

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the Project Document (PD), the project's global environmental objective is to support Indonesia's efforts at conserving biodiversity by strengthening the capacity of the Research and Development Center for Biology to collect, inventory, and monitor biodiversity data. Biological inventories are a crucial part of environmental assessment and biodiversity conservation.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's components are stated in the Project Document as follows:

1. General project management and coordination
2. Systematic collections and research in botany and zoology
  - a. Human resources development: 18 graduate-level scholarships in systematic biology, 11 overseas work-study programs, local management training programs, and on-the-job training for managers, scientists, interns, and technicians
  - b. Collections restoration and development: provide renovations, supplies, and staff to improve and expand specimen storage, improve organize, and restore deteriorating specimens
  - c. Research facilities: renovate and provide literature and equipment for biology research facilities
  - d. Publications and products: develop an illustrated technical glossary, a computerized bibliography, a computerized gazetteer, a database and handbooks covering taxa, national field guides, and a specimen identification service
3. Information systems management: set up a computer database and local area network for biodiversity specimen management and dissemination
4. Scientific collaboration and services: technical assistance and office equipment to strengthen capacity to manage collaborative research, client services, and training programs

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

There were no changes to the project objectives.

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

The project falls under GEF Operational Program 3: Forest Ecosystems. The Operational Program prioritizes conservation and sustainable use of forest ecosystems, which the project intends to accomplish by increasing the ability of Indonesia's Research and Development Center for Biology to collect, inventory, and monitor biodiversity data. Increasing the inventory and monitoring capabilities of this institution will add to the scientific knowledge of Indonesia's biodiversity, which will in turn aid the Indonesian government in its forest conservation efforts.

The project also aligns with Indonesian priorities. The 1991 Biodiversity Action Plan outlined a strategy for biodiversity conservation that included provisions for the Research and Development Center's improvement in information and research collections. This improvement effort will be aided by the project.

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

Overall project effectiveness is rated moderately satisfactory. The project "restored and developed the collections in the [Research and Development Center for Biology] to world-class standards" (TE, page 3). Human resources and technical capacity were strengthened. The project met most of its objectives, but failed to obtain the required scientific literature and did not provide internet or intranet access to the Research and Development Center for Biology. On a component-by-component basis:

1. General project management and coordination

This will be discussed below, under Project Implementation and Project Execution.

2. Systematic collections and research in botany and zoology
  - a. Human resources development: 18 graduate-level scholarships in systematic biology, 11 overseas work-study programs, local management training programs, and on-the-job training for managers, scientists, interns, and technicians

The aforementioned targets for human resources development were either met or exceeded. According to the TE, the training opportunities improved work morale, team building, and allowed the employees of the Research and Development Center for Biology to create an overseas network “that enhances scientific collaboration and extends the Research and Development Center for Biology’s biodiversity services” (TE, page 6). The capacity building efforts also upgraded curatorial practices to international standards.

- b. Collections restoration and development: provide renovations, supplies, and staff to improve and expand specimen storage, improve organize, and restore deteriorating specimens

This component also exceeded its target. 255,000 botany specimens were renovated or stabilized, out of an original target of 200,000. Botany specimens were given new covers and a new organization system. However, the restorations only covered only 12% of the Center’s botany specimens, with a backlog of 200,000 specimens stored in unsatisfactory conditions. An Integrated Pest Management system replaced the use of toxic chemicals for preserving botany specimens and practices for keeping the research center clean and secure were improved. For zoology specimens, the entire collection of over two million specimens was stabilized, reorganized, and moved to a new facility that meets international standards. However, some zoology collections remain unidentified and unattended.

- c. Research facilities: renovate and provide literature and equipment for biology research facilities

The target for improving research facilities was met. Three research laboratories and a type room were upgraded, and renovations took place in several other areas. An electric plant specimen drier and a walk-in freezer were installed. The building was rewired to solve fluctuations in electrical voltage. Nineteen microscopes were provided, but according to the TE more are needed. New storage and viewing equipment were procured, along with two computers and a server.

- d. Publications and products: develop an illustrated technical glossary, a computerized bibliography, a computerized gazetteer, a database and handbooks covering taxa, national field guides, and a specimen identification service

For botany publications, only 50% of the planned acquisitions of scientific literature were provided, but targets for the production of botany publications was “nearly met” (TE, page 7). A technical bilingual glossary, a computerized bibliography, four original field guides, a curatorial manual, a management policy, and five international publications were produced by the project. 83 reference books were bought on zoology, which did not meet the project target. The project produced a management and curation handbook, a museum brochure, and two field guides on zoology, but a technical glossary was not completed. The TE attributes the incompleteness of this component to the unforeseen need to restore the entire zoology collection. The project only planned for a partial restoration, and the need to restore the entire zoology collection and procure additional equipment caused a delay in this component.

3. Information systems management: set up a computer database and local area network for biodiversity specimen management and dissemination

Software for an Indonesian Biodiversity Information System for both botany and zoology was developed and is fully functional, although the information system was downgraded into a pilot version at project midterm. The database was showcased at an international meeting in Germany, and a website was created for accessing information about the project. 384,000 zoology and botany records were added to the database. According to the TE, there were some problems with erroneous data validations, but they were in the process of being corrected. There were also problems with the IT staff lacking knowledge of nomenclature rules due to insufficient coordination between the IT staff and the taxonomic staff. In addition, “several taxonomists demonstrated limited understanding of the [database] and its potential use” (TE, page 8). The TE states that the project “worked through” these issues (TE, page 8). The database was used for preparation of two field guides authored by the staff of the research center. The project procured computers, accessories, and software to the Center, but the project was unable to provide intranet or internet access, as had been expected. The TE reported problems with maintenance contracts on this component.

4. Scientific collaboration and services: technical assistance and office equipment to strengthen capacity to manage collaborative research, client services, and training programs

The project produced 17 field guides, two collection manuals, and a brochure for the research center. Many of these were produced entirely by research center staff, while others were prepared in collaboration with NGOs such as BirdLife International and Wetlands International. According to the TE, this component developed adherence to standards for peer review, style, and originality among research staff. The project established a foundation for distributing the research center’s publications and producing additional books on biodiversity. The project also sponsored competitive research grants to support collaborative taxonomic research with other research and academic institutions, but the midterm evaluation “found that the quality of the proposals and utility and quality of the reports did not justify further use of GEF funds” (TE, page 9). Finally, public open house and training events were sponsored to expose the Indonesian public to the work and benefits of the research center. Over 6,000 students and teachers attended these events.

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

The project was extended by five months, and the TE reported a number of delays in project implementation. The Project Implementation Unit did not adhere to World Bank procurement procedures, which resulted in delays in obtaining equipment and publishing materials. The Technical Advisory Group broke their contract with the project in 1998 following civil unrest, which caused delays in some project activities. Staff changes “have been dealt with sporadically and with difficulty,” which also caused delays (TE, page 10). The financial and institutional sustainability study was also delayed, but the TE does not explain why. The unanticipated need to move all of the zoology specimens to a new facility caused delays in the project’s training and publication components. The delay in providing

reference materials “seriously compromised the efficiency and quality of future curation and research” (TE, page 7). There were also “delays caused by contractor and technical assistance differences” in setting up the databases (TE, page 8). However, the TE reports that problems were identified and acted on in a timely manner, and the project completed most of its outputs by project closure. Lastly, the TE states that until the midterm evaluation, project implementation progress was rated as unsatisfactory, but progress improved considerably following the midterm report.

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

*Financial: **Moderately likely***; a budget line was established for the maintenance and continued restoration of the collections. Nonetheless, “this funding is likely to remain insufficient to meet all the aspirations of the staff” (TE, page 12). The project has procured enough curatorial supplies to last 3-4 years, but “maintenance and upgrading of research and IT equipment remain highly dependent on international collaboration” (TE, page 12). A foundation for publishing and distributing the works of the research center is in place. However, the financial and institutional sustainability study that was carried out by the project was not integrated into the future plans of the research center.

*Sociopolitical: **Moderately Likely***; government commitment to the research center appears high, as evidenced by the center’s ability to hire ten staff despite a hiring freeze in the Indonesian civil service. Also, the research center prepared a transition plan to integrate project initiatives into regular operations. However, “the technicians in the Herbarium are insufficient to maintain the yearly increase of the collections, thus they will have limited effect on the remaining unrestored collections or the large backlog of unsorted material” (TE, page 12). In addition, “the recommendations [made by the project] to PPPB management have not been adopted and the structural changes to commercialize products and services of researchers have not been considered in the recent PPPB reorganization” (TE, page 13).

*Institutional: **Moderately likely***; the education, training opportunities, and equipment upgrades offered to the research center have strengthened its capacity to manage biological collections and coordinate biological research. Outside scientists and institutions have returned specimens to the research center at an increasing rate due to the improved state of the collections. On the other hand, the TE mentions that “issues on intellectual property rights have not been addressed and this threatens the availability of the data to the public (contradicting the project objectives)” (TE, page 12). If the information is not made publicly available, the research center “will have missed the opportunity and the intention to become a useful, dynamic research and management tool” (TE, page 12). The TE does not specify the legal issues or how they could be resolved.

*Environmental: **Not applicable**.*

## 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?

Actual cofinancing was only 66% of planned cofinancing. All cofinancing came from the government of Indonesia. The Asian financial crisis of 1997 and subsequent drop in the value of the rupiah limited the ability of the Indonesian government to provide the original dollar value of the planned cofinancing. It is not clear in the TE which activities were financed by cofinancing, and what effect the lack of actual cofinancing had.

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?

As mentioned above, the project was extended by five months, and the TE reported a number of delays in project implementation. The Executing Agency did not adhere to World Bank procurement procedures, which resulted in delays in obtaining equipment and publishing materials. The Technical Advisory Group broke their contract with the project in 1998 following civil unrest, which caused delays in some project activities. Staff changes "have been dealt with sporadically and with difficulty," which also caused delays (TE, page 10). The financial and institutional sustainability study was also delayed, but the TE does not explain why. The unanticipated need to move all of the zoology specimens to a new facility caused delays in the project's training and publication components. The delay in providing reference materials "seriously compromised the efficiency and quality of future curation and research" (TE, page 7). There were also "delays caused by contractor and technical assistance differences" in setting up the databases (TE, page 8). However, the myriad delays did not appear to affect the completion project outputs or project sustainability.

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

Country ownership appears to be mixed. Government commitment to the research center is high, judging by the center's ability to hire ten staff despite a hiring freeze in the Indonesian civil service, as well as the government's provision of its cofinancing commitment despite a severe financial crisis. However, the research center did not adopt the recommendations made by the project regarding management and research services and products, which may limit the project's sustainability. The TE reported that the Research and Development Center's management was not always "sufficiently engaged to assist the Project Implementation Unit in solving some critical problems," although it showed "great support" for the project (TE, page 4). Also, a User Advisory Group was created to involve the public in the project, but the User Advisory Group did not function well beyond the initial consultation, and there was a lack of incentives for user participation.

## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	--

According to the Project Document, the Research and Development Center for Biology would develop the project monitoring system during project inception. The PD has several guidelines for the content of the monitoring system, but it is unknown whether the monitoring system was developed. The indicators of the project's logical framework are measurable, relevant, and achievable. However, there is no budget for M&E in the Project Document.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE does not describe project M&E.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--	-----------------------------

The TE judged the project quality at entry to be satisfactory, and the project "was well structured" (TE, page 14). One flaw noted in project design was that the project document was too detailed, such that "it appeared to have intimidated execution" (TE, page 3). Also, the project design underestimated the very low baseline of IT capabilities in the research center, thus underestimating the center's needs and limiting the ability of the project to meet its objectives in this regard.



The TE rates the supervision of the World Bank as highly satisfactory. According to the TE, the project was adequately reviewed with sufficient supervisory missions. When problems were noted in the midterm review, the Bank increased its level of supervision until corrections were made. Overall, “the Bank has provided significant support to the government and the implementing agency and its responses to implementation problems were timely and efficient” (TE, page 14).

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
---	--

The TE states that the groups that were formed to assist the project, such as the Steering Committee, Project Management Committee, User Advisory Group, Technical Advisory Group, and Project Implementation Unit provided a mixed level of support, “resulting in inconsistencies and sometimes strained relationships among implementers and managers,” and “some groups that were hoped to facilitate smooth implementation of project activities did not consistently deliver” (TE, page 5).

The TE reported that the Research and Development Center’s management was not always “sufficiently engaged to assist the Project Implementation Unit in solving some critical problems,” although it showed “great support” for the project (TE, page 4). In addition, the Project Management Committee “was not consistent in fulfilling its executive responsibility, but has improved through the project life” (TE, page 5). According to the TE, the User Advisory Group did not function well beyond the initial consultation, and there was a lack of incentives for user participation. The Project Implementation Unit “established a poor record in adhering to Bank procurement procedures, resulting in delays in obtaining scientific and curatorial equipment, materials, taxonomic references, and book printing” (TE, page 5). The Steering Committee, on the other hand, “provided sustained and critical support” (TE, page 5).

The TE also rates the conduct of the Technical Advisory Group as satisfactory; it “established the critical scientific basis for most of the project activities” (TE, page 5). However, “the style of work delivery by some Technical Advisory Group members caused strained relationships,” although the TE does not explain further. Lastly, “there have been inconsistencies in project management that affected the implementation and coordination of activities. Staff changes to improve project management have been dealt with sporadically and with difficulty resulting in long delays. The knowledge and proactivity of staff to seek assistance to deal with financial and procurement matters remained low” (TE, page 10). Project management used 26% of the project’s funds as opposed to the 17% that was originally budgeted, but the TE does not explain the reason for this.

## **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.

No environmental change was reported in the TE.

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.

No socioeconomic changes were reported in the TE.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project improved the human resources and technical capacity of the Research and Development Center for Biology. 19 staff completed graduate degrees, and 7 degrees were in progress at the time of writing of the TE. 27 staff completed work study programs abroad, 28 internship programs were completed by university students, and 17 mentors visited the center (TE, pages 5-6 and 17-18). Three research laboratories and a type room were upgraded, and renovations took place in several other areas. An electric plant specimen drier and a walk-in freezer were installed. The building was rewired to solve fluctuations in electrical voltage. Nineteen microscopes were provided. New storage and viewing equipment were procured, along with two computers and a server. 83 reference books were bought on zoology. The project procured computers, accessories, and software to the Center (TE, pages 6-7 and 17-18). In addition, the process of publishing guides, articles, manuals, and brochures fostered adherence to standards for peer review, style, and originality among research staff (TE, page 9). No further information is available.

b) Governance

An Indonesian Biodiversity Information System was developed and is fully functional. 384,000 zoology and botany records were added to the database (TE, pages 8 and 17-18). No further information is available.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts were reported in the TE.

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.

There was no evidence in the TE of mainstreaming, replication, or scaling up of the project's initiatives.

## **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.

This project, which was seen as innovative and risky at the time of approval, has demonstrated that it is worthwhile to invest in biological collections in other countries to aid in management and monitoring of plant and animal resources.

Individuals and institutions in the global biodiversity community are willing to support biodiversity collections in developing countries. International exposure and links to the global research community can be fostered through mentorship programs.

It is possible to establish world-class storage facilities for a major biodiversity collection of international importance.

The government of Indonesia fulfilled its cofinancing and implementation commitments to the project despite the economic and political crises of 1997-1998. This is a response to the country's Biodiversity Action Plan and general concern for biodiversity.

The benefits of a biodiversity collections project would be extended through internship programs connecting different research centers.

Many of the adjustments made during implementation were needed because the time needed for certain activities was underestimated, or there was an underestimation of the number of specimens.

Having scientific advisors provide technical assistance based on need for short periods of time was sufficient, flexible, and cost effective compared to contracting full time consultants for long periods.

## 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Staff must be prepared to change traditions that hamper implementation. Management must support staff in changing the work culture, and both groups must stay focused on the objective. That said, the project must work within and respect the organizational structure of the implementing institution. There must be a common desire to develop as independent and equal partners in the international research community.

An open and flexible project design with room for development is necessary for the development of database facilities. The institution must accept IT as the backbone of collections management and information dissemination. This requires effective teamwork between technical and IT staff.

## 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 contains a detailed assessment of the project's outcomes, impacts, and shortcomings. More detail on the project situation prior to the midterm review would have been helpful, since the midterm review appeared to have caused a dramatic increase in progress.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is internally consistent, well-substantiated, and mostly complete. The TE did not explain why project management used 26% of project funds rather than 17% as budgeted. It also did not explain the cause of some of the project's shortcomings.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Adequate assessment, but more details on the intellectual property and legal issues would have been useful. Also, there is no overall assessment of the research center's financial situation.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned and recommendations stemmed from project experience, but were not entirely comprehensive. There could have been recommendations on enhancing sustainability and project oversight, for example.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes, but the financial breakdown was not detailed enough to determine the specific activities that were funded by cofinancing, and the TE did not describe what effect the decreased cofinancing level had on the project.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	There was no information on project M&E.	HU
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</b>

Overall TE Rating =  $(0.3 * (10)) + (0.1 * (4+4+4+1)) = 3 + 1.3 = 4.3 = MS$

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