

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	815		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	0.72	0.72
Project Name:	Dry Forest Biodiversity Conservation Project	IA/EA own:		
Countries:	Grenada, West Indies	Government:	0.41	0.41
		Other*:		
		Total Cofinancing	0.41	0.41
Operational Program:	Arid and semi-arid zone ecosystem; Focal Area: Biodiversity	Total Project Cost:	1.13	1.13
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Forestry and Parks Dept- Ministry of Agriculture-Gov't of Grenada	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Aug. 2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: June 2005	Actual: June 2006
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 46 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 60 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 14 months
Author of TE: Samuel Taffesse		TE completion date: May 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO: July 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 2 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	MS	MS	NA	U
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	Uncertain	L	NA	MU
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	N/A	NA	UA
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	MS	S	NA	MU
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS

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

Yes, the terminal evaluation report provides a comprehensive description of project implementation and outputs as well as a fair assessment of outcomes and sustainability.

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

No such findings mentioned were mentioned in the terminal evaluation report. However, a letter – which will not be

named to maintain anonymity – dated Feb-29-2008, alleges that targets with respect to the Grenada Dove have not been met and that some gains made by the project since closing have been lost. The letter claims that an ex-situ dove population was never established at the Louisville Zoo, that wildlife corridors were never created, targeted Dove research never published, and that in spring 2007, “one third of the dove habitat was declassified from its former status as a national park and assigned for tourism development by a group under the lead of the Canadian Hotel chain Four Seasons.” The letter also claims that the project’s Ecosystem Research Coordinator, Bonnie L. Rusk, was contracted by the development company Cinnamon 88 to study the impact of development on the Dove.

As noted in this review, the project suffered from the devastation of two major hurricanes, and due to resource allocation, was not able to build any partnerships with private landowners. This review also notes that Government support for the creation of a resort abutting or encroaching on the Dove sanctuary was a serious risk at the time of project closing. Further investigation is required to establish why the results of scientific research have not been published, and if there was actual mismanagement of the project, or a conflict of interest on the part of the Ecosystem Research Coordinator.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

The project’s global environmental objective was to “improve management and conservation of Grenada’s dry forest ecosystem and its component species of global significance.” This was to be achieved through “effective stakeholder participation in decision making and conservation activities” and through the collection and analysis of scientific data on the dry forest ecosystem.

The project was restructured and funding reallocated following two hurricanes in 2003 and 2004.

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)?)

The development objective of the project was to promote the adoption of effective, long-term strategies for the conservation of dry forest on public and private land. This objective included four components:

1. Public outreach to raise the awareness of key stakeholders of the importance of the dry forest habitat, and develop a constituency for its long-term protection through integrated environmental outreach and communication.
2. Scientific research and monitoring to provide information for improved decision-making and management of the dry forest ecosystem and its associated biodiversity.
3. Capacity building to strengthen the capacities of the Forestry and Parks Department to sustainably manage the forests and to promote long-term strategies for conservation and conservation financing.
4. Private sector partnerships with landowners, developers, business, NGOs and civil society to develop and promote conservation strategies, and foster sound land management practices.

According to the terminal evaluation, an ancillary project goal was the promotion the adoption of new land management practices that would minimize land degradation and forest loss.

In the aftermath of the September 2004 Hurricane Ivan, the project was restructured on March 31, 2005 to (a) extend the Closing Date to June 30, 2006; (b) allow for the rehabilitation of the hurricane-damaged Mount Hartman Visitors Center by establishing a new expenditure category of works and reallocating funds accordingly among various other expenditure categories; and (c) support additional biodiversity research and monitoring activities needed to facilitate the post-hurricane recovery of the Grenada Dove population and its dry forest habitat.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
		X	
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, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

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

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

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

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

The dry forests of Grenada are under severe pressure from human development needs. The southwest of Grenada, which contains half of the island's dry forests, is also the most populated region of the island as well as the main center for the island's tourism. Those areas not actively under development for housing or tourism are being used for a variety of purposes, including charcoal production, livestock grazing, and hunting. Many of the current forest use practices are unsustainable. According to the project document, this problem is exacerbated by the lack of public awareness of the value of dry forest ecosystems, insufficient scientific information, and low government capacity to implement an effective conservation strategy. This project is designed to address these shortcomings and reduce the threats to biodiversity in Grenada.

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

This project supports an ongoing 10-year strategic program in the Forestry and Parks Department, which will create an Environmental Education Unit, a Wildlife Conservation Unit, and a Biodiversity Unit. The project objectives are linked to the Grenada Forest Policy, approved in 1999, which mandates the conservation of representative pockets of all forest ecosystems, and the protection of rare, indigenous biodiversity. Project outcomes support recovery plans for two endangered species, the Grenada Dove and the Hookbilled Kite. Grenada is currently drafting a National Biodiversity Strategy and once this is completed it should provide a mechanism for sustaining this project.

(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?

WB/GEF is providing support for Grenada Dove conservation, and in particular, for the establishment of the Mt. Hartman National Park, through the Pilot Phase OECS Ship Generated Solid Waste Management Project (GET Grant Number TF028596).

(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)

This project supports the priorities of the COP of the CBD on the sustainable use and conservation of arid- zone ecosystems.

A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership¹

The Government of Grenada is a signatory of "St. George's Declaration," along with other members of the Organization of Eastern Caribbean States (OECS). This declaration emphasizes the need stronger regional environmental management, recognizing that tourism, a major regional economic activity, depends on a healthy environment. The project outcomes support Grenada's obligations under this declaration.

b. Effectiveness

Rating: MU

This project has been successful in raising the general awareness on the uniqueness of the dry forest and in promoting long-term strategies for conservation of the dry forest on public lands. The project, with full support of the government, has contributed to improved management of dry forest in Grenada and the Mt. Hartman Sanctuary in particular. According to the terminal evaluation report, the results of this improvement were apparent early in project implementation, but were later compromised due to the two major hurricanes (2004-Ivan and 2005-Emily). In March 2005, the project was restructured and its closing date extended by one year to permit reconstruction of the Mt. Hartman Visitor's Center. Restructuring significantly scaled back the private partnership component, and reallocated resources to support the biodiversity research and monitoring activities required to facilitate the post-hurricane recovery of the Grenada Dove population and its dry-forest habitat.

Most of the targeted activities under environmental education/public outreach have been achieved. The project's strategic communication program used popular media, competition and educational programs to raise the awareness of

¹ Please consider for regional and global project only

the value of dry forest ecosystems and the need to protect the two endangered species (Grenada Dove and Hook-billed Kite). Surveys before and after the media campaign show that public familiarity with the term “dry forest” increased from 16.8% in 2003 to 76.5% in 2006. A primary and secondary school curriculum on dry forest ecosystems was developed but has not yet been implemented. The Mt. Hartman National Park Visitor’s Center, which had been destroyed by Hurricane Ivan in 2004, was rebuilt and re-opened in May 2006. However, both the terminal evaluation and IA’s grant report note that there were significant delays in re-opening the Visitor’s Center and that it was not operation at the time of project closing.

The project has been more successful in establishing a scientific research and monitoring component and collected baseline data to guide conservation efforts. Several studies to establish baseline data were conducted in collaboration with universities, zoos, and an international NGO, and portions of the Grenada Dove Recovery Plan have been implemented. The project has developed a GIS database has been developed, but due to limited staff resources at FNP, the database is not operational. Also, the Mt. Hartman management plan was not completed by the project closing date.

Capacity building activities to expand the dry forest conservation program and modernize the technical competencies of the FNDP been moderately successful. Dry forest management and conservation is now integrated into annual work plans for the department. Staff training targets were met in part as training activities were shelved following the hurricane. The terminal evaluation mentions that “Although not completed by project closing, the management plan developed for the Mount Hartman protected area will be instrumental and is the product of the improved capacity of FNP.”

The project has been ineffective in promoting a long-term strategy for conservation of the dry forest on *privately owned* lands. Following the two hurricanes, it was agreed that there was no support from the private sector to protect and manage networks of key dry forest conservation sites. The project, therefore, did not designate areas for prevention. It also failed to establish an award for conservation excellence in the private sector, and no arrangements were established to manage network of dry forests.

The terminal evaluation notes that the Government of Grenada may permit development of a resort complex in the area adjacent to the Mt. Hartman National Park, with possible incursion onto the Dove habitat. This would seriously compromise the few gains made through this project by endangering the future of the species and the dry forest reserve.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

Rating: U

Project implementation took almost five years and there were several delays in project implementation not attributable to the occurrence of natural disasters. The IA’s final grant report notes that during the extended implementation period, “the Bank needed to supervise the project and review several TORs for consultant services, which had an implication on staff time and cost. The project depended on international consultants (non-Grenadians) that were expensive for the project.”

Given the long implementation time period, the limited effectiveness, and the limited possibility for replication, efficiency is rated unsatisfactory.

d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

Unable to assess

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

The project improved the management of dry forest in Grenada and the Mt. Hartman Sanctuary in particular. Results of this improvement were apparent early in project implementation, though were later compromised due to the two major hurricanes that hit the Island. The terminal evaluation report notes that the dry forests have recovered quickly from hurricane damage due to improved management of the protected areas.

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

The combined impact of the awareness building and communication activities was that the public's familiarity with the term "Dry Forest" increased from 16.8% in 2003 to 76.5% in 2006. In addition, more than twenty percent (20.7%) of respondents in 2006 (compared to 2003) indicated awareness about activities that are detrimental to the Dry Forest. The project has established a scientific basis for future sustainable management of dry forest areas, however impact on government policy was low. According to the terminal evaluation report, the government has expressed interest in permitting the development of hotels within a portion of the protected area or the sanctuary of species of global significance.

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

a. Financial resources	Rating: L
Dry forest management activities are controlled by the FNPDP, a department under the Ministry of Agriculture that is supported through annual government budget. Entrance fees at Mt. Hartman go the park management budget. In addition, the government is seeking co-investors for further improvements at Mt. Hartman that may attract more tourists to the site.	
b. Socio-economic / political	Rating: L
The project's public outreach has been very effective and public support for conserving dry forest habitats is strong.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: MU
There is pressure to exploit and develop the areas surrounding the dry forest protected areas and initial government commitment for conservation may be reversed.	
d. Environmental	Rating: ML
There is a significant risk of natural disasters as evidenced by this project's history, but if managed appropriately the dry forest ecosystems are capable of quick recovery.	
e. Technological	Rating: N/A
This project does not have any technological risks.	

4.3 Catalytic role³

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders.
No market based incentives were introduced. The general public consensus on the value of dry forest ecosystems creates social pressure to continue and expand conservation efforts.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors
No institutional changes mentioned.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
No policy changes as result of this project.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
No guaranteed follow-on from the Government or other donors.
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
There was no mention of project champions.

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

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The Government of Grenada provided in-kind co-financing of \$0.40 M or 36% of project cost. The government allocated staff and resources (office space, vehicles, etc.) to the project and paid for some outside project staff.

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

The project also leveraged outside resources and in-kind contributions. The main financial contribution was \$5,580 from a private company for billboards about the dry forest and the Granada Dove. In-kind contributions from NGO and research institutions were estimated at \$139,000.

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?

In the aftermath of the September 2004 Hurricane Ivan, the project was restructured on March 31, 2005 to (a) extend the Closing Date to June 30, 2006; (b) allow for the rehabilitation of the hurricane-damaged Mount Hartman Visitors Center; and (c) support additional biodiversity research and monitoring activities needed to facilitate the post-hurricane recovery of the Grenada Dove population and its dry forest habitat.

The project also suffered from several delays, starting early in project implementation. Almost eight months elapsed between the signing of the agreement and the first disbursement to the Special Account. There were recurrent delays due to understaffing at the executing agency, the FNDP.

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.

There is mixed evidence on the issue of country ownership. The government has provided co-financing for the project, yet government commitment to the project seems to be wavering as the project comes to a close. The terminal evaluation report mentions that the government is considering development of a resort adjacent to the Mt. Hartman Sanctuary, This presents serious risks to the sustainability of the Dove restoration program.

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

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

The M&E plan in the project document has a project timeline with a set of detailed activities for each component. Five broad indicators were to be used to measure progress towards development objectives. Monitoring of project implementation was to include semi-annual reports on each project component.

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

There is no mention in the terminal evaluation report of exactly how the M&E plan was implemented.

b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? There was no specific M&E item in the budget.

b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Unable to assess.

b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Unable to assess.

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. Insufficient information to assess.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MU

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

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.

Financial oversight by the implementing agency, the World Bank, was poor during the first half of the implementation period. Mid-course, the Bank team discovered that the project lacked an appropriate system for financial management and transaction handling. The problem was remedied quickly and later audits by the Bank's financial management specialist showed that the revised system conformed to the Bank's guideline. The Bank team also ensured that annual audits and financial management reports were made available and, recently, the team worked closely with disbursement specialists in ensuring that unused balance of the Grant (\$ 5415.95) was returned.

The Bank team worked closely with the Govt. of Grenada in amending the Grant Agreement following the devastation brought about by the two hurricanes. The strategic choice made by the team to continue with the awareness building after the hurricane, in hindsight, was a significant decision that ensured the project objective did not get lost as the country's priority shifted towards rehabilitation and reconstruction work. The continuation of this communication program ensured that the dry forest did not suffer from excessive intrusion by illegal squatters and cutting of the trees for reconstruction and rehabilitation purpose. However, the Bank should have also revised project goal indicators reflect the changes in component resources allocation.

Support for the project team was adequate. The Bank brought in biodiversity experts to advise the project team and

review research progress and proposals. However, the 2007 GRM notes that the Bank should have looked into the lack of cooperation between the project coordinator and FNPDP staff.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies⁴ (rating on a 6 point scale): MS

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 the Govt. of Grenada, through the Ministry of Agriculture's Parks and Forest Unit Forestry (FNDP). The FNDP maintained a good focus on result despite persistent problems with understaffing and limited capacity. The terminal evaluation report mentions that the quality of the work carried out was high. Following the two hurricanes, the government remained true to the objective of the project and partnered with the Bank team in realigning activities reflecting the changed priorities. The Government, through the Ministry of Agriculture, also facilitated the partnership with the private sector (in financing billboards' creation) and external learning institutions and NGOs in support of the project.

The FNDP did face some challenges in executing the project. According to the terminal evaluation the "lack of coordination of project activities with FNPDP tasks and failure to get the staff of the institution behind the project were two of the major obstacles to implementation." During project implementation, the financial management system was found to suffer from ineffective internal controls that resulted in double payment of consulting fees and lack of proper documentation procedures. These weaknesses were rectified with the hiring of a Project Accountant.

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

1. Following natural disasters and as "emergency works" take precedence, it is crucial to ensure the project objective is not lost. As mentioned in several section of this document, the level of devastation wrought by the two hurricanes during the implementation period of this MSP could have easily derailed the project from its stated objective. However, the government commitment and the Bank's team's strategic choice to focus on communication/awareness building ensured that the project objective was not lost following these two natural disasters.
2. Project coordination should be streamlined to fit with the activities of the existing institution. While from the start the project aimed to streamline the project activities into FNPDP tasks, this was lost for almost two years due to lack of coordination between the project coordinator and the staff of the FNPDP.
3. A project coordinator should be a consensus builder. There is a consensus among FNPDP staff for a project coordinator to work on seeking coordination and facilitating participation and not pushing his/her own decision. Had the project implementation been led by agreements reached via consultation with staff, the project would have been fully integrated into the activities of FNPDP early and division of labor could have allowed all tasks to be completed by the agreed on time.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

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

Recommendations for the Bank

1. Early consultation is an important ingredient for awareness building activity. The project conducted the Attitudinal Survey that showed an improvement in support of the conservation effort for dry forest in Grenada. During the project preparation, consultation of stakeholders revealed the level of awareness and the type of communication activity to conduct. This early consultation contributed to the wide awareness created under the project.
2. Following a natural disaster, it is important to review not only where the project needs adjustments but also whether there is a need to revise indicators. The Bank team should be highly commended for reviewing the project following the two hurricanes and for its successful decision to proceed with communication and awareness building measures. As resources are moved from one component to the other, the associated indicators have to be revised as well.

Recommendations for the Recipient (Client)

1. Throughout project implementation, it is recommended to ensure that the activities of a project are streamlined into activities of sectoral agencies.
2. At all time ensure that responsible institutions are fully staffed: Changes in priorities that ensued following the two hurricanes gave the government the pretext of not replacing staff of FNPD that separated with the institutions due to different reasons (death, retirement, among others). It is important that the government review the staffing need occasionally from the perspective of the requirements to fulfill the mandate of the institution.

Recommendations for the Donor(s)

1. Ensure that there is a high level of commitment. The success of this project is due to the high level of commitment by the government of Grenada to preserve their national bird, the Grenada Dove.
2. Support recovery and rehabilitation when the priorities change: Natural disasters of the magnitude of Hurricane Ivan do not spare any section of development activities – all initiatives are affected. In such circumstances, it is important for the donors' community to act immediately and to identify areas of rehabilitation related to their specific involvement or line of work within the development activities and support a government in an emergency situation on transitional basis.

Recommendations for the Development Community

1. Continue with awareness building following a natural hazard when priorities seem to shift: One of the lessons learned from this project is the need for a functioning communication strategy, which can be readily replicated to other areas and projects. The need for continuous awareness building and creation of public support for conservation is an important ingredient in preserving the achievements made even in the face of major disaster when nothing seems to matter except reconstruction.
2. Conservation requires a long-term commitment: In conservation, the gains made through intervention could be reversed easily. During the implementation of the project, whatever gain made in rehabilitating dry forest and the observed increased in the population flagship species of this ecosystem was practically wiped out by Hurricane Ivan. Therefore, a long-term view that will smooth out this occasional reversal has to be pursued in lieu of quick-fix initiatives

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
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? Outputs and outcomes relative to objectives are assessed for each component of the project.	S
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?	MS

Generally speaking the report is internally consistent and provides evidence to substantiate the ratings. However, it does not cover M&E issues in adequate depth.	
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report provides a realistic assessment of sustainability.	S
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The evidence provided supports the lessons learned.	S
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? Yes, actual project costs are included in the report.	S
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report does not contain a section on M&E, although it is briefly described in the section on implementation. The information provided is not sufficient to allow the reviewer to rate the quality of M&E implementation.	U

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

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

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)