

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		818	
GEF Agency project ID		1073	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Contributing to the Conservation of the Unique Biodiversity in the Threatened Rain Forests of Southwest Sri Lanka	
Country/Countries		Sri Lanka	
Region		South Asia	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP3 - Forest Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		The Forest Department, in the Ministry of Forestry and Environment of the Government of Sri Lanka (sometimes referred to as the 'proposing agency')	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Village CBOs: beneficiaries	
Private sector involvement		N/A	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 1998	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		August 2005	
Actual date of project completion		December 2008	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.250	0.250
	Co-financing	0.0025	0.0025
GEF Project Grant		0.725	0.725
Co-financing	IA own	N/A	N/A
	Government	0.300	0.300
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	N/A	N/A
	Private sector	N/A	N/A
	NGOs/CSOs	N/A	N/A
Total GEF funding		0.725	0.725
Total Co-financing		0.300	0.300
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.025	1.025
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2007	
Author of TE		Alan Rodgers and S D Abayawardana	
TER completion date		January 17, 2017	
TER prepared by		Punji Leagnavar	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is: “Protection of the ecosystems in the rainforests of Sinharaja and Kanneliya-Dediyagala-Nakiyadeniya (popularly known as the KDN complex) through community co-management” (CEO, p.3).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The objective of the project is to ‘achieve is a well-established system of conservation forests collectively representing a refuge of globally important species’ (CEO Endorsement, p.8). At the time of the CEO Endorsement and ProDoc, there were four project outcomes:

- a) Buffer zone community (and society at large) cooperating in the conservation of the selected rainforest ecosystems harboring globally threatened species
- b) A suitable model developed for securing collaboration between the local community, state agencies and other stakeholders in managing the rainforest ecosystems
- c) Sustainable use of non-timber forests products secured
- d) Forests adequately protected against encroachment and illicit logging

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

In 2006, the project changed its project log frame and reduced the outcomes to 2 rather than 4. At the end of the project, it operated under this logframe. Even though both the IA + EA agreed on the new approach, it did not formalize it with a Tri-partite Review or send it to UNDP - GEF for confirmation. The TE (2007) conducts its evaluation based on the new logframe, while the final PIR (2008) uses the original logframe.

The most updated 2006 logframe includes the following outcomes:

- *Outcome 1:* Improved biodiversity status of target FRs as a result of reduced encroachment, logging and non-sustainable resource uses.

- *Outcome 2:* Communities adjacent to FRs have capacity, resources and incentives to support conservation initiatives whilst maintaining incomes on improved agriculture and (alternative income generation) AIG enterprises that reduce dependency on forest biodiversity

4. GEF IEO 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
----------------------	----------------------

The project receives a *satisfactory* rating for relevance. With regard to its relevance to national priorities, the project links to several national priorities, action plans and programs. Particularly, the project supports the Biodiversity Action Plan and the Forestry Sector Master Plan which focused on protecting the Sri Lankan threatened, fragmented rainforests (CEO Endorsement, p.3).

This project also fits within the GEF-3 Biodiversity Operational Program 3 on Forest Ecosystems, and specifically the expected outcome 'globally important biodiversity has been conserved or sustainably used in a specific forest ecosystem' (GEF Operational Program Biodiversity, p.3). The project worked to protect specific wet zone forest ecosystems and endemic species within those ecosystems in Sri Lanka.

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

Like the TE, This TER uses the revised outcomes and indicators (2006) as a reference point for the evaluation. Based on the information in the TE, this TER rates overall effectiveness as *satisfactory*.

Outcome 1: Improved biodiversity status of target FRs as a result of reduced encroachment, logging and non-sustainable resource uses.

The TE finds that the outcome indicator for this has been met. The indicator that evidenced the achievement of this goal were four-fold, that: (1) encroachment stopped, (2) illicit logging stopped, (3) old logging gaps are filled by normal succession, and (4) endemic species regenerate. The TE found that there was evidence that all of these have been achieved. However, there is little substantive detail or data supporting this information. For example, the

TE merely states that “Most endemic birds are seen frequently” without specifying or quantifying “most” or “frequently”.

The project also defined 3 outputs that support the outcome. 2 of these outputs (concerning forests that are protected against encroachment and capacity building for conservation staff) were also met in a *satisfactory* way. 1 of the outputs on M&E programming, by contrast, is rated MU/U by the TE. This is due to the fact that the project suffered from poor M&E implementation and it affected the efficiency and effectiveness of the project. To illustrate that, the TE states that the entire logframe was changed at a very late stage in the project (2006) as the staff realized that the management approach they were focusing on was not sustainable. The project then changed its outcomes, outputs and indicators but did not have it officially approved or communicated among partners, therefore leading to confusion about ultimate project results.

Outcome 2: Communities adjacent to FRs have capacity, resources and incentives to support conservation initiatives whilst maintaining incomes on improved agriculture and AIG enterprises that reduce dependency on forest biodiversity

This TER finds that this outcome has been met and gives it a *satisfactory* rating. Although the project did not set targets or baseline for the achievement of the outcome, the TER does state that the indicators have been achieved. For example, one of the indicators was the ‘number of people who have adopted improved tea agriculture and show increased yields’. The TER state that communities have adopted improved tea agriculture in “a big way” and that tea yields are up by 25%. Another indicator is ‘number of functioning societies with functioning loan credit support that assists AIG enterprise’. The TER notes that “Communities in all 27 villages ... are fully registered with audited bank accounts and a monthly membership fee...Loans support AIG activity, which has reduced forest dependency” (TE, p.35).

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

The project was able to operate within budget (in 2007 at the close of the project, there was even an excess of \$40,000) and to meet project Outcomes. The TE notes that: “Overall we believe the project has achieved a great deal with a relatively small MSP (\$750,000) NEX process assisted this relative frugality. Cost Effectiveness is rated HS throughout” (TE, p.33). The project however, experienced delays and the end of activities was 3 years later than expected at project start, with the final project activity in 2008 instead of 2005. This affected cost-effectiveness because the project budget was not forecasted to extend to beyond 2005, and it led to the Executing Agency having to undertake the activities.

This TER finds the sustainability of this project is *moderately likely*.

- *Financial resources* – The financial sustainability of the project is likely. At the end of the project, the Sri Lankan government had dedicated a specific budget line to continue project activities. This is because most of the activities were well institutionalized into the Executing Agency, and already entrenched into the regular programming of the Forestry Department (TE, p.36). The project also showed an increase in income generation for families, which could lead to greater project sustainability. Specifically, micro-credit activities “drastically improved the income situation” for families that switched from forest destructive practices to a community-co management mechanism and AIG (PIR 2008, p.21).
- *Sociopolitical* – The TE showed that this project was able to build a sense of ownership from the beneficiaries that will contribute to the sustainability of the project. The project specifically created ‘Village Societies’ and Community Based Organizations. These organizations were pivotal to the achievement of the project outcomes. The TE states that: “The strength of the Village Societies and the new partnership gives a new mechanism for interaction on conservation. Socio-economic parameters of the villagers suggest that their growing economic status has reduced demand for forest products (although continued flow of forest water continues to emphasize the importance of forests to communities)” (TE, p.36). The TE was conducted two years after completion of capacity building activities, and it found that the forest partnerships are strong and continue to operate.
- *Institutional framework and governance*- The institutional sustainability for this project, according to the TE is “guaranteed” (TE, p.6). This is because the EA deeply integrated the project into its national objectives and programs. There are other governance variables that support the rating that the institutional and governance dimension is likely sustainable. First, the project developed legal structures that protect against the illegal extraction of forest resources (the Sri Lankan ‘Conservation Forest’ status which elevated the status of wet forest ecosystems, and the international MAB status). Second, there is a strong sense of village institutional structures concerning forestry that was created by the project.
- *Environmental*- There are many new environmental risks that face forest conservation in the wet forests. These compounding environmental factors are the reason why the project is moderately likely to be sustainable in the environmental dimension. Environmental risks such as new invasive species (*Alstonia scholaris*), lack of biodiversity monitoring and climate change are mentioned in the TE. Unless these are directly confronted by the government agencies working on conservation, or the forest dependent populations, the project activities cannot be considered sustainable (TE, p.36).

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 Project Document was completed during the GEF-3 cycle, before the GEF requirement for equivalent co-finance came into force. However, the document did mention other sources of financing for the project, which could be considered co-financing, notably from the government and several bilateral donors (TE, p.19). This co-financing played a large role in the project, as the TE writes, they did so by "providing direct co-finance in taking over some project activities" (TE, p.17). AfDB supported much of the boundary demarcation (especially the lesser forests of the KDN complex), and Aus-Aid supported some project activities and has included lessons learned from this project in the development of its larger national programmes (potentially creating replication activities) (TE, p.17)

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 project had several delays and extensions particularly towards the end because of lack of project personnel. For example, the project's main activities were finalized in 2005, however a final evaluation (TE) was delayed until September 2007 because no suitable evaluator could be sourced; and even later (2008) the final PIR was completed. The project received a special time extension to complete assessment/ reports that were identified as essential final activities of the project during evaluation. It is difficult to assess if these delays affected outcomes or sustainability, and it is not mentioned in the TE.

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 TE cites that the ownership of the project, in particular by the EA, is one reason that project institutional sustainability is so likely (please see sustainability section). As well, it mentions that: "The ownership of the project...specifically within the Forest Department (using UNDP – Government NEX -National Execution Modalities), has been a major factor in this success. The project has been administered and managed by government processes" (TE, p.4)

On the beneficiary side, the TE did also note that there was a strong sense of ownership from the communities. The project team worked to forge this ownership. The TE notes that the strategy to allow villagers to choose priorities on forest training created the sentiment that the trainings were not imposed on, and that it fostered ownership. The trainings were crucial to achieving the outcomes related to capacity building, so for that reason the ownership that was created led to the ultimate achievement of the outcomes.

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: Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	------------------------

The Monitoring and Evaluation design at the start of the project had a lot of inadequacies which lead the TE and this TER to rate it as unsatisfactory. The weakness in the design and assumptions of the project made it difficult to monitor the progress or shortcomings of the project as it was in implementation. Some of these problems included:

- (1) Lack of a rigorous logframe without defined targets and baselines (biodiversity values, incomes, etc.); the lack of critical starting information made it difficult to know how the project was creating any real change
- (2) The M&E framework was weak and lacked specificities about M&E personnel roles and responsibilities (i.e. who is collecting information/data and when).
- (3) The M&E terminology throughout the project document is not consistent. The TE finds that "The difficulty is that the terms (Objective, Outcome and Output) are used interchangeably and erroneously (commented on by the Mid-Term Evaluation)." (TE, p.11)

The Project Document does not line item the amount that is allocated for M&E activities. The TE rated the budgeting for M&E activities as moderately unsatisfactory.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The terminal evaluation rated M&E implementation as moderately unsatisfactory, and this TER agrees with that rating. Although the project was able to implement the M&E plan, it was focused on monitoring inputs and processes (i.e. number of trainings, km of boundaries cleared) instead of focusing on outcomes or impact. The project as able to complete all of its M&E 'responsibilities' (such as PIR, tracking tools, MTR, etc.) but, there were substantial delays in implementing the M&E at the final stages of the project that affected the way the project was able to incorporate adaptive management/ learning. Here are a few of those problems:

- The project changed its logframe during project implementation but did not institutionalize that into the M&E framework, nor did it seek approval through appropriate channels on changing the logframe

- The TE and PIR were not conducted according to the required M&E plan – the TE was done 2 years after the completion of the project, and the PIR was completed 1 year after that. Any lessons from the PIR could not have been integrated into the last months of the project because it was completed so much later than envisaged.

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: Moderately satisfactory
--	---------------------------------

The TE states that “The UNDP Office did provide input, did host TPRs, did produce annual PIRs and did visit the project sites. Project fund disbursement was satisfactory”. Although it did not provide an official rating, it says that things “worked” (TE, p.18).

However, there were some inefficiencies and shortcomings in project implementation. One is the lengthy delay in finalizing the final project activities and sourcing an evaluator for the TE and PIR. In addition, the original design of the project included many assumptions that later affected the project. Those assumptions and theory of change should have been reexamined throughout the project and fully integrated into an adaptive management approach. For instance, one assumption was that many villagers in the project sites work on forestry related activities for their livelihoods, when in fact that is not the case. Many villagers were actually involved in the tea industry, thus, the likelihood that they wanted to be involved in other non-forestry related income generating activities was low (TE, p.6). For these reasons, the TER rates Quality of Project Implementation as *moderately satisfactory*.

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

The Forestry Department executed this project well, and receives a satisfactory rating. The TE notes that the EA’s ability and capacity to manage, and administer the project worked “very well”, and that the only deficiencies were related to how effectively the EA responded to M&E systems changes, such as changing the project logframe. “Implementation was through the Forest Department. A senior Forest Officer said “We have considerable capacity to administer and manage, where we need technical innovation and skills we can hire in external expertise”. And for the most part this management worked well – deficiencies as noted above were in M and E systems and testing responses to change” (TE, p.8).

The achievement of the outcomes can be associated with the effectiveness to which the EA operated. The Forestry Department was in charge of all project activities and showed that it was even able to conduct cost-savings on its own “The project was efficiently managed, and being rooted so hard in government forestry, many savings were made in management costs” (TE, p. 6)

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.

In terms of impact, the TE notes that biodiversity is generally improving (there is less encroachment, less illegal forestry activities, etc.), but that a “Lack of impact data makes it difficult to get hard data on biodiversity status” (TE, p.6). And it is difficult to assess without the specific monitoring of indicator or target species (TE, p.25). Therefore, it is difficult to make an assessment of the environmental impact/change.

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.

In terms of socio-economic changes, the project did contribute to greater income generation in some villages, either through improved tea cultivation, or through the development of micro-loans that villagers were accessing. There were a total of 495 families that participated in the training courses on conservation in tea cultivation (intercropping with pepper and use of fertiliser trees such as *Gliricidia*). The project data shows that household’s tea net income increased by 28% because of the project activities (TE, p.29).

The Project Document stated that “Women will be encouraged to further strengthen their participation in CBO activities”. The TE also noted a very high level of women’s participation in the Societies that the project developed, and their participation was high in terms of the credit scheme management, livelihood development, forest conservation etc. (PIR, P.21). This could reflect a larger change, that women are more involved in decision making processes and household income.

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 was able to train and build the capacity of conservation staff to effectively manage conservation forest with community and science partners. The TE notes that the field and supervisory staff were all trained in conservation (TE p.34). As well, the trainings concerning tea cultivation and community involvement in eco-tourism built the capacity and knowledge of the villagers (TE, p.35).

b) *Governance* - The project spent considerable time developing community capacity, and built a network of Village Conservation Societies/CBOs that are independently managed by small committees. These organizations are formalized and legally registered with the Sri Lankan government, and were able to open and maintain bank accounts and receive micro-loans for alternative income generating activities. These are new institutions that will likely stay and continue operating. At the time of the TE, the evaluation finds that although the membership for the Societies declined somewhat, it has again increased (TE, p.26).

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 project documents do not make references to any unintended impacts.

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.

The project documents do not make references to any activities or initiatives that have been mainstreamed or scaled.

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 TE noted several learned lessons from the Contributing to the Conservation of the Unique Biodiversity in the Threatened Rain Forests of Southwest Sri Lanka project (TE, p.6)

- The national execution of projects (NEX) worked very well in this project, however, it could have been further strengthened if the EA had completely integrated the UNDP-GEF processes within their own agencies processes.
- The project suffered from the beginning since it did not have a viable M&E framework with logical assumptions. Adaptive management is critical in these cases, so the project could easily adapt to changes and challenges¹. However, those adaptive processes need to be done through participatory and stakeholder led processes as well, not just through ad-hoc decision making.
- This project did not invest in reporting and communicating project goals and achievements, something that would be critical for replication, other projects, etc.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The project makes recommendations for the project staff to finalize the project (the TE was completed before the finalization of the project), and also makes general recommendations for future projects (TE, p.42-43).

The recommendations for the project team to finalize the project, the TE provides the following:

- Recreate a logframe that is coherent and robust in the final closure of the project
- Spend remaining funds on project functions such as a terminal report, monitoring survey, an exit strategy with the credit groups, or developing a ecotourism fund
- Create frameworks for long-term monitoring

The recommendations for future GEF projects includes:

- GEF requirements should be built into NEX/EA processes, and have annual work-plans
- Projects should have specific funding for reporting and documentation
- Project formulation should include an Exit Strategy, which is elaborated in the Inception Report process

The recommendations for 'further GEF support' were also included. These were provided to guide the GEF in future investments in Biodiversity Strategic Objectives. These include:

¹ The Mid Term Evaluation (2003) pointed out that the collection of non-forestry products had decreased significantly in both forests, saying: "since the initial design in 1998/9 the project concept is less sound, since socio-economic changes have led to less pressure on the forests". This data point should have been a wake-up call for re-examining the project concept

- Strategic Objective 1 – Protected Areas: Projects should focus on system wide gap analysis, connectivity and reducing fragmentation, PES, ecological evaluation driving enhanced financial support, and issues of carbon sequestration and climate change could be captured in a system wide full size project
- Strategic Objective 2 – Mainstreaming and Markets/Policy Reform: Private home garden systems offers an entry point for targeted agro-forestry

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 IEO 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 report goes through all the outcomes and outputs to assess the project achievements and does a good job of describing why and how the outcomes were achieved.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and presents evidence when it is making a claim.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability is assessed properly and according to each of the sustainability dimensions. Some of the descriptions, however, could be more specific and substantiated by evidence or supporting information	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the analysis of the evidence	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE provides a final budget breakdown (expenditure) but it shows the budget for each year, and not per activity	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE did assess the quality of the M&E system, and detailed and supported the rating it gave for M&E Implementation and M&E Design	S
Overall TE Rating		S

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

Project MTR