

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	855		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1271	<b>GEF financing:</b>	0.73	0.73
Project Name:	"Establishment of Nuratau-Kyzylkum Biosphere Reserve Project as a Model for Biodiversity Conservation in Uzbekistan"	IA/EA own:	0.15	0.15
Country:	Republic of Uzbekistan	Government:	0.48	0.48
		Other*:	0.02	0.02
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	0.66	0.65
Operational Program:	OP.1 Arid and semi-arid ecosystems. OP.2 forest ecosystems. OP.3 mountain ecosystems.	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	1.38	1.38
IA	UNDP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	State Biological Control Service (Gosbiocontrol)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		03/2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: 08/2005	Actual: 08/2007
Prepared by: Florentina Mulaj	Reviewed by: Neeraj Kumar Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 53	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 77	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 24
Author of TE: Jean-Joseph Bellamy & Natalya Marmazinskaya		TE completion date: August 15, 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: April, 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 8 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	S	S	NA	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	MS	NA	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	NA	S	NA	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	HS	MS

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

The TE report for this project is internally consistent and the evidence is complete, but it cannot be considered a good practice because of the following shortcomings:

- The report does not include project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used.
- There is a lack of clarity and insufficient information on the M&E and on the performance and quality of the IA and the EA;

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?  
 No. There are no evaluation findings that require follow-up.

**3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES**

**3.1 Project Objectives**

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

The goal of the project was “to conserve the globally important biodiversity, landscapes and cultural assets of the Nuratau Mountain Range and the adjacent Kyzylkum Desert and to provide a model for protected area development in Uzbekistan/ the region.”

**b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

Based on the project brief, the following were the three main development objectives of the project:

- “to promote a new and more durable approach to biodiversity conservation within the project area through the integration of conservation and sustainable natural resource development,”
- “to promote local level awareness, ownership, capacity and commitment to the process of achieving biodiversity conservation and sustainable development in the project area,”
- “to provide a model for new approaches to the conservation of biodiversity in Uzbekistan/ the region,”

No changes in the development objectives during implementation.

**(describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?**

<b>Overall Environmental Objectives</b>	<b>Project Development Objectives</b>	<b>Project Components</b>	<b>Any other (specify)</b>

**c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)**

<b>Original objectives not sufficiently articulated</b>	<b>Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives</b>	<b>Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious</b>	<b>Project was restructured because of lack of progress</b>	<b>Any other (specify)</b>

**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 project was designed to develop and test an integrated and participatory approach to in-situ biodiversity conservation in Uzbekistan by integrating conservation and rural development objectives in

order to achieve sustainable conservation and sustainable livelihood goals.	
<b>(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?</b>	
The project is fully relevant within the complex development context of Uzbekistan and particularly within the context of environmental governance in place. The project was designed to develop and test an integrated and participatory approach to in-situ biodiversity conservation in Uzbekistan by integrating conservation and rural development objectives in order to achieve sustainable conservation and sustainable livelihood goals. It is part of the strategies included in the NBSAP. Nevertheless, the TE notes that Uzbekistan does not really have a national development plan detailing national priorities. And as such, it is difficult for international development partners to identify the national priorities and develop projects in response to these priorities. Under the leadership of UNDP and the Ministry of Economy and Welfare Improvement Strategy (equivalent to a Poverty Reduction Strategy) for the period 2008-2012 is being developed with the collaboration of the World Bank and the Asian Development Bank.	
<b>(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?</b>	
The project is in line with the GEF Strategic Priority #1 (Protected Areas) with the key objective to conserve biodiversity through the expansion, consolidation, and rationalization of national PA systems. The project is also relevant under the <i>OP #3 "Forest Ecosystems"</i> and it is also in line with the <i>OP #1 "Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems"</i> and <i>OP #4 "Mountain Ecosystems"</i> which have the objective of conserving and use sustainably the biological resources in these ecosystems.	
<b>(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)</b>	
The project is relevant for the implementation of the UNCBD in Uzbekistan. The project outcomes are directly relevant to the priorities and requirements of the CBD. As such, it shows a strong relevance of the project within the context of implementing the UNCBD in Uzbekistan.	
<b>A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership<sup>1</sup></b>	
No, the project did not promote any international or regional cooperation and partnership.	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating:S</b>
<p>The project had seven expected outcomes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Establishment of a Biosphere Reserve, on the basis of full stakeholder consultation, which provides an effective legal and administrative framework for the achievement of integrated conservation and sustainable rural development objectives, and an enabling environment for the development of appropriate income generation and small business activities</li> <li>2. A detailed integrated management plan for the Biosphere Reserve (NKBR) which has been operationally tested during the project (pilot management plan) and upgraded/revised on the basis of this experience and the recommendations of the stakeholders.</li> <li>3. Increased awareness and valuation of biodiversity and its services by the public and local authorities / decision makers.</li> <li>4. Increased capacity of stakeholders (local conservation/natural resources authorities, rural communities) to influence and play a role in the conservation/appropriate use of biodiversity resources and pursuit of sustainable local development.</li> <li>5. Increased knowledge and experience of methods and approaches to address the major threats to biodiversity in the project area through community based land and natural resource use pilot projects.</li> <li>6. Practical examples for protected areas authorities in Uzbekistan, and regionally, of new approaches to biodiversity conservation and key lessons / factors important for development of similar initiatives.</li> <li>7. Heightened profile of the area, increased capacity and opportunity to attract other relevant and complementary initiatives by UNDP / partners / co-financiers, and improved legal/administrative environment for sustainable income generation initiatives and small businesses.</li> </ol> <p>Based on the information provided in the TE, the project partially achieved its expected outcomes. Despite the fact that the responsibility of creating the NKBR resides outside the project authority, the project was</p>	

<sup>1</sup> Please consider for regional and global project only

<p>able to utilize its resources to achieve good results and contribute toward the objective of the project which was to conserve the globally important biodiversity, landscapes and cultural assets of the Nuratau Mountain Range and the adjacent Kyzylkum Desert and to provide a model for protected area development in Uzbekistan and the region.</p> <p>However, the project assumed that “those relevant government agencies and the Cabinet of Ministers / Parliament show adequate commitment to the timely approval and enactment of required legislation”. This assumption was not part of the most important project risks and it seems like the assumption of creating the NKBR was a “fait accompli”. It is only in 2005 that an additional risk was identified and categorized as political “the Government will not legally establish the Biosphere Reserve by the end of the project, which will not allow the project to logically complete all planned activities and reach envisaged objectives”.</p>	
<b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p>Based on the information provided in the TE, it may be inferred that the project was well managed and the resources utilized efficiently. The project finances were adequately managed by the UNDP. The project delivery mechanisms were effective. The implementation approach emphasized a strong participation of relevant stakeholders and most of the project achievements are a result of this inclusive approach.</p>	
<p>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.</p>	
<p>No information.</p>	

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

**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.

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>
<p>The TE concludes that most of the project activities are likely to be sustainable. However, it may be difficult to continue meeting the cost of renting the NKBR information centre in Yangikishlok. This is the only “project item” identified by the TE which may not be sustainable after the project end date. As for the sub-project achievements, they are “owned” by the local recipient and no recurrent costs to be supported by an external organization exist.</p> <p>In the case of a GOU decision to create the NKBR, the budget and staff to fund the Administration of the reserve is available. Since 2006, the Evaluators were told that a budget is available at the Ministry of Finance for the NKBR and that this information is known to the Cabinet of Ministers (decision-makers for the NKBR).</p>	
<b>b. Socio-economic / political</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>
<p>There are no political risks that are expected to undermine the longevity of project outcomes. The level of stakeholder ownership is sufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained.</p>	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: 3</b>

<sup>2</sup> 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 project had to address an unforeseen issue within the existing legal framework at the start of the project. In order to create a NKBR, there was a need to amend the law on protected areas. The project supported the process to amend this Law leading to an official amendment in December 2004.

The TE notes that “considering the status of the project, which is pending for the official establishment of the NKBR, the current legal and policy frameworks are adequate for the creation of the reserve. However, this environment will not be conducive once the biosphere reserve will be created. There will be few areas where more adapted Laws, policies and institutions will be needed to implement some of the findings from the project.” And for these new approaches to be implemented, it will necessitate some changes of the legal and policy frameworks on the basis of the management plan elaborated with the support of the project.

<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating:4</b>
There are no environmental risks which can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits. On the contrary, most of the activities should contribute to improving the ecological sustainability in the NKBR area.	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating:</b>
Not applicable for this project.	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role<sup>3</sup>

<b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders</b>
The project has led to increased awareness among public authorities, decision makers and local communities, and has increased their capacities to influence and play a role in the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity resources. Heightened profile of the area, increased capacity and opportunity to attract other relevant and complementary initiatives by UNDP / partners / co-financiers, and improved legal/administrative environment for sustainable income generation initiatives and small businesses.
<b>b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors</b>
The TE indicates that the replication and scaling-up of the project achievements are good. The BR concept was brought to Uzbekistan by the project and is now a concept (3 management zones) that the government wants to replicate in other protected areas in the country. Through the amendment of the Law on Protected Natural Areas (which the project contributed to), the BR concept was, therefore, mainstreamed into the national framework for the management of the protected areas in Uzbekistan. This approach will be replicated in other protected areas in the country.
<b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b>
The project concept, lessons learned and best practices have been used in the design and implementation of various other projects in the country and in the region (including GEF-funded projects).
<b>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)</b>
No information
<b>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)?</b>
No information

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

<b>a. Co-financing.</b> To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of
---

<sup>3</sup> Please review the ‘Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework’ prior to addressing this section.



<p>the expected results. The progress of the project was also reported in the PIRs by measuring its contribution against the GEF strategic targets in biodiversity related to BD1: Protected Areas; BD2: Spatial, Sectoral, Market and Organization/Business Mainstreaming; and, BD4: Lessons Learning, Dissemination and Uptake. However, as indicated earlier, the project did not use the Tracking Tool for GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategic Priority One: Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Area Systems at National Levels.</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document?</p> <p>UA. The project document does not provide clear information on the budget dedicated to the M&amp;E. It does state that for “evaluation missions” the budget dedicates US\$15,000. But this is specifically to missions. As far the budget for the entire M&amp;E plan is concerned, the project document does not provide information.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation?</p> <p>There is no sufficient information to make this assessment.</p>
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?</p> <p>There is no sufficient information to make this assessment.</p>
<p>b.3 Can the project M&amp;E system (or an aspect of the project M&amp;E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.</p> <p>Yes. The ME system used in this project can be considered a good practice. The indicators measured well the actual progress made toward the achievements of the expected results. But more information regarding the budget for the M&amp;E should have been included in the project brief or the TE. However, considering the TE does not make any reference to budget-related issues for ME, it can be assumed that sufficient funding was provided.</p>

#### **4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution**

<p><b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale):S</b></p>
<p><b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S</b></p> <p>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.</p> <p>The TE rates the efficiency of the UNDP-CO as satisfactory. It notes that initially, the role and the capacity of UNDP-CO was an issue which was raised during the mid-term evaluation (September 2004). At this time, UNDP-CO had no environmental unit and as a consequence was providing a very limited support to the project. However, since the creation of the Environmental Unit within UNDP (end of 2004), an environmental capacity exists within UNDP and the Unit fulfilled the roles and responsibilities expected (and obligated in exchange of receiving a management fee) from a GEF Implementing Agency. The TE does not provide any additional information with regard to the quality of supervision by the regional office of the UNDP.</p> <p>Overall, there are no issues or problems related to quality of the IA mentioned in the TE.</p>
<p><b>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>4</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): S</b></p> <p>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.</p>

<sup>4</sup> 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.

The efficiency of the Gosbiocontrol as the project executing agency is rated as satisfactory in the TE. The TE explains the duties and responsibilities of the EA, however it does not elaborate the degree to which the EA performed at each of those tasks. It only concluded that the performance of the EA in meeting its obligations was satisfactory. Hence, taking the TE's assessment into account and that no problems or issues regarding EA performance were mentioned, a rating of satisfactory is reasonable.

## 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

- The design of projects involving the achievement of critical milestones such as a new law or a new institution should better take into account the time needed for the political process to go through. This political process should also be fully part of the logic of the project intervention and allow the project to stop/pause until this achievement is met.
- A project involving a change of the legislation and/or policy framework should not be shorter than 5 years. The time it takes to change a Law or a Policy is often underestimated and the overall project duration too short to develop the full necessary capacity to make the change sustainable.
- Considering the difficulties/barriers to work in an environment such as Central Asia, it is not efficient to sub-contract an external partner for small sub-projects; particularly for sub-projects with small budgets
- In a complex socio-economic-political context such as Uzbekistan, the design of projects should emphasize assessments (using instrument such as PDFs) focusing on policies, legislation and institutions (including capacity assessments - and a thorough assumptions and risks assessment.)
- When using a Project Management Unit (PMU) to implement projects, the long term sustainability of project achievements is always riskier than when the project is implemented within a stronger partnership with one local institutions; sharing resources. Moreover, the earlier the project achievements are institutionalized the better the long term sustainability will be.
- Within the context of a project focusing on legislation and institution development, the implementation of sub-projects demonstrating and testing new approaches is vital for these projects. It provides good examples of sustainable use of the natural resources to improve the local livelihood; and also conserving the local biodiversity at the same time.
- There is little emphasis on policy development and policy implementation in Uzbekistan. Legislative frameworks are the guiding principles for ministries and agencies' programming. This approach is time-consuming and resource intensive and prevents a more rapid response for agencies to adapt locally.
- The management of a biosphere reserve area which includes many rural communities and few small towns is a complex area to manage that is much more difficult to manage than a more traditional protected area. The management approach needs to be much more participatory and be inclusive of all the population leaving in the area; particularly the land users.
- Accurate and relevant information and communication are important components of the management framework of a BR. Good and accessible information is key for good decision-making but also to keep people abreast of new developments, to offer information on best practices, etc.

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

- As part of building the political case for the establishment of the NKBR, the project should introduce the NKBR package to the committee on the environment existing under the Senate
- Organize a meeting with the Prime Minister, the Chairman of SCNP, a Representative from the Cabinet of Ministers, UNDP and the Project Management Team to review the process of establishing the NKBR. This recommended meeting should be prepared in the context of the closure of the project, press on for the political process to be finalized and to obtain the latest status on the establishment of the NKBR which will be the final statement from a government perspective to be in the final project report.
- Continue to support the Gosbiocontrol and SCNP to help any possible actions they would like to undertake to press on the political process of establishing the NKBR.
- The existing body of knowledge of the project should be loaded onto the web and anybody should be



able to Terminal Evaluation of UNDP-GEF Project “Establishment of Nuratau-Kyzylkum Biosphere Reserve Project as a Model for Biodiversity Conservation in Uzbekistan” Page ix access it. The numerous models, manuals, plans, assessments and other pieces of project information should be posted to a web site and be available to whoever wants to access it. The project should catalogue this information and should also provide a copy of most of this knowledge to the main relevant organizations such as SCNP and the Forestry Department and their respective Agencies.

- The project should conduct a full review of the agreements reviewed with project support and document them all in the end of project report to leave a transparent paper trail after the project end.
- Once created, the GOU will need support to establish this new NKBR and to develop the capacity of the new Administration to manage this new area.
- The livestock and rangeland management plan supported by the project needs to be published and “owned” by a local organisation. The project should discuss this matter with the main stakeholder (the Institute of Karakul Sheep Breeding and Ecology of Desert) and the Ministry of Agriculture.
- Any approval of new GEF funded biodiversity project should be tied with the conclusion of this project. In the situation where the NKBR will not be created before the end of the project, it is important to obtain the “official version” of the government to bring the NKBR proposal to a closure.
- Projects with a similar critical milestone which is not dependent on the project but on one partner should be designed carefully and be flexible enough to be implemented in two phases: one before the critical milestone is reached and one after the critical milestone is approved, created or met. This type of project needs to have a stopping/pausing point before going into the next phase of implementation.
- Conduct comprehensive assessments for the design of new projects, emphasize community/stakeholders participation and develop projects for a minimum duration of at least 5 years. Comprehensive assessments should avoid surprises during the implementation of these projects.
- When designing new projects in the natural resource management area, emphasize a capacity development approach with some key features such as: a. Build on existing programmes, structures & mechanisms; b. Emphasize early engagement of Stakeholders and keep ownership with them; c. Work with champions but still support less engaged Stakeholders; d. Early Institutionalization = LT Sustainability.
- Streamline UNDP administrative procedures; particularly the line of authority to approve any payment of project expenditures. The efficiency of these payments should be improved and a careful use of cash payments in rural areas by projects should be accommodated.
- The implementation of sub-projects should be executed by the projects themselves and should have duration of a minimum of three (3) years. The budgets are too small to attract international NGOs with good project implementation track record.
- Support a greater involvement of the scientific community in this type of project; particularly with a focus on the impact of management practices on the biodiversity.

## 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.

No comments

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?	HS
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

<p>The report is generally consistent and the evidence is complete. However there are areas in which the report lacks clarity and sufficient information, such as the section on the budget for the M&amp;E, on the performance and quality of the IA and the EA, and on the project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used.</p>	
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b></p> <p>The project assessment of sustainability and the exit strategy of the project was highly satisfactory. It addressed the financial, socio-economic/political, institutional, and environmental aspects of sustainability. The report also made a good assessment of the exit strategy and measures to mitigate the risks, which was not included at the design stage of the project.</p>	HS
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b></p> <p>Almost all of the lessons learnt are comprehensive and are supported by the evidence. In a few cases, the lessons need further elaboration and better connection to the evidence where they originate from in the report.</p>	S
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b></p> <p>The report includes total project costs and the amount of co-financing committed. However, it does not include actual project cost by activity, output or outcome or by sub-project.</p>	MS
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b></p>	S

**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)**  
 UNDP New York: Mr. Christopher Briggs (UNDP GEF Regional Coordinator for Europe and CIS); UNDP Uzbekistan Office: Mr. Richard Roemers (PO Env.), Mr. Mark Anstey (Biodiversity Consultant).

**9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)**