

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	January 18, 2010
GEF Project ID:	865		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)**
IA/EA Project ID:	1027	GEF financing:	0.725 +PDF 0.025	0.7243
Project Name:	Conservation of the Asiatic Cheetah, its Natural Habitat and Associated Biota in the I. R. of Iran	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Islamic Republic of Iran	Government:	Nal in kind 0.2100	Nal cash 0.8584 Nal in kind 0.2355
		Other*:	NGO in kind 0.5226	WCS 0.410 GEF SGP 0.208
		Total Cofinancing	0.7326	1.7119
Operational Program:	OP1: Arid and semiarid ecosystems	Total Project Cost:	1.4576	2.4362
IA	United Nations Development Program	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Department of Environment of the I.R. of Iran, Wildlife Conservation Society, IUCN, and Cheetah Conservation Fund.	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		09/10/2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: 09/10/2005	Actual: 09/30/2008
Prepared by: Luisa Lema	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 48 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 85 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 37 months
Author of TE: Urs Breitenmoser, Afshin Alizadeh and Christine Breitenmoser-Würsten		TE completion date: Jan 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO: Nov 2009	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 10 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

** The terminal evaluation did not assess the finances of the project, as it was not requested in its ToR. It did include the amounts contained in the Final PIR and Final report. The amounts reported here are those borrowed from the Final report.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	N/A	UA	N/A	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	UA	N/A	L
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	MU	N/A	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	MU
2.1e Quality of the	N/A	N/A	N/A	S

evaluation report				
-------------------	--	--	--	--

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why? No. The terminal evaluation gives an excellent review of project outcomes, under achievements, and recommendations for further implementation. However, it does not provide information on actual expenditures and co-financing.
2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.? None of these issues is mentioned in the terminal evaluation.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives				
a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?				
According to the project Brief, the objective of the project was “the conservation of the Asiatic cheetah (<i>Acinonyx jubatus venaticus</i>) in the I. R. of Iran and the related complex of rare and endangered wild species and their natural habitats with the support and collaboration of local communities.” The objective did not change during implementation.				
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 project Brief does not state any development objectives. However the accomplishment of each expected outcome was logically assumed to be an objective in the reviews performed during project implementation, and in the terminal evaluation. The expected outcomes (objectives) were:				
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. “Better understanding of crucial biotic territories for the Asiatic cheetah and related species in the I.R. of Iran, and enhanced knowledge of cheetah population dynamics, behavior and survival factors. 2. Improved management of the crucial biotic territories by governmental and non- governmental entities with relevant interests and concerns (stakeholders) in order to rehabilitate over-grazed habitat and ensure better protection for cheetahs and their prey. 3. Enhanced and sustained well being of the human communities living within or in proximity of such natural habitats. 4. Enhanced awareness and support of the government and civil society of the I.R. of Iran on relevant issues and concerns, in particular regarding the prevention of non- habitat-related threats to the Asiatic cheetah (e.g. illegal hunting and killing of cheetah and related species) among most relevant groups (local peri-desert communities, nomadic herders, hunters, youth).” 				
Expected outcome number 3 was removed in the 2006, 2007 and 2008 PIRs. However, the terminal evaluation includes it and analyses outcomes related to it. There were no additional changes in the objectives during project implementation.				
Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)	
	X Objectives not specified as such in Brief; expected outcomes adopted as objectives during project implementation. Objective 3 was removed halfway into the project.			
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, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)
		X		X Structural differences and legal issues with the

				contractor of co-management activities led to delays and further removal of output.
--	--	--	--	---

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	Rating: S
<p>The outcomes of the project are relevant to the GEF Operational Program 3, which aims at the conservation and sustainable use of the biological resources in arid and semi-arid zone ecosystems. They are also relevant to the Constitution of Iran, which defines environmental protection as a duty and prohibits activities that may result in damage to the environment; Iran’s commitment as a party to the Convention to Combat Desertification, the country’s National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan; and, the National Strategy for Environment and Sustainable Development.</p>	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: MS
<p>The project was expected to achieve the conservation of the Asiatic Cheetah through a combination of research and monitoring, improved protection, co-management, and awareness and education. Major outputs include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increase in known cheetah distribution and possible movement patterns. • Estimation of Iran’s cheetah population size and better understanding of autoecology. • Department of Environment staff, NGOs and students trained in cheetah monitoring techniques. • Biological and social characterization of areas of cheetah distribution. • Identification of land use rights and procurement of access rights. • Change of protected area designation to stricter categories and creation of new protected areas, with improved staffing, equipment and infrastructure. • Improved surveillance and law enforcement in protected areas. • Increase in legal penalties on killing cheetah. • Significant increase in public awareness, and partnership with Ministry of Education for inclusion of cheetah conservation issues in mainstream education programs. • Declared <i>Asiatic Cheetah Protection Day</i> (31 August). <p>The terminal evaluation notes that the project did not achieve several of the outputs initially planned, particularly in the area of co-management, for which a serious dispute with the contractor obstructed implementation. The project did not result on available biological knowledge based on robust methods, processed and reported according to scientific standards; park guards received late payments, had insufficient personal equipment and lack of transportation and communication means; and, the co-management component was abandoned.</p> <p>The terminal evaluation criticizes the complexity of the management structure designed for the project. Several bodies were not effectively put in place (Steering Committee, Rapid Biological Survey Team, Inception Mission Team, Chief Technical Advisor), which affected the delivery of the results expected (including the project logframe), and impeded the implementation of adaptive management.</p> <p>It is important to mention that several of the outcomes not met through project implementation were later on compensated with the intervention of different initiatives; the terminal evaluation highlights the additional investments by Wildlife Conservation Society (in research and monitoring), the UNDP/GEF SGP (in co-management), and the Department of Environment Biodiversity Fund. The intervention of the UNDP/GEF SGP in the project area will not be reviewed here, as it is the result of a different GEF investment.</p> <p>The terminal evaluation acknowledges that it was out of the reach of the evaluators to verify many of the results and conclusions drawn in the project reports (e.g. biological parameters). It notes that the final report did not distinguish whether an activity was performed as part of the UNDP/GEF SGP project, or as a partner contribution. It also mentions that some findings were not published or available in English when the terminal evaluation was done, and that some information was not collected in a scientific way. Having said that, it concludes that all expected outcomes that were reached at some level.</p> <p>The terminal evaluation concludes that “the situation of the Asiatic cheetah today is more promising than seven years ago, and that this would most likely not be the case without the CACP [this project], regardless of all the critiques and shortcomings that is raised in this report.”</p>	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: MS

According to the terminal evaluation, the expected outcomes of the project were overambitious for its foreseen duration and funding. While some components of the project, such as awareness and education had excellent results with a limited budget, others like co-management (with 345,000 USD originally allocated to it) had few outcomes as a direct result of the project. As mentioned above, several shortcomings in the implementation were largely compensated over time thanks to the collaboration with other initiatives funded by Wildlife Conservation Society and UNDP/GEF SGP.

The project had serious delays and required three no-cost extensions; the activities were originally planned for 48 months, but lasted 85. Several factors contributed to the delay of the project, including continual changes in the top management, disputes with contractors and the absence of a revised logframe, as will be further explained in section 4.4.b.

The extension of the project allowed for further work on cheetah population monitoring, continued public education and awareness, and sustained management in protected areas. Although the extension of the project did not require additional funding from the GEF, the co-financing provided by the Department of Environment did increase from 210,000 USD to over 1,000,000 USD. These additional funds were largely used to pay for park guards and grazing rights. In the long run, the additional investment from the Department of Environment is contributing to project sustainability and governmental engagement, and does not necessarily has to be seen a cost overrun.

4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.

The project raised awareness on cheetah conservation threats at the national and international level. The project worked with schools and developed educational materials that triggered the support of the Ministry of Education. The project received considerable media attention from the early stages; the PIRs mention numerous articles in newspapers and several hours of airtime for documentaries about Cheetah. The terminal evaluation reports elevated understanding demonstrated by Iranian media staff about cheetah conservation issues.

The project resulted in long-term environmental benefits that go beyond the improvement in the conservation status of the targeted species. The management of protected areas within the cheetah range was enhanced through improved staffing, facilities and equipment. The existent protected areas had their denominations legally modified to more strict categories, new protected areas were created within the species range, and traditional grazing rights were bought from communities. However, the critical state of the cheetah population in the country makes it difficult to determine if the execution of the project will result in any long-term impact in favor of its conservation.

Lastly, the project improved the knowledge of Asian cheetah ecology, and provided a basis for continued scientific monitoring that could lead to a fine understanding of the population dynamics and ethology.

There are no negative impacts reported for the project.

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
Available financial resources are likely to guarantee sustained project outcomes and continuation of activities. On one hand, the National Government has shown a fair financial commitment during project implementation – it invested over one million dollars in project activities, both in-cash and in-kind – and given the importance of the project at the national level, it is expected that such support continues. On the other hand, a second phase of the project, which builds on this one, is currently on-going, with 500,000 USD in GEF funding (see http://www.undp.org.ir/index.php/operations/procurement/79).	
b. Socio political	Rating: L
No significant socio-political risks are foreseen. The project reportedly achieved an outstanding level of public awareness at the national and international levels. The engagement of the local communities is contingent on the extent to which their livelihood concerns are addressed. Although the livelihoods component of this project was dropped, the dropped activities are being taken up through the GEF supported UNDP-SGP. The terminal evaluation identifies weaknesses in the design of the proposed SGP project and concludes that this might limit its effectiveness. However, this may not lessen the present achievements of the assessed project.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
The project set a regulatory framework that allows for the sustainability of the outcomes. The legal protection of the Asian cheetah range is improved thanks to increased protective status of the existing protected areas, and the creation of new ones. There is institutional will at the government level to maintain and improve the benefits of the project; an example of it is the funding commitment of the Department of Environment, who halfway into the project started	

paying for game guard salaries, securing the sustained protection of the reserved areas. Another example of the commitment of the executing agency is the moratorium in the issuance of new hunting licenses throughout the identified cheetah range. Government involvement integrated areas beyond the Department of Environment, such as the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Industry and Mines.

d. Environmental

Rating: UA

The project applied measures to reduce threats to cheetah conservation, such as poaching and grazing; however, the small sample and the short time data series make it impossible to assess whether the resulting magnitude of the threats poses a risk for the continuation of the benefits of the project.

4.3 Catalytic role

a.. Production of a public good

The project improved the ecological knowledge of the Asian cheetah, created new protected areas, and developed educational materials. The benefits from all of them are expected to continue.

b.. Demonstration

The project reportedly received a fair amount of international attention and “has the potential to help spread the interest [in wildlife conservation and research] across the national borders to the whole region.”

c.. Replication

The moratorium on new hunting licenses was spread to other regions of Iran. There is no evidence of replication of other components, but the comprehensive project design does have the potential to be replicated.

d.. Scaling up

The methodologies introduced by the project reached the national system. For example, the 2003 PIR reports that the Department of Environment started applying GPS in routine biological surveys and mapping of wildlife.

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? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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 in-kind contributions of the Department of Environment covered personnel, equipment, transportation and facilities for the use of governmental bodies and NGOs during the project. More importantly, most of the project costs after 2004 were paid with co-financing funds from the Department. These funds were used in research, construction of new game posts, maintenance of infrastructure, procurement of access rights inside protected areas, and payments for the salary of Department of Environment experts and field staff. The co-financing provided by the agency exceeded one million dollars (in-cash and in-kind), compared to 210,000 USD originally planned. This contribution allowed for the prolonged extension of the project and the increased sustainability of project outcomes.

Additional co-financing was provided by Wildlife Conservation Society, who contributed to the implementation of research and monitoring activities, and provided staff time and travel costs.

Lastly, the UNDP/GEF SGP supported the project by providing grants for community development in the project area through seeding ecotourism, handicrafts and medicinal plant businesses.

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?

The project got three extensions and was eventually completed after a delay of more than three years, almost doubling its expected duration. The terminal evaluation considers that the project document envisioned an overly complex organizational structure for a medium sized, four-year project. This affected implementation of activities and resulted in lower project performance. The Inception Mission, which was supposed to result in a revised log frame, never took place. The Steering Committee and the Mentoring Team, two institutions foreseen in the Project Document that would have aided adaptive management, were never properly established. There were frequent project management changes at senior levels, and disagreements between the National Project Directors and National Project Managers; both positions changed three times during implementation. A prolonged legal dispute between the Department of Environment and UNDP on the one hand, and CEESP/IUCN on the other hand led to delays. Lastly, the terminal evaluation considers that scale and scope of the threats and identified project sites (3,800,000 hectares) was disproportionate compared to the resources earmarked for the project.

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.

The project was executed by the Department of Environment, a cross-governmental agency that influences all ministries. The executing agency not only made large financial investment in the project, but it also involved other governmental bodies, such as the Ministry of Education and the Ministry of Industry and Mines. On the down-side,

there were difficulties in project management and serious problems in project monitoring that were not properly addressed (or not addressed at all) by the government. These include high staff turnover, lack of coordination between National Project Manager and National Project Director, and absence of monitoring and support bodies.

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
<p>The project document included a plan for monitoring and evaluation with a basic logframe that was to be finalized after the Inception Mission. It also planned for a series of measures for continuous adaptation, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A Chief Technical Advisor to provide continued support to the project • An Inception Mission Team to assess the threats and conflicts in each project site and to conduct stakeholder consultations • A Rapid Biological Survey Teams to undertake initial surveys in order to compile critical biological information necessary to ensure that project activities are effective • A Mentoring Team of external advisors to visit the project at the end of each implementation year and provide recommendations for changes • A Steering Committee to review the recommendations of the Mentoring Team each year and modify the project accordingly <p>As noted in the terminal evaluation, the expected outcomes addressed the major issues for the long-term conservation of cheetahs in Iran. They not only remained important during the implementation of the project, but will remain valid beyond the project phase.</p> <p>On the other hand, several indicators were overambitious and unrealistic given the timeline and resources available for project implementation. The terminal evaluation brings attention to the fact that the Project Document itself mentioned that the goals and outcomes were formulated based on a limited knowledge and would need adjustments.</p>	
b. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): U
<p>The project had regular field visits, standard yearly reviews, a Mid-Term Evaluation, a Final Report, and a terminal evaluation. The GEF EO only had access to the PIRs done in 2003, 2004 and 2007; these reports are complete, but ratings on some aspects (particularly co-management) were too optimistic.</p> <p>Lack of baseline information made it impossible to assess the project achievements on some indicators. For example, the biological surveys to establish the conditions of cheetah populations started late in the project, after three years of implementation (PIR 2004), thus, there was no baseline data to assess improvement in the variables. The implementing agency justifies the late initiation of these activities because of the need to prioritize the protection, recovery and hands-on management of the critical cheetah habitats. Also, the terminal evaluation emphasized the impossibility to corroborate some data due to the inconsistencies in reporting.</p> <p>The foreseen control mechanisms were either not functional for the most part of implementation, or never put in place; a Chief Technical Advisor was hired late and worked for the project only for a few months, the Inception Mission never happened, the Steering Committee only met a few times, and the Mentoring Team was never constituted. Because the Inception Mission did not occur, the logframe was never revised, and a workplan incorporating adaptive management was never designed. Both the mid-term evaluation (2004) and the terminal evaluation mentioned the lack of an adequate logframe as a major weakness. The absence of a Steering Committee affected the implementation of the recommendations from the mid-term evaluation and the application of adaptive management. The terminal evaluation found this control structure to be extremely complex for the dimensions of the project. In any case, some functional support and control body was needed during the project, and it did not happen.</p>	
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? No.</p>	
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Unable to Assess</p>	
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provide 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 evidence that the information provided through the monitoring system was not adequately used and corrective measures were not taken on important issues. This disruption was caused both by the lack of control mechanisms and by the frequent change in management staff, namely the National Project Director and National Project Manager.</p>	
<p>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.</p> <p>The monitoring and evaluation system foreseen proved to be hard to implement and was not effective. It cannot be considered a good practice.</p>	

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

According to the terminal evaluation, UNDP was actively involved in the execution of the project, and participated in the shaping of the project strategy, the provision of international support and activities related to capacity building and advocacy. The agency had continuous field visits and provided timely feedback in the PIRs. The choice of the Department of Environment as an executing agency was key to the political and social support that the initiative gained, and to the continuation of activities beyond the project.

The implementing agency had important faults related to monitoring and evaluation, including quality-at-entry problems. The project design envisioned a complicated system of support and monitoring, which included a number of bodies that never got to be functional or put in place. The project document also provided a poor group of indicators that was to be revised after an Inception Mission; since the Inception Mission never took place, the project was left without a logframe that allowed for adaptive management. The Mid-Term Evaluation mentioned the absence of a logframe as a weakness that should have been identified by the UNDP; however, this problem was never addressed. Lastly, the terminal evaluation mentions inconsistencies in reporting, which affected the capacity of the evaluators to corroborate the outcomes mentioned in the reports.

UNDP compensated for the lack of implementation of community engagement components by implementing the UNDP/GEF SGP in the project area. Yet, the terminal evaluation notes structural problems in the execution of these small grants, which apparently are building new enterprises based on inexistent and improbable markets. The evaluators make a call for a better implementation of these community projects in order to diminish the risk of jeopardizing the trust of locals.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale): MU

The project was executed by the Department of Environment of the Islamic Republic of Iran. The terminal evaluation notes that this project created “more national and international awareness than any other wildlife conservation project in the region”, which is certainly a result of the good work of the executing agency. The Department of Environment showed a strong commitment to the project, investing over 230,000 USD in kind and over 850,000 USD in cash. Its contribution was especially important in the last years of implementation, when GEF funding was diminishing. The Department of Environment proved a strong political commitment by making it possible to raise the conservation restrictions in the cheetah range, through the modification of the designation of some protected areas and the creation of additional ones. In addition, the Department of Environment procured traditional and hereditary land tenure rights within sensitive core and protected areas.

In spite of the apparent financial and political commitment, the Department of Environment had serious faults in execution. The terminal evaluation informs that the project was understaffed, underequipped and lacking important capacities during long periods of project implementation; these were major reasons for the delays and under achievements of the project. The agency never implemented important components, including the creation and enforcement of support and control structures, and the promotion of collaborative management with local communities. The absence of any support and control body left important management and monitoring tasks unfulfilled. The problems with communication amongst partners noted in the terminal evaluation also show a lack of leadership and involvement on behalf of the Department of Environment. An important component of the project, such as co-management, should not have been withdrawn and left for implementation to partner initiatives, which seem to not have been effective either, as per the terminal evaluation.

Although the Department of Environment seems to have been candid at reporting obstacles and delays to the UNDP, it was not responsive at the recommendations and comments of the project reviews.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

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 terminal evaluation includes the following lessons learned:

- Reviews are more effective if a team of reviewers combining all skills required accompany the project throughout its implementation.

¹ 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.

- While it is good to have ambitious expectations and to work hard to meet them, unrealistic goals are demotivating and can obstruct cooperation of project partners.
- Effective management implies designing an organizational structure that is straightforward, flexible and efficient and serves mainly the implementation of the project activities and collaboration between project partners.
- Reliable monitoring data are indispensable for the assessment of any conservation measures, and it normally takes several years to establish a well-functioning system.
- The lack of reports using scientific standards or papers published in scientific journals makes it difficult for the evaluators to assess findings and results. Producing scientific reports and publications provides a useful control with regard to the performance of the project.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

- Utilize scientific standards and reporting systems to track species' conditions. Use IUCN Red List principles to formulate concrete quantitative project goals.
- Protection and co-management must be integrated.
- All important reports should be in the original language and in English.
- It is important to keep the project high in the media agenda and work on public relations.
- The community-work started with the GEF SGP needs to be carefully evaluated. Both to continue and to discontinue these projects bears the risk of failure and frustration; it is very difficult to undo errors when working with local communities.
- This initiative needs several lines of cooperation and communication, including with other bodies of the government, with the media, with locals and with international and scientific partners.

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.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? The project gives a complete overview of outcomes and impacts of the project, and addresses the limitations to determine the success of some of the outputs.</p>	S
<p>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? The report ratings are consistent with the evidence presented.</p>	HS
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The evaluation addresses the sustainability of the project from different perspectives (political, ecological, social) and gives recommendations to sustain outcomes.</p>	S
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are supported with the evidence presented.</p>	S
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? A financial analysis was not included in the ToR for the terminal evaluation; however, the terminal evaluation gives an overview of project finances as presented in previous implementing agency reports.</p>	MS
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The terminal evaluation gives special importance to the implementation of M&E.</p>	HS

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

UNDP Iran website:
<http://www.undp.org.ir/index.php/operations/procurement/79>

Version of Project Document, downloaded from:
<http://www.undp.org.ir/DocCenter/projectdocs/Cheetah%20Project%20PD.pdf>