

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
		<b>Review date:</b>		04/01/09
GEF Project ID:	876		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P052400	<b>GEF financing:</b>	7.5	7.50
Project Name:	PARTNERSHIP FOR NATURAL ECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT PROJECT	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Burkina Faso	Government:	1.68	1.82
		Other*:	4.28	3.70
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	5.96	5.52
Operational Program:	1	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	13.80	13.02
IA	WB	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	MINISTRY OF ENVIRONMENT & HYDRAULIC ( General Directorate of Water & Forest or DGEF)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		05/02/2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: 12/31/2007	Actual: 12/31/2007
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 67	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 67	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 0
Author of TE:	N/A	TE completion date:  June 19, 2008	TE submission date to GEF EO:  December 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 6 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
<b>2.1a Project outcomes</b>	S	S	MS	MS
<b>2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes</b>	N/A	U (Significant risk)	-	U
<b>2.1c Monitoring and evaluation</b>	S	-	"Modest"	MU
<b>2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution</b>	NA	S	NA	MS
<b>2.1e Quality of the evaluation report</b>	N/A	N/A	S	S

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

The TE has several strong points such as presenting all required information in a clear and concise style, and providing a good analysis of project M&E and supervision. On the other hand the TE sometimes lacks sufficient supporting evidence to back up its findings and conclusions.

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

There is no mention of any of these issues in the TE.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

The ProDoc describes the GEO of this 3-phase project as “to have secured biodiversity in priority protected areas”.

There were no changes to the GEO during project 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 ProDoc states that the GEO and the Development Objectives for phase 1 are combined: “reverse biodiversity trends in priority protected areas”.

There were no changes to the Development Objectives.

*“Component 1. National Capacity Building for Support to Decentralized Management of Protected Areas: support the Government in creating the enabling environment for community-based project area management. It specifically aimed to (i) support the Ministry of Environment and Hydraulics in reviewing the legal and institutional framework, particularly the Forest Code, (ii) strengthen the capacity of the Government and NGOs to provide conservation assistance throughout the country, and (iii) support studies that would contribute to the development of the sector.*

*Component 2. Local Capacity Building to Manage Protected Areas: support surrounding communities and other partners to sustainably manage the protected areas. It specifically aimed to (i) support the establishment and building the capacity of the Inter-Village Protected Area Management Associations (AGEREFs), (ii) design and begin the implementation of Protected Areas Management Plans, and (iii) strengthen the capacity of local government staff and communities to manage protected areas.*

*Component 3. Program Administration and Monitoring. This component aimed at ensuring good administration of the project.”*

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
		After the Mid-term review a small grants sub-component, and a focus on creating biological corridors were added to Component 2.	

**If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change**

Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)
				This subcomponent was introduced to improve the livelihoods of local people that lived near the PAs

### 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:**

<b>(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?</b>	
The project was designed to complement Burkina's Community-based Rural Development Program (CBRDP), an overarching program supporting the decentralized rural development strategy. In addition, the project objectives remain relevant to the new Government's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (2004) priorities (i.e. protect the environment and improve living conditions) and to several programs of the Government's Priority Action Program to implement the PRSP 2004-06 (e.g. support to productive sectors through, among other interventions, improvement of sustainable natural resource management, including vegetation and fauna, development of protected areas; intensification and diversification of forest and wildlife products through, among other interventions, placing wildlife areas under sustainable management in the context of the national program for wildlife and protected areas management).	
<b>(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?</b>	
In the 2000 Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan, Burkina defined its long-term vision and commitment to incorporate protected area management in rural development. This project is part of the 15 years National Natural Ecosystem Management Program (PRONAGEN). PRONAGEN plans to secure biodiversity in priority protected areas and sustain provision of benefits to peripheral communities.	
<b>(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?</b>	
PAGEN achievements are consistent with the GEF Operational Strategy for biodiversity, particularly OP 1 (Arid/Semi-arid ecosystems) through support for activities in savannah habitats of the Sudanian and Sahelian 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>	
Burkina Faso has ratified the Biodiversity Convention (1992), the Convention on Migratory Species (1990), and the Desertification Convention (1996). In line with CBD COP4 guidance, PAGEN took an ecosystem approach to maximize biodiversity conservation in a range of ecosystems under different management regimes that involve a range of stakeholders: local communities, private sector, nongovernmental organizations (NGOs), and government agencies.	
<b>A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership<sup>1</sup></b>	
Although not originally planned, the establishment of a biological corridor between the PONASI WCU and the Mole National Park in Ghana resulted in improved cooperation between the two countries. The goal of the corridor was to connect the two ecological blocks of Burkina Faso and Ghana, thus allowing the migration of wildlife (particularly elephants) between the two areas.	
<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
According to the TE, the project successfully decreased agricultural encroachment at values lower than the original target and contributed to an increase in the number of animals in the wildlife corridors targeted by it. For example, the project maintained the 0% encroachment target for the first three aforementioned sites and exceeded its target for the Sahel - with a reported reduction of encroachment from 20% to 13%. The TE also reports that the percentage of mammals increased by 148% in Comore-Leraba and by 118% in Boulon-Koflande. These achievements were a result of the creation of new protected areas, the improvement in PA management, and the decrease in illegal poaching. Another important achievement was the creation of two biological corridors within the PONASI WCU (Kaboré-Tambi - Nazinga and Kaboré-Tambi - Red Volta valley in Ghana) after mid-term review in 2005. The TE concluded that since only a subset of the output indicators proposed in the PAD have been monitored; it is not possible to assess the project achievements in all the areas. For example, there is little information on: (1) whether the share of the national budget allocated to biodiversity conservation has increased; (2) whether international protocols with Mali and Ivory Coast have been implemented; and (3) whether an external monitoring system has been adopted. The TE provides some information on the contributions of the micro-projects (such as apiculture and charcoal production) to local development and poverty alleviation, including the creation of 283 jobs between 2003-2007. In addition, based on Government completion reports, the TE found that only one community institution is officially concessionaire of a protected area: the AGEREF in Comoé-Léraba (the AGEREFs in Boulon-Koflandé and Mare aux Hippopotames act as if they were concessionaires, but they have not yet given officially the concession to manage a protected area); (2) three protected area management plans have been adopted (Kaboré Tambi National Park, Comoé-Leraba, Mare aux Hippopotames), but there is no information on the level of implementation of these plans;	
<b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: UA</b>
There is little information in the TE on efficiency. The TE provides some information on the revenues generated by the sub-projects (on the small-grants component) and the number of jobs created but does not analyze the mechanism's efficiency. Another very significant missing piece of analysis in the TE relates to the costs for incorporating the creation of biological corridors into the project; given the fact that this was a new activity introduced after mid-term, the TE should have indicated from where these funds came and how these reallocated funds were spent. The TE reports that depreciation of dollar led to reduction in the project budget by a fifth of the total amount. Due to this reduction some activities had to be dropped, including part of the small grants component, the payment of	

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

compensation for resettled people and the finalization/validation of a Resettlement Framework, the final aerial inventory, the final stakeholder workshop, and certain planned studies such as the beneficiary assessment and project impact study (which should include an analysis of the cost-effectiveness of the project), the study on the impact of agricultural expansion, etc. The contingency resources were inadequate to allow for completion of these activities.

**d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated)**

According to the ProDoc the project indicated that “the limit of existing protected areas will be redefined as necessary to ensure that no involuntary resettlements occur and new protected areas will be negotiated with the land users.” With the creation of the two biological corridors within the PONASI WCU after mid-term however, 2,697 people were resettled. While a mitigation plan and proposed compensation measures were drafted, the TE indicates that there were not “sufficient resources in the project budget to cover the mitigation measures.” Although the depreciation of the dollar may have affected the overall financing available for this project, the reallocation of resources towards proper compensation should have been made a priority (although the US\$325,000 that was allocated towards sub-projects/small grants seems to have been directed to some of these beneficiaries).

**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))**

This project negotiated and created 6 new protected areas in the Sahel and two biological corridors within the PONASI WCU, for a total area of 578,176 ha.

**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: MU</b>
With the introduction of the GEF's RAF, Burkina Faso was included in the “Group Allocation” for biodiversity projects and currently (as of end of march 2009) there is no GEF biodiversity project in the work plan for the country. The TE indicates that an IDA allocation of US\$5 million is being made available to support a follow-on operation. While this amount may be able to support some consolidation of the gains made in the first phase (national capacity building and further micro-project support), it will not be sufficient to ensure sustainable financing for the management of the priority protected areas targeted in this project.	
<b>b. Socio-economic / political</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
As noted in the TE, the project did not adequately assess the risk of resettlement. The TE indicates that the Government provided some compensation by providing new land, water points, and approximately US\$100,000 which was paid to some 1,764 persons. Although this fell short of the compensation level suggested in the mitigation plan, no formal complaints have yet been received on how the settlement was handled. There is a risk that the compensation will be perceived as inadequate by the resettled communities, and that they may feel they have the right to return to their original sites.	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The project resulted in the establishment of an effective and functioning institutional framework for wildlife and protected areas management, and has successfully put in place an Anti-Poaching Strategy and a new Forestry Code. On the other hand, it is not clear how the newly created protected areas will be managed, given the expanded amount of territory that has now entered into protection.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
The TE mentions the strong human pressure and high increases in cultivated land in the areas surrounding the protected areas. The latter have increased from 15 to 49%, from 43 to 93% and from 58 to 77% in the Comoe-Leraba, the Boulon-Kouflande and the Mare aux Hippopotames over the past five years. This pattern indicates that there is significant pressure on the natural resource base which could threaten the integrity of the protected areas in the future.	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: NA</b>
Not applicable	

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

<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)

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

<b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to catalyze changes in stakeholders</b>
Although the project's main focus was on conservation of biodiversity, it also had positive impact in terms of local development and poverty reduction. The involvement of local communities in activities related to the management of the protected areas (e.g. surveillance, reforestation, construction and maintenance of tracks and water points, tourism/safari hunting, etc.) and the support to natural resource-based income generating activities or micro-projects (e.g. apiculture, aulacodiculture, exploitation of non-timber forest products, etc.) generated a marginal increase in income among the communities surrounding the protected areas According to the TE, support to revenue generating activities resulted in the creation of 283 permanent jobs between 2003 and 2007. The young represented the social group who benefited more from these new employment opportunities. About 343 women directly or indirectly benefited from these activities, particularly those related to the exploitation of non-timber products.
<b>b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities changed institutional behaviors</b>
The project resulted in the establishment of an effective and functioning institutional framework for wildlife and protected areas management (e.g. partnerships with various public and private partners through the establishment of collaboration protocols, execution protocols, and contracts for the provision of services; involvement of local communities in the decision and management of protected areas through the establishment of AGEREFs or Support Committees, etc.)
<b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities led to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b>
The project resulted in the formulation of various strategies, programs and action plans for the conservation and development of wildlife resources (e.g. the Anti-pouching National Strategy, a new Forestry Code and implementation decrees, and a draft National Program for the Management of Wildlife and Protected Areas).
<b>d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project led to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)</b>
There is no mention of catalytic financing resulting from the project implementation.
<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>
The TE does not mention any particular champions.

#### 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 GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The amount of planned government contribution is unclear. As per the ProDoc the expected government contribution was US\$1.68 million. In comparison, the TE reports, that the planed and actual government contribution was US\$1.82million. The project documentation is also unclear about the way it reports parallel finance. Included in the total project costs are four projects which were implemented separately from PAGEN (projects were funded by the Netherlands, ADB, and NGOs). So, while it may be relevant to discuss these investments which were operating in or around the project sites during PAGEN, these funds are not co-financing and should not have been considered part of PAGEN's overall costs. On the other hand, the funds moved from the Community-Based Rural Development Program CBRDP IDA project on the other hand, which directly financed PAGEN subprojects, are co-financing and could be recorded as part of PAGEN's total actual costs.
<b>b. Delays.</b> 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?
There were a few initial delays in recruiting and appointing key staff which delayed the start-up of the project, but the TE concluded that this did not affect project outcomes or sustainability.
<b>c. Country Ownership.</b> 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 Government demonstrated ownership and commitment in supporting the implementation of the project as demonstrated by its contribution to this project (about 25-30% of the total GEF allocation) to which an exceptional allocation of 258 million CFA (about US\$ 540,000) was added in 2007 to partially compensate the financial loss due to the depreciation of the dollar. In addition, the Government took the responsibility to compensate the resettled communities from its own resources.

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

<b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): S</b>
Annex 1 of the ProDoc displays the program's overarching purpose and the project's phased objectives. It includes key performance indicators, the program's data collection strategy and critical assumptions associated with the relative	

<p>indicators. Two outcome indicators were chosen to monitor the progress of the project towards the PDO/GEO: (1) the percentage improvement of bioindicators, and (2) the percentage of the area of the protected areas with agricultural encroachment.</p> <p>However the TE found that there was some inconsistency between the M&amp;E system presented in the ProDoc versus the Grant Agreement, but found no explanation to why these changes had been made.</p> <p>CONAGESE was made responsible to oversee adequate implementation of the environmental management plan. This implied screening all management plans prior to official adoption and implementation, review of Environment and Social Assessment (ESA) of each infrastructure with potential impact on the environment, as well as regular field missions to verify that the project is implemented according to ESA provisions.</p>
<p><b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MU</b></p>
<p>It is not clear why during the course of supervision, only a certain number of the original indicators were monitored and reported against. Regarding the indicators chosen for measuring the project objectives, the TE found inconsistencies between indicators used in the PIRs and the ones presented in the ProDoc. In addition, the baseline information for agricultural encroachment was not provided until late 2004. Shortcomings in data collection are noted in the TE, such as the fact that while data regarding the number of mammals in the targeted areas was collected once through a pedestrian survey (baseline) and again on year later by aerial survey a second survey although planned was not conducted.</p>
<p><b>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document?</b> M&amp;E of the project activities was one of the 3 components of the project, with a budget of US\$ 0.73 million at appraisal.</p>
<p><b>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation?</b> According to the TE, the final budget for the M&amp;E component (#3) was of US\$1.21million, a substantial increase from the planned costs. No explanation for this increase is provided.</p>
<p><b>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?</b> Although the TE does not provide any clear evidence that the monitoring system provided real time feedback, the evaluation and supervision part of the project was central in determining important project changes. For example the Mid-term review of the project resulted in the inclusion of a small-grants sub-component and the creation of the biological corridors which resulted in resettlement of local people.</p>
<p><b>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.</b> No. Baselines for certain project indicators were not established until 2 years after the project started, and the TE found that there were shortcoming in the data collection.</p>

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

<p><b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MS</b></p>
<p><b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MU</b></p>
<p><i>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.</i></p> <p>PAGEN was designed to complement the Government's overarching rural development program; its support for national as well as local capacity development was in line with the country's biodiversity action plan. The main project objectives were not revised during project implementation, there have not been revisions of project components, and implementation arrangements remained valid throughout project implementation, thus suggesting a good project design. But a proper mitigation plan and finance scheme was not properly designed as part of the project and this had a negative effect on the sustainability of project achievements.</p> <p>In addition, after the mid-term review a decision was made to create a conservation corridor involving involuntary resettlement despite the fact that neither an adequate social assessment nor compensation package (including social and physical infrastructure and livelihoods replacement) was developed.</p> <p>Nevertheless, the TE concludes that Bank supervision was effective in helping the Government push forward legal and institutional reforms for the wildlife sector. Two issues were not adequately recorded and documented in the various supervision documents (Aide-Memoires or ISRs): resettlement and indicators. A Safeguard Specialist participated in a few supervision missions and provided guidance on how to deal with the issue of resettlement. A Mitigation Plan was drafted (though not finalized/approved because of lack of resources), and compensation provided to resettled communities. However, this process has not been adequately recorded in the various reports, making unclear whether Bank's procedures have been properly followed.</p>

<p><b>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>4</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): S</b></p> <p><i>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.</i></p> <p>According to the TE, the National Wildlife Service in the National Forestry Department in the Ministry of Environment and Hydraulics performed satisfactorily, despite relatively high turnover among project staff during project implementation. Procurement and financial management were conducted well and the quality of the reports provided was generally good.</p>
--

**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**

*Livelihoods:* Alternative natural resource-based income generating activities and other local development activities which exploit territorial assets need to accompany conservation activities to reduce pressure of local communities on natural resources and increase their incentive in engaging in sustainable management of natural resources. However, Community Driven Development (CDD) operations are not necessarily the best instrument to support natural resource management activities, and, therefore, their complementarity with a GEF operation should be carefully assessed. When presented with CDD options, communities tend to choose activities that meet their basic needs, including health and education opportunities, as opposed to natural resource management activities.

*Local Involvement:* Governments often do not have the capacity to manage protected area systems. Involvement of local communities in the management of protected areas and in the sharing of benefits is a critical element for protected area management. However, project preparation should include a rigorous social assessment to determine existing land access and use rights, ownership as well as analysis of the pre-existing ecosystem services that are being provided by the area prior to becoming involved in changing management structures. Care must be taken when shifting from centralized management to decentralized involvement to determine the roles and rights of local managers in relation to the national or district authorities, depending on the classification of the specific sites. Moreover, when assisting with the development of local management structures, care must be taken to determine the legitimacy and "representativeness" of an NGO chosen or the capacity of the community and its structure to manage a site in a sustainable and economically viable manner.

*Planning and Consultation:* While wildlife resources need to be managed within a transboundary and ecosystem perspective, the creation of new protected areas should in most cases include prior consultation and/or consent from the communities, an adequately financed plan for resettlement, including attention paid to cultural heritage, social values, and economic needs. The creation of new protected areas should be accompanied by a management plan that takes into account local capacity and a long-term financing plan that works to ensure sustainability over time.

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

No recommendations are included in the TE.

**6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.**

-

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

<b>6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b></p> <p>Project outcomes and impacts are assessed in a concise and clear manner.</p>	S

<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.



<p><b>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?</b>  In general the TE is internally consistent and presents substantiated ratings for most of the required criteria.  On the other hand, insufficient evidence is provided regarding the achievement of some of the qualitative outputs discussed in the TE (improved protected areas management, decreased reliance on natural resources etc.)</p>	MS
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b>  TE reports thoroughly on the persisting risks to project sustainability, and stresses the need to continue with phase 2 of the project in order to .</p>	S
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b>  Lessons included in the TE are supported by the evidence presented and are comprehensive. The TE does not include any recommendations.</p>	S
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b>  Planned and actual project costs are presented, including an assessment of the effects that the depreciation of the dollar had in project implementation. The TE was not able to include costs per activity because of lack of data regarding co-finance.</p>	MS
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b>  TE makes an assessment of project indicators (as stated in ProDoc and as used during project implementation). It also includes an assessment of project supervision by the WB.</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)**

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