GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	947		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P072979	**GEF financing:**	4.5	4.5
Project Name:	Regional Integrated Silvopastoral Approaches to Ecosystem Management Project	IA/EA own:	.6	
Country:	Nicaragua, Colombia, Costa Rica	Government:		
		Other*:	3.35	
		Total Cofinancing	3.95	7.04
Operational Program:	OP12	**Total Project Cost:**	8.45	11.54
IA	World Bank	Dates		
Partners involved:	Centro Agronomico Tropial de Investigacion y Ensenanza (CATIE); Centre for Research on Sustainable Agricultural Production Systems (CIPAV); Institute of Research and Development of the University of Central America (NITLAPAN-UCA); LEAD-FAO	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		July 2002
		Closing Date	Proposed: July 2007	Actual: January 2008
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 70 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 75 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 5 months
Author of ICR: Gunars H. Platais		TE completion date: January 2009	TE submission date to GEF EO: January 2009	Difference between ICR completion and submission date (in months): 0 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	HS	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	**N/A**	Negligible to low risks	Negligible to low risks	ML

2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	S	-	High	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	**NA**	**NA**	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	**N/A**	**N/A**	S	MS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?
The terminal evaluation report should not be considered good practice. Although the report provides sufficient information on project activities and outcomes, it does not present it in a coherent manner. Additionally the report does not provide sufficient information regarding the project's M&E system such as how much funding was eventually utilized for M&E or if timely feedback was provided by the system.

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

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 document the global environmental objective of the project is:

"to demonstrate and measure the effects of the introduction of payment incentives for environmental services to farmers on their adoption of integrated silvopastoral farming systems in degraded pasture lands in Colombia, Costa Rica and Nicaragua and the improvements in eco-systems functioning, global environmental benefits, and local socio-economic gains resulting from the provision of said services."

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the global environmental objectives during the implementation of the project.

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)?)

According to the project document the following are the development objectives of the project:

(i) Achievement of "incremental local environmental benefits" through "reduction in erosion, improvement in soil and water quality, increased production, income and employment in rural areas from degraded pasture land in up to six watersheds" across the 3 participating countries.

(ii) Achievement of "incremental global environmental benefits" through "improved biodiversity and carbon sequestration services", which will help to protect "some of the world's most valuable eco-systems and reduce the risk of climate change."

(iii) "Experience on farmers' reactions to the payment of environmental services and experiences in the management of payment incentive schemes required to produce global environmental benefits."

(iv) Establishment of "guidelines for sustainable financing mechanisms for the promotion of silvopastoral systems to rehabilitate degraded pastures."

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the development objectives during the implementation of the project.

Overall Environmental	Project Development	Project Components	Any other (specify)

Objectives	Objectives		

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)**

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**

The project's emphasis on integrated approaches for the rehabilitation of degraded ecosystems, through emissions reductions and improved storage of GHG, improving the quality of agro-biodiversity, land, and water and energy resources conforms to the priorities specified in the GEF Operational Program12, which addresses integrated ecosystems management. All three participating countries, Nicaragua (in 1995), Costa Rica and Colombia (both in 1994) have ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity. The project will help all three countries in meeting their obligations under the CBD. In addition the project's objectives align with the national guidelines and strategies of the three participating countries i.e. Action Plan of the Costa Rican National Biodiversity Law; Columbia's National Strategy Study on "Optimization of the Use of the Clean Development Mechanism in Colombia. The project design and objectives are also consistent with all three country's sector priorities regarding natural resource management and biodiversity conservation outlined in each participating nation's CAS.

b. Effectiveness **Rating: S**

The ICR rates the project as "satisfactory" which is substantiated by the accomplishment of key targets and objectives and the strong regional and global learning and scaling-up the project has achieved. The ICR indicates significant strides in local environmental benefits were achieved as water quality in project areas were "markedly better" and establishment of live fences provided a safe corridor for wildlife to traverse. Additionally the project was able to secure incremental global environmental benefits through improved biodiversity and carbon sequestration and helped increased farmers exposure to payment for environmental services schemes.

The following are some of the project's key achievements:

- 12,260 hectares (target: 12,000 hectares) with improved biodiversity and carbon sequestration indices
- 3,673.2 hectares (target: 4,000 hectares) of silvopastoral systems established in the three project countries
- 19,558 incremental (target: 25,000 tons) of carbon sequestered annually in areas receiving payments for environmental services
- Increased biodiversity in the pilot zones in the three project countries: Number of bird species in secondary and riparian forests: 197 (target 117.4). Butterfly species: 130 (target 18.2). Mollusk species: 81 (target 80)
- 265 farms (292 target) with eco-services payments implemented in each of the three target countries

Additionally the "most innovative outcome" of this project was the establishment of a differentiated payment scheme according to the degree of environmental service being provided which allowed farmers to decide "how much" conservation they were willing to undertake. In addition to these achievements, this project's greatest achievement was as a demonstration project. The project was successful in raising awareness how to effectively integrate biodiversity conservation and cattle ranching. According to the ICR, the project was "very effective" in terms of dissemination and capacity building strategies "at all levels" and has introduced financial mechanisms (i.e. rural tourism, payment for environmental services, credit systems and certification of livestock products) which will help in supporting the development of SPS in the participating countries for the long-term.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) **Rating: S**

As previously mentioned the majority of the project activities have been implemented satisfactorily with the project successfully achieving many of the project's key objectives. The project was implemented over 5.5 years, which includes a 6 month extension to complete project activities as a result of delays that occurred during the outset of the project. While this was a modest extension, the ICR provides limited information if extension was a no-cost extension and how the difference in the original total project cost $8.45 million, and the final project cost, US$ 11.54 million, was utilized. The ICR does mention the project had "relatively high costs" due to its intensive monitoring, capacity building as an experimental demonstration project. However, the ICR asserts GEF financing and co-financing were utilized in an "efficient manner" which allowed for the demonstration of project activities also helped generate information and mechanisms to scale-up operations in each country.

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

According to the project document the overall mission of the SPS project was to "demonstrate and measure the effects" of the introduction of payment incentives for environmental services to farmers upon their adoption of integrated silvopastoral farming systems in degraded pasture lands. At this point it is difficult to determine if the project has led to significant global environmental benefits. However at the project's closure key intermediate outcomes were achieved, such as the establishment of 3,673 ha of silvopastoral systems and a total 265 farms with eco-services payments implemented across the three target countries. While some improvements to the eco-system such as increased biodiversity (i.e. bird, butterfly and mollusk species) have been achieved in the pilot zones of the three project countries, it is unclear if continued development and replication of the SPS project will lead to significant measurable impacts.

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 ICR. 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: ML**

Overall it appears that there is a high likelihood that financial resources will be available to continue the project activities. In order to ensure the project's long term sustainability, various sustainable financing mechanisms were pursued in the project (i.e. payment for environmental services, credit systems). Below is the breakdown by country of the various methods that were pursued:

Colombia
FEDEGAN, Colombia's National farmer's organization, utilized the project to develop a program for mainstreaming SPS for sustainable management of cattle production at the national level. FEDEGAN has also earmarked funds for credit with the national bank (FINAGRO) and in collaboration with other organizations for the development of a future GEF project to conserve biodiversity in cattle farms.

Nicaragua
SNV (Foundation of Netherlands Volunteers) contributed "seed money" to finance the development of a system for PES for conservation of water resources near Nicaragua's Matiguas- Rio Blanco watershed. FDL, Nicaragua's Local Development Bank, a rural finance bank which provides agricultural credit at the national level, supported the development of "green credit package" in the amount of US $400,000 to invest in a "biodiversity friendly" silvopastoral system. FDL plans to increase funding for this credit scheme over the years which will help in the long-term replication of the project results.

Costa Rica
FONAFIFO developed the Ecomarkets 2 project which will work on watersheds similar to that of the pilot area in Costa Rica. The Ecomarkets 2 project will utilize the experiences and methods developed by the silvopastoral project for payment of environmental services.

According to the IEG review there is "some risk", in the long-term, that funds for farm activities that were "less profitable" and were provided extra incentive payments would not receive further public support through "sufficient budgetary allocation."

b. Socio political **Rating: ML**

One of the main risks to sustainability is if project incentives are not sufficient to motivate farmer participation. However, the project was able to demonstrate that silvopastoral systems can be profitable for farmers as the increase in productivity due to improvements in cattle stocking rates and animal conditions led to reduced costs as a result of lower herbicide usage and soil erosion. The ICR indicates the project has been a "win-win" as farmers have been able to increase productivity and ultimately their bottom line while benefiting the environment by reclaiming degraded soils and increasing biodiversity conservation. However, the ICR indicates there are certain situations where the adoption of SPS-while providing greater public good-is not necessarily in the farmer's financial interest. For instance, the ICR indicates land use changes may have, in the short-term, impact on farm productivity which makes farmers less willing to adopt SPS. The ICR asserts in these situations a "continuous payment" would need to be made in order to make SPS more attractive alternative.

c. Institutional framework and governance **Rating: ML**

According to the ICR the project has enhanced the ability of the three key implementing institutions, CATIE, CIPAV, and NITLAPAN-UCA, which were already well-established, to work on the "agriculture-environment nexus". The ICR indicates the staff of all three institutions were "positively affected" by the "intra and inter-institutional interactions" and the capacity building opportunities the project provided. The activities also strengthened their collaboration with national and regional institutions such as CRQ in Colombia, FONAFIFO in Costa Rica and FDL in Nicaragua and with the private sector (FEDEGAN in Colombia, NESTLE and CORFORGA of Costa Rica and Rainforest Alliance).

d. Environmental **Rating: NA**

Not applicable.

4.3 Catalytic role

a.. Production of a public good

The project was able to successfully produce several public goods:

- 12,260 hectares with improved biodiversity and carbon sequestration indices
- 3,673.2 hectares of silvopastoral systems established in the three project countries
- 265 farms (292 target) with eco-services payments implemented in each of the three target countries
- Training and technical assistance provided regarding silvopastoral systems and PES to a total of 5,097 farmers and 77 institutions and organizations including community groups

b.. Demonstration

According to the ICR the project's greatest achievement, as a pilot project, has been in raising awareness and learning about harmonizing cattle farming with environmental objectives through "effective dissemination" and capacity building strategies at various levels: farmers, technicians, politicians and researchers. The project exceeded initial targets in disseminating SPS information and demonstrating and measuring the effects of adopting biodiversity friendly practices to farmers (5,097 vs. 1,200 targeted), community organizations and/or NGOs (77 vs. 12 targeted), as well as policymakers and regional networks. The project has been instrumental in increasing the awareness of the potential of integrated ecosystem management has on providing critical environmental services including the restoration of degraded pasture. This has been achieved through extensive training, capacity building and dissemination of knowledge generated through the project such as participation in international events to present project results (i.e. GEF workshops), through publications and technical bulletins, field days and seminars. The ICR credits this "knowledge base" in helping to provide guidance for the replication of the SPS at "various levels."

c. Replication

According to the ICR **r**eplicability and scaling up of the project is "being met" and the project is successfully influencing policies and practices across public and private sectors in the three participating countries, as well as regionally and globally:

Colombia - Colombia is moving forward with an independent follow-up project through which FEDEGAN, a partner in this project, plans to scale SPS up to 62,000 hectares in prominent cattle ranching areas throughout the country. The Colombian Ministry of Agriculture established the "Incentivo de Capitalizacion rural ICR" for any type of farmer interested in implementing SPS.

Costa Rica - CORFORGA, the cattle farmers' association in Costa Rica has utilized this experience to develop an incentive scheme for environmentally friendly livestock systems, including a credit line for good farming practices that encompasses silvopastoral practices. An IDB-funded project on training and payment for environmental services in Costa Rica is using this experience to guide the compensation of farmers for the adoption of good farming practices, as is the Regional Environmental Authority (CRQ) in Colombia.

Nicaragua - Nicaragua, through its Local Development Fund (FDL), is also moving forward on scaling-up the projects activities with a line of credit to promote the adoption of SPS. The Nicaraguan government is also considering a follow-on integrated agriculture project i.e. payments to cattle ranchers that adopt practices that are environmentally friendly.

Regionally, CCAD is using the information generated by the project to promote sustainable land management in Central America. In Latin America, FAO has established a network on sustainable livestock systems (CODEGLAC) supported by the project. Globally, CATIE is collaborating with FAO-LEAD to develop proposals, such as watersheds in India, which utilizes the project experience. Additionally the ICR indicates World Bank projects in Brazil, Ecuador, El Salvador, Guatemala, Honduras and Mexico which incorporate environmental service payments for watershed protection and forest conservation have also benefited from the knowledge produced by the project.

d.. Scaling up
See section 4.3c.

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 ICR does not provide a breakdown of the actual amount of co-financing or where and how the difference in total project cost, $8.45 million, and the final project cost, US$ 11.54 million, was utilized and financed. The only information it provides is that LEAD-FAO provided co-financing of US$ 350,000 for part of the PES in Costa Rica and several other policy-related activities, which is equivalent to the amount originally proposed in the project document.

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 suffered initial delays in implementation due to "deficiencies in procurement" and delays in the implementation of subsidiary agreements between CATIE and CIPAV and NITLAPAN. Due to these delays at the project' a 6-month extension was granted to finalize project activities, such as the completion of the last PES and monitoring the projects' land use change impacts.

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.

As previously mentioned the project's objectives align with the national guidelines and strategies of the three participating countries: Action Plan of the Costa Rican National Biodiversity Law; Columbia's National Strategy Study on "Optimization of the Use of the Clean Development Mechanism in Colombia" and Nicaragua's National Biodiversity Strategy. The project design and objectives are also consistent with all three country's sector priorities outlined in each nation's CAS. Overall the national governments and relevant agencies of the three participating countries were integral to and facilitated the project's implementation. The project's execution was led by CATIE, a well known international nonprofit civil association in Costa Rica that conducts research, education and outreach activities in agro-forestry systems and natural resources management. Locally, the project was executed by UCA-NITLAPAN in Nicaragua, CATIE in Costa Rica and CIPAV in Colombia. According to the ICR, at the project's outset these three institutions contributed "significantly" to the project's design, with CATIE providing key technical support. The ICR ultimately credits these institutions for helping to establish a "better designed project".

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

a. M&E design at Entry **Rating (six point scale): S**
The M&E plan at entry appeared to be sufficient and practical. The project document specified M&E procedures such as yearly, voluntary stakeholder roundtables to be conducted in each country to review and provide feedback on project results. Monitoring and evaluation responsibilities were also clearly designated to the project's key stakeholders with CATIE designated a "co-coordinating role" to monitor project objectives, outcomes, and activities using extensive log frame indicators provided in the project document. Additionally provisions were made for the creation of database which collected biophysical, socio-economic as well as baseline carbon data for each farm that was selected. Most importantly, from the project's outset a significant amount of funds, approximately US $950,000, was allocated for the implementation of M&E activities.
b. M&E plan Implementation **Rating (six point scale): S**
The ICR reports the project's M&E system was "successful" in monitoring and measuring the project's impact on farms, institutions and its ability to be replicated. However, the ICR provides very limited information to actually support these conclusions. The ICR reports that the project's logical framework was used "consistently" during project implementation to monitor the project outputs. From the information provided in the ICR it appears the project's M&E system tried to establish a data collection framework through the development of various indices to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. For example indices for the evaluation of biodiversity as well as an ecological index to monitor land use changes using GIS images were developed. Several monitoring methodologies were also developed in Costa Rica and Colombia to quantify the impacts of land use changes on water quality and flow. Additionally a method of monitoring of socio-economic indicators was also developed to evaluate the impacts of land use changes on productivity, income and use of labor on farms. The ICR indicates local experts across the participating countries were trained on the usage of these methods and indices to monitor the project's progress.
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? According to the project document, approximately US $950,000 was allocated for the monitoring and evaluation of ecological services.
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? Although no information that was provided in the ICR indicating if M&E funding was insufficient and timely, from the project document it is clear a significant amount of funds, approximately US $950,000, was allocated for the implementation of M&E activities.
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? Unable to assess.
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. Yes. The project's M&E system established new indices (i.e. ecological index, evaluation of biodiversity index, productivity, etc) and methodologies for their usage that will enable long-term monitoring of the project's outcomes.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S
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. The World Bank's main role was to collaborate with local experts across participating countries by providing technical expertise in the project's development and implementation. The ICR credits the Bank's role in providing technical support as "being critical [to] the success of this project." According to the ICR, the Bank's team was "highly qualified" and maintained a "high level of participation" throughout the various

supervision missions through “constant communication and technical exchanges”. The ICR indicates the Bank’s commitment to the project was due to its innovativeness and the potential for future “agriculture-environment nexus work”. The Bank’s senior management followed the project closely, selecting it as a “best implementation practice” and including it in the World Development Report. According to the review conducted by the IEG, the Bank “performed impressively”, especially in the project’s design. In particular, the IEG review highlights the Bank’s strong focus on measurement which allowed for the rapid accumulation of “evidence” as well as lessons during the project period.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies[1] (rating on a 6 point scale): S

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

The project’s execution was coordinated by CATIE in Costa Rica. Locally, the project was executed by UCA-NITLAPAN in Nicaragua, CATIE in Costa Rica and CIPAV in Colombia. The project execution was complex due to the fact it was an experimental, research project that was executed across three different countries. The project was ambitious as it attempted to assess whether payments for environmental services could change behavior as well as measure the extent to which SPS contributed to improved livestock production, provided local environmental benefits and contributed to the wellbeing of local populations in addition to providing incentives to farmers to adopt SPS practices that generate environmental services.

According to the ICR many aspects due to the research, experimental nature of the project complicated the project execution. During the project’s execution some aspects of the project’s design proved to be “less effective than had been hoped” with the project’s execution at times “falling short”; for example the differentiated payment scheme. The PES mechanism was used to evaluate farmers’ response to incentive systems for global environmental benefits in terms of land use changes. An experimental policy was pursued where some would receive payments for four years and others would only receive it for two years. Even though efforts to explain that payments had been adjusted so that both received similar amounts regardless of differing disbursement years, significant confusion resulted which “increased the workload, out of proportion to the benefits achieved.”

In addition while field staff of the executing organizations had many years of experience working with farmers they had far less experience and knowledge on how to conduct research. As a result, in some cases, field staff was more concerned with supporting farmers rather than conducting “a carefully monitored design experiment”. However the ICR indicates the problem was offset by CATIE’s role in the project’s execution and the inclusion of “academic partners” in monitoring efforts at each site.

In light of the project’s complicated nature and multi-national implementation, the majority of the project activities have been implemented satisfactorily with the project successfully achieving, at times exceeding, many of the project’s targets. In addition the project was completed in 5.5 years, with only a modest 6 month extension to complete project activities. These achievements combined with the project success in disseminating SPS information and demonstrating and measuring the effects of adopting biodiversity friendly practices to various stakeholders demonstrate the effectiveness of the project’s executing agencies. Additionally the “knowledge base” created as result of this project will also help providing guidance for the replication of the silvopastoral system in other contexts.

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

These were the key lessons learned that were specified in the ICR document:

i. Some silvopastoral practices can play an important role in rural development, be highly profitable

[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.

for farmers and can help to generate substantial benefits in terms of biodiversity conservation, carbon sequestration, and water services.

ii. Highly profitable silvopastoral practices for farmers imply that mechanisms such as payment for environmental services (PES) are not always needed to induce their adoption.

iii. Land use index is a good proxy for payment for environmental services.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

These were the key recommendations made in the ICR document:

i. Apply and simplify the application of environmental service and biodiversity indexes developed by the project as they are very useful tools which farmers can easily relate to and adopt.

ii. Determine reliable biodiversity predictors - the large database developed by project a large database on biodiversity and found two main variables, diversity of tree species and tree cover, which can be used to predict biodiversity along with landscape connectivity.

iii. Empower and continue to train farmers to become the project's voice so they can become key "dissemination agents" which can help in the greater adoption of silvopastoral systems outside intervention areas.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

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

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

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? Although at times dispersed, the report provides an assessment of the project outcomes, with a table that breaks down project outcomes by objective and indicator.	S (5)
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? While the report is not is presented in a coherent manner, there were no major evidence gaps and the IA ratings were in general supported by the evidence that was provided.	MS (4)
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? The report provides a sufficient assessment of the project's sustainability breaking down the analysis of sustainability along social, economic, institutional dimensions.	S (5)
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? The lessons learned are, for the most part, comprehensive and are supported by the evidence presented in the report.	S (5)
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? The ICR provides a breakdown of actual project costs by project component but does not provide information about the actual total co-financing used.	MS (4)
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems? The report could have benefited from a more detailed assessment rather than the brief evaluation of the project's M&E system the report provides.	MU (3)

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