

UNEP EO Assessment of project ratings and performance using the Terminal Evaluation report for the project entitled “ECORA: An Integrated Ecosystem Management Approach to Conserve Biodiversity and Minimise Habitat Fragmentation in Three Selected Model Areas in the Russian Arctic”

GEF PROJECT ID: 1163

Criterion	Evaluator’s Rating	UNEP Evaluation Office Rating	Evaluation Office’s Summary Comments
A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)	MS	MS	Performance is adequate to immediate outcome level but linkage beyond is limited
A. 1. Effectiveness - overall likelihood of impact achievement (ROI rating)	MS	MS/MU	Progress along the project’s intended causal pathways has yet to move beyond immediate outcome level,
A. 2. Relevance	HS	MS	The evaluation notes the changing implementation context surrounding the project between design and implementation. Para 73.
A. 3. Cost-effectiveness	MU	MU	EO concur with evaluator’s rating
B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)	ML	MU	Lowest sustainability likelihood rating must be adopted as B1 to B4 are regarded as ‘limiting factors’.
B. 1. Financial	MU	MU	EO concur with evaluator’s rating
B. 2. Socio-political	L	L	EO concur with evaluator’s rating
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance	ML	ML	EO concur with evaluator’s rating
B. 4. Environmental	L	ML	EO concur with evaluator’s rating
C. Catalytic Role	MS	MS	EO concur with evaluator’s rating
D. Stakeholders involvement	S	MS	Feedback from stakeholders in the region suggest that indigenous groups did not feel as engaged as the evaluation report suggests.
E. Country ownership / driven-ness	MS	MS	EO concur with evaluator’s rating
F. Achievement of outputs and activities	MS	MS	EO concur with evaluator’s rating
G. Preparation and readiness	S	MS	Para 99 mentions a number of shortcomings that suggest a lower rating is merited
H. Implementation approach	MS	MU	There was insufficient evidence in the report to justify the rating given
I. Financial planning	No rating	MS/MU	Insufficient funds budgeted for travel to the Model Areas. Inflationary effects were not foreseen. Cofinancing information was readily available
J. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating) Sub criteria (below)	S	MS//MU	EO award a lower rating overall rating for M&E to reflect the aggregate of sub-criteria below
E. 1. M&E Design	S	MS/MU	The design for M&E systems was basic.

Criterion	Evaluator's Rating	UNEP Evaluation Office Rating	Evaluation Office's Summary Comments
E. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)	S	MS	Few of the Indicators mentioned in the project's results framework were measured.
E. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	S	MS	Budget limited site visits for monitoring
K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping	S	U/A	Insufficient information was presented to inform a sound judgment on project supervision
Overall Rating	S	MS	

