

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3669	
GEF Agency project ID		P086660	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		Second Natural Resources Management Project	
Country/Countries		Tunisia	
Region		North Africa	
Focal area		International Waters, Land Degradation, Strategic Priority for Adaptation (SPA)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		International Waters-SP2, Land Degradation-SP1, Land Degradation-SP2, Strategic Priority of Adaptation	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources, National Sewerage and Sanitation Agency, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		06/17/2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		02/19/2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2015	
Actual date of project completion		12/26/2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.99	0.02
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		9.73	9.43
Co-financing	IA own	36.07	33.01
	Government	14.61	0
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs		7.22	3.1
Total GEF funding		10.72	9.45
Total Co-financing		57.90	36.11
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		68.62	45.56
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2018	
Author of TE		Anatol Gobjila	
TER completion date		April 2020	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts Sohn	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
<b>Project Outcomes</b>	MS	MS	MS	MS
<b>Sustainability of Outcomes</b>		NR	NR	UA
<b>M&amp;E Design</b>		MS	MS	MS
<b>M&amp;E Implementation</b>		MS	MS	MS
<b>Quality of Implementation</b>		MS	MS	MS
<b>Quality of Execution</b>		NR	NR	UA
<b>Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report</b>		-	S	S

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Global Environment Objective (GEO) was to ‘reduce the threat of land degradation and climate change to vulnerable agricultural production systems in the target areas while developing options to address land-based pollution affecting the Mediterranean Sea’ (PD, Pg 1).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Development Objective (PDO) was ‘to improve living conditions for rural communities in the project area inter alia by fostering increased access to basic infrastructure and services, sustainable increase of income, improved natural resource management practices and promotion of an integrated approach to community-based development among various stakeholders’ (PD, Pg 1). The project had the following three components:

1. Support to Participatory Development Plan (PDP) investments
2. Support to the development of treated wastewater use on agricultural land
3. Institutional strengthening and awareness raising

### 3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

The project’s PDO and GEO were revised through a level 1 restructuring approved on February, 2013. The PDO and GEO were combined and reformulated to ‘improve access to basic infrastructure and production means, and to improve management of natural resources, using a participatory approach in the project area’ (TE, Pg 9). The restructuring was aimed to reflect changes brought about by an uprising and revolution that engulfed Tunisia in the months of December 2010 and January 2011. The level 1 restructuring also altered the results framework and cancellation of Component 2.

This led to a few changes in the activities. Component 2 was cancelled due to changes in country priorities brought about by the revolution. For instance, under “improve access to basic infrastructure” the project focused on financing primarily rehabilitation/construction of rural feeder roads and access to water activities; under “improve access to production means” the project focused on financing technical assistance and investments for access to irrigation and income generating activities; and under “improve management of natural resources” the Project focused on financing technical assistance and

investments in sustainable land management, land consolidation, and improvements of pastures and local forests.

#### 4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>4.1 Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the relevance of both the original and revised project objectives to be ‘high’, and this TER rates relevance as ‘satisfactory’. The rating by the TE did not take into account the relevance of the project and its objectives to GEF’s strategic priorities. As per the information in the available documents, the project objectives were relevant as fully aligned with the development strategies of the Government of Tunisia (GoT). The TE noted that the project’s restructuring attempted to make the objectives less ambitious, given the difficult political economy context, which required delivery of fast and tangible results to respond to the population’s expectations after the revolution. However, the revisions did not affect the level of relevance of the project’s objectives and activities. In particular, the objectives were relevant to the Government of Tunisia 2007 National Development Plan (NDP) - a comprehensive development approach that guarantees sustainable growth and harmonious balance among economic, social and environmental priorities.

The project’s objectives were also relevant to the GEF-4 strategic priorities in the focal areas of international waters, land degradation, and climate change. The project also supported the objectives of Tunisia’s national Action Program (NAP) - the core strategic framework for implementing the UNCCD at national level; the Initial Communication (INC) and Second National Communication that reflected the country’s rising concerns in respect to climate change.

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately satisfactory</b>
--------------------------	--

The TE rated the effectiveness of the project as ‘substantial’ and based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER rates it as ‘moderately satisfactory’. The project had undergone restructuring four times due to changes in the country priorities brought about by the revolution of 2011. The alignment with the new priorities and context led to the reformulation the original Project Development Objective/Global Environmental Objectives. The revisions were approved by the Board and led to modifications in the results framework (indicators and target values) as well as certain changes in the outputs and activities under each component of the project.

The efficacy of the project is assessed in all the available documents based on the updated targets, according to which, the project contributed towards measurable improvement in the welfare and economic activities in rural communities and the services available to those communities. As per the information in the TE, the project results indicate a robust level of achievement of the revised outcomes. However, it must be noted that post restructuring, investments were based on demand-driven activities and targets adjusted based on observations of demand patterns in four years of implementation, which was likely the better if not the best estimate of target values.

It is worth noting that the level of project's original achievement and ambition was lowered as a result of the level one restructuring as the original outcome of 'improving living conditions' was revised to an input to the discarded outcome ('improve access to basic infrastructure and production means, and to improve management of natural resources'). As stated in the TE, this adjustment was made to address and capture the 'right level of ambition' given the extremely difficult political economy context that required delivery of fast and tangible results to respond to population's heightened expectations post revolution. The achievement of project activities against the original components is detailed below:

### **Component 1: Preparation and implementation of Participatory Development Plans (PDPs)**

Main original outputs under this component included improving access to water and management, rural roads and developing sustainable agricultural production systems. After the revisions, the project under component 1 aimed to improve access to basic infrastructure and production means by financing the construction of several infrastructure (roads, water, etc.) and supporting income generating activities via training and financing.

As per the TE, the project led to the development of 1339 water supply points, including for domestic-use (original 400, revised 900) (TE, para 34). The project also supported provision of new/improved irrigation or drainage services covering 1507 Ha (target of 600 Ha) that covered 55% of the population of the 3 Governorates in 64 districts (Imadas) (TE, Outcome 1, page 31). Under construction and rehabilitation of rural roads, 210 kilometers of rural feeder roads covering around 8 percent of the population in target areas (about 10,620 households or about 64,000 people considering 6 people per households) were built or rehabilitated (original target 90 km, revised target 150km) (ICR, para 34). Against a target of 3,500 ha, the project led to 5,554 ha of irrigated land developed and rehabilitated representing a 30% increase of irrigated areas in the targeted Imadas (TE, Outcome2, Pg 32). The project supported 3,691 different kind of income generating activities (sheep fattening, beekeeping and poultry) and provided 4,474 beneficiaries with technical advice on investment projects, 1,402 beneficiaries trained in livestock production, and more than 1,000 livestock producers received regular technical and management advice (TE, Outcome 2, page 32). These interventions resulted in improved access to basic infrastructure to roughly 76,000 beneficiaries, which represented around 12,700 households (original target 21,000, revised target 50,000) (TE, para 34). The project improved access to production means to 19,700 direct beneficiaries (original target 17,500, revised target 18,000) by supporting income generating activities mentioned above. The evidence shows that the project substantially improved access to basic infrastructure and production means for beneficiaries in the project area.

As per the information in the TE, large areas were brought under improved soil and water conservation but the project lacked substantial data on the impact of the project's extensive water and soil conservation activities. The Project also addressed climate-resilience through water and soil conservation activities as well as focused on increasing access to irrigation services and implementation

of climate-smart Income Generation Activities. The activities under the project brought nearly 5,500 hectares of small-holder plots under irrigation coverage (on- and off-farm systems), and the IGAs were supported for the diversification of agricultural activities away from climate-risky field crop cultivation, to sustainable animal husbandry, climate-resistant arboriculture, and protected agriculture (e.g. the proliferation of 150 green houses in Medenine, one of the most water-stressed regions of Tunisia).

**Component 2: Support to Treated Wastewater Reuse in Agriculture**

Following the 1st restructuring, this component was dropped and the corresponding funds were reallocated for activities related to meet the rural infrastructure needs, including irrigation and conservation of water resources under the Component 1. The cancellation of Component 2 was dictated by changes in country priorities brought about by the revolution of 2011. In addition, ‘a series of technical, environmental and institutional challenges in the targeted pilot sites (including security of personnel on the ground) had made implementation of the component impossible in the remaining implementation period’ (TE, Pg12).

**Component 3: Institutional Strengthening and Awareness Raising**

The project helped in empowering participating communities to make their own decision on development priorities either through formally established (Agriculture Development Groups) ADGs or informal Extended Development Committees (EDCs). To this end, the project contributed to the functionality of 64 ADGs compared to the target of 51, the signing and execution of 201 annual plans and/or contracts compared to a target of 132, and finally an 84% of execution of these plans compared to a target of 90 percent.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------	-----------------------------

The TE rated the efficiency of the project as ‘modest’ as it took into account the methodological and project specific impact data constraints in calculating Economic Internal Rate of Return (EIRR). This TER has rated the efficiency of the project based on the extent to which the project’s resources were used efficiently. The project faced 2 years of delays due to political events that occurred during the start of the project and changed priorities, which led to the restructuring of the project in 2013. These implementation delays resulted in increasing the administrative cost, limiting the administrative efficiency of the project during the initial years.

But as per the TE, the initial implementation delays were off-set by the extension of the closing date by nearly 24 months, which with support from the Bank, helped in mitigating the implementation inefficiencies and all the planned activities were completed without additional administrative costs and well-within the projected budget. The project relied for delivery of its interventions on the Participatory Development Plans (PDPs) that involved local communities and was crucial for planning and budgeting. Support and partnership of multiple technical institutions also helped in achieving project results efficiently. According to the TE, ‘in terms of unit costs, project’s activities were implemented efficiently, well-within comparable cost ranges for similar types of activities across Tunisia’ due to which the efficiency of the project is rated as ‘satisfactory’.

The TE did not provide a rating to the risks affecting the likelihood of sustainability of the project outputs and outcomes. There is not enough evidence in the available reports to provide a rating and assess all four aspects of risks separately. But as per the information in the TE, ‘governance issues remain extremely salient in the Tunisian context, exacerbated by an extremely challenging fiscal position of the Government’ (TE, Pg ). Given the fiscal situation of the Government, the extent to which the Tunisian institutions (regional authorities, Regional Coordination Units and specialized technical entities such as the Office of Pastures and Animal Husbandry) would be able to manage the local infrastructure created by the project in long term, was also uncertain. Moreover, lack of a ‘follow-up operation and an exit strategy by Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Fisheries (MAWRF)’ to sustain the project achievements, could pose a risk to the momentum and sustainability of the project outcomes. However, there is still not adequate information to assess the extent to which these risks can affect the likelihood of sustainability of project results.

## 5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

As per the Project Document, the Government of Tunisia made a commitment to finance USD 14.6m (PAD, page v) and beneficiaries were supposed to contribute USD 7.2m (PD, page v). At project close, while the beneficiaries contributed USD 3m (41% of expected contributions), there was no contribution from the Government of Tunisia as it made a request during restructuring to reduce its contribution to zero and a lower contribution from local communities. At project close, the World Bank financed USD 33 m (91% of committed financing) as compared to the original commitment of USD 36.1m. The revision in the budget was made after the restructuring and to readjust the activities and outputs as per the new context. As noted by the TE, the restructuring was aimed to address low disbursement rates and miniscule results/achievements and reflect changes in country priorities brought about by the revolution of 2011. The TE did not discuss the impact of lower co-financing on the achievement of project results.

5.2 Project extensions and/or 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project was approved in June 2010, became effective in February 2011, and was closed in December 2017 (compared with the original closing date of December 2015). The project was delayed by 2 years due to political events in the country and changing priorities, which also led to amendment of the project’s development and environmental objectives, as part of level 1 restructuring in February 2013, followed by three level 2 restructurings in 2015, 2016 and 2017. Most of the activities under the revised results framework were completed by the project end. But a significant part of the Income Generation Activities (IGAs) were implemented towards the end of the project due to which not enough support could be provided to link these with the access to finance and markets considered crucial for the sustainability of these activities.

5.3 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:

There is not enough evidence in the TE and other reports to review the country ownership on the project.

## 6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately satisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	--

The TE rated the M&E design at entry as ‘modest’ and based on the available evidence, this TER rates it as ‘moderately satisfactory’. The project document included results framework with indicators to assess the original Project Development Objectives (PDO) and Global Environmental Objectives (GEO). The results framework included the target values for all the indicators, as well as identification of data collection source/instruments and allocation of responsibility for data collection. However, the indicators were designed to measure level of achievement of outputs as opposed to outcomes/impact. Moreover, as per the TE, ‘the complexity of the original M&E design and excessive layering of objectives was caused by a poorly flowing Results Framework’ (TE, para 57). The results framework was revised after restructuring to better align with the new project development and environmental indicators. However, the revised indicators were also designed to measure only access to basic services and production means, due to which no outcome indicators were introduced, leaving the results chain focused on measurement of physical achievements for all indicators.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	--

The TE rated the M&E implementation as ‘modest’ and based on the available evidence, this TER rates it as ‘moderately satisfactory’. As per the information in the TE, the Regional Agricultural Development Commissariats (RADCs) through Regional Coordination Units (RCUs) and Central Coordination Unit (CCU) made significant efforts in collecting and systematizing implementation monitoring data throughout life-cycle of the project. This allowed for corrective action and adaptative management of the project. The monitoring system delivered well in line with the design of the framework revised after the restructuring, which was also adopted by the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Fisheries (MAWRF) to be replicated for various other projects under its implementation. Although several thematic studies were carried out and yielded some information on impact, but the results framework had insufficient focus on impact indicators that did not allow for better interpretation of results in terms of effects/impact. As the TE noted, ‘the Project did not produce strong analyses on the impact of natural resource management activities, especially considering the availability of co-financing from the GEF, to

allow for more site-specific conclusions on soil conservation, avoided losses due to increased protection from anti run-off measure, pasture biodiversity improvements, etc’ (TE, Para 59).

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six-point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	<b>Rating: Moderately satisfactory</b>
--	--

This TER agrees with the rating provided by the TE to the quality of project implementation as ‘modest’. The rating takes into consideration certain gaps identified in the design of the project document. For instance, the design of the project did not take into account the lack of the capacity and experience of the local project partners in implementing Bank project. The project design also lacked an adequate assessment of several other potential risks such as ‘high poverty levels, vulnerability to land degradation including desertification, and increased drought risk with water scarcity expected to worsen as a result of climate change’ (PD, para 5). However, as noted by the TE, the project benefitted from the implementation support from the Bank. The Bank teams provided support through proactive corrective measures through multiple restructurings to allow for effective implementation and maximize the results, especially in the context of challenging post-revolutionary times. Bank teams provided timely technical supervision and support summarized in detailed Aide-memoires. The country office also maintained regular interactions to provide fiduciary and safeguards support that enabled regular payments facilitating smooth implementation of the project.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	<b>Rating: Unable to assess</b>
---	---------------------------------

The TE and other available documents do not have adequate information to enable assessment of the quality of project execution.

## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

***Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.***

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented,



sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

Under improved management of natural resources, the project supported plantations (36,000 trees planted) and anti-erosive infrastructure through restoration of gabions and setting up aquifer recharge units. The Government of Tunisia's project completion report referenced in the TE stated that the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) works have had various impacts such as: (i) reduced losses of agricultural/farm land due to soil erosion; (ii) protection of houses located near wadis; (iii) groundwater recharge; (iv) flood protection of a downstream town (Medenine); (v) reduced sedimentation. However, the project did not carry out an assessment to quantify actual impacts of these interventions on erosion, soil fertility, groundwater recharge, or dam siltation (TE, Para 9).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

1. Preliminary assessments of land consolidation activities conducted on 15,243 hectares indicated a significant increase in the profitability of farms whose land was consolidated. But, the TE cautioned against generalization of such conclusions based on small samples. Moreover, as noted earlier under the M&E sections, the project did not have a methodology or indicators to understand and assess the effectiveness of natural resource management activities, particularly those related to GEF's global mandate.

2. Access to water resulted in a reduction in the average distance travelled to fetch water from 3.0 to 0.5 kilometers and reduced the amount of time women and children spent supplying the household with water by an estimated three hours per day (TE, para 38).

3. Income generating activities supported by the project yielded average net earnings of TND1,300 per year, ranging from TND450 for poultry and TND1,000 for beekeeping to TND2,270 for greenhouse and TND3,000 for sheep fattening.

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

#### a) Capacities

1. The Project had a significant institutional development dimension and reached nearly 6,000 individuals with capacity enhancement activities. The universe of beneficiaries included key government

institutions such as the Ministry of Agriculture, Water Resources and Fisheries, Ministry of Environment and Sustainable Development, Regional Agricultural Development Commissariats (including teams of animators), Regional Coordination Units, Agricultural Development Groups, Extended Development Committees as well as to the farmers and rural entrepreneurs.

2. While the project provided training and technical support to income generation activities beneficiaries supporting 3,691 income generating activities but, as the TE also noted, lack of access to finance and markets might dampen their growth in future and affect sustainability.

#### b) Governance

The available reports do not provide any information on changes in the governance brought about by the project.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

According to the TE, gender was given significant attention in the project as well as efforts to ensure specific targeting of women. This resulted in achieving a rate of 38 percent inclusion of women (TE, para 48).

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The available reports do not provide any information on this aspect.

## **9. Lessons and recommendations**

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The main lessons listed in the TE are as follows:

1. There should be an institutionally-mandated process for reassessing projects in rapidly deteriorating conflict and fragile environments.
2. Additional efforts to achieve formalization of participating grass-roots institutions should be considered at project design.
3. GEF funded natural resource management projects should strive for better measurement of impacts.
4. Effective promotion of income-generating projects requires more than start-up support.

5. The current project’s experience in applying the integrated participatory approach for local development should be thoroughly considered in future operations.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE did not provide recommendations separately as it was part of the lessons listed in the section above.

## 10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE provided an adequate assessment of the relevant outcome and impacts of the project. Although the assessment was constrained by the lack of information/data on the impact but the TE tried to fill in the gap to the extent possible through referring to other studies conducted in the area or similar context.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence presented was complete and convincing but TE did not dwell in detail about the ‘quality of execution’ and its impact on the achievement of project results	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE touched upon some of the main issues related to the sustainability of the project. However, the TE did not provide the overall rating and the extent to which these different risks are likely to impact the sustainability of the project. It also did not elaborate on financial and environmental risks, if any.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by the evidence presented in the main body of the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report included information on the actual project costs and actual co-financing.	S
Assess the quality of the report’s evaluation of project M&E systems:	This aspect was covered adequately.	S
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

## 11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).

*This TER did not use any other source of information.*