

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terminal Evaluation of UNDP/GEF Emergency Biodiversity Conservation Measures for Recovery and Reconstruction in Response to Wenchuan Earthquake in Sichuan Province

PROJECT SUMMARY

Project Title: Emergency Biodiversity Conservation Measures for Recoverand
Reconstruction in Response to Wenchuan Earthquake in Sichuan
Province (Sichuan Earthquake Project)

GEF Project ID: PIMS 4187

UNDP Project ID: 00062480

Focal Area: Biodiversity Conservation, Short-Term Response Project

GEF Strategic Priority: **Biodiversity Conservation**

Country: China

Duration: 2009-2010

Executing Agency: UNDP

Implementing Agencies: Ministry of Environment Protection (MEP)

1. Introduction

A catastrophic earthquake with a magnitude of 8.0 Richter scale hit Southwestern China on May 12, 2008, following with 193 major aftershocks in magnitude above 4 Richter scale as of June 2. The quake affected areas reached 440,000 square kilometers in total, and the population 45.61 millions. The earthquake hit region of southwestern China lies in the upper reaches of Yangtze River Basin, one of 25 global biodiversity hotspot identified by Conservation International, and one of the WWF's Global 200 eco-regions. The earthquake has caused massive environmental damage and vegetation destruction as well due to landslides, blockage of rivers and streams and land subsidence which posed threats on biodiversity from three dimensions: (1) direct impact of earthquake resulted in habitat loss and fragmentation, individual death of wildlife, and conservation infrastructure and facilities damage etc. (2) threats posed by secondary (earthquake induced) environment risks, including sharply reduced food supply for wildlife due to loss of vegetation, and the death caused by underground water environment changing, species migration due to loss of habitats, etc. (3) potential threats posed by disaster relief measures and other human activities in the process of affected area reconstruction. This medium-size project was developed in a short space of time to respond to the emergency.

2. Project Objectives

UNDP/GEF Project aimed to complement the efforts by the Government of China, the local government and communities and their partners by ensuring that environmentally sound and biodiversity-friendly approaches are adopted into recovery and reconstruction efforts particularly in the Wenchuan area. The overall project goal is to conserve critical ecosystems and their associated threatened and endangered species in the quake region and mitigate the loss of biodiversity occurring as a result of the earthquake. The project objective is to mainstream biodiversity in the post-quake recovery and reconstruction process and strengthen protected area system with demonstrations in the quake-hit regions of Sichuan Province.

Three components and associated outcomes of the Project include:

Component 1: Rapid assessment of earthquake induced impacts and post quake ecological risks on critical ecosystems in affected areas.

- ✓ **Outcome 1:** Knowledge and understanding improved and information gaps filled on the earthquake induced impacts and post-quake ecological risks on biodiversity in affected areas.

Component 2: Mainstreaming biodiversity into post-disaster recovery and reconstruction process in affected area.

- ✓ **Outcome 2:** Recovery and reconstruction plans in project areas incorporate biodiversity conservation objectives
- ✓ **Outcome 3:** Improved monitoring capacity with biodiversity concerns in the process of disaster relief, and post quake recovery and reconstruction

Component 3: Planning, Prioritization and Budgeting Framework to achieve strengthened PA management.

- ✓ **Outcome 4:** Development of PA reconstruction framework with prioritized actions for investment by government and national and international communities
- ✓ **Outcome 5:** Revitalized management capacity in demonstration PAs in affected areas

3. GEF OBJECTIVE AND PURPOSE OF TERMINAL EVALUATION

Monitoring and evaluation in the Global Environment Facility (GEF) projects have the following overarching objectives:

- To promote accountability for the achievement of GEF objectives through the assessment of results, effectiveness, processes, and performance of the partners involved in GEF activities. GEF results are monitored and evaluated for their contribution to global environmental benefits.
- To promote learning, feedback, and knowledge sharing on results and lessons learned among the GEF and its partners, as a basis for decision-making on policies, strategies, programme management, and projects, and to improve knowledge and performance.

The purposes of conducting evaluations includes the understanding of why and the extent to which intended and unintended results are achieved, and their impact on stakeholders. Evaluation is an important source of evidence of the achievement of results and institutional performance, and contributes to knowledge and to organizational learning. Evaluation should serve as an agent of change and play a critical role in supporting accountability.

In accordance, all full and medium-size projects supported by GEF are subject to a final evaluation upon completion of implementation. In addition to providing an independent in-depth review of implementation progress, this type of evaluation is responsive to GEF Councils' decisions on transparency and better access to information during implementation and on completion of a project.

Specifically, the Terminal Evaluation (TE) must provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of a completed project by assessing its project design, process of implementation and results vis-à-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. TEs have four complementary purposes as follows:

- To promote accountability and transparency, and to assess and disclose levels of project accomplishments;
- To synthesize lessons that may help improve the selection, design and implementation of future GEF activities;
- To provide feedback on issues that are recurrent across the portfolio and need attention, and on improvements regarding previously identified issues; and,
- To contribute to the GEF Evaluation Office databases for aggregation, analysis and reporting on effectiveness of GEF operations in achieving global environmental benefits and on quality of monitoring and evaluation across the GEF system.

A mix of tools is used to ensure effective project M&E. These can be applied continuously throughout the lifetime of the project – e.g. periodic monitoring of indicators, or as specific time-bound exercises such as mid-term reviews, audit reports and independent evaluations.

4. OBJECTIVES OF THIS TERMINAL EVALUATION

This terminal evaluation (TE) is being carried out to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the Sichuan Earthquake Project by assessing its project design, the process of implementation and results and outputs as they relate to project objectives endorsed by the GEF and other partners including the agreed changes in the objectives during project implementation. Specifically, the TE will undertake the following tasks:

- Assess overall performance and review progress towards attaining the project's objectives and results including relevance, efficiency and effectiveness of the actions taken given the available funding and capacities for implementation;
- Review and evaluate the extent to which the project outputs and outcomes have been

achieved and provide rating employing the six-point rating scale (HS to HU – see Annex 2);

- Assess the project results and determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to any positive or negative consequences and provide a rating of project objective achievement on the six-point rating scale;
- Assess the extent to which the project impacts have reached or have the potential to reach the intended beneficiaries;
- Critically analyze the implementation arrangements and identify strengths and weaknesses in the project design and implementation and provide a rating of the project implementation, employing the six-point rating scale;
- Describe the project's adaptive management strategy – how have project activities changed in response to new conditions and have the changes been appropriate;
- Review the clarity of roles and responsibilities of the various agencies and institutions and the level of coordination between relevant players;
- Assess the level of stakeholder involvement in the project from community to higher Government levels and recommend on whether this involvement has been appropriate to the goals of the project;
- Describe and assess efforts of UNDP in support of implementation;
- Review donor partnership processes, and the contribution of co-finance;
- Describe key factors that will require attention in order to improve prospects for sustainability of project results achieved; and,
- Identify and document the main successes, challenges and lessons that have emerged.

5.Scope of Evaluation

Under the guidance and support of UNDP CO, the terminal evaluation consultant/team will present a comprehensive and balanced appraisal of project results by using the project document and other information generated by the project including baseline and information generated by its M&E system, and to seek necessary contextual information to assess the significance and relevance of results. The evaluation should be done in line with GEF Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies to Conduct Terminal Evaluations. Three main elements to be evaluated are Delivery, Implementation and Finances. Each component will be evaluated using three criteria: effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness:

Project delivery: The TE will assess to what extent the Sichuan Earthquake Project has achieved its immediate objectives. It will also identify what outputs, impacts and results have been produced and how they have enabled the project to achieve its objectives. The consultants are required to make assessment of the following issues under each priority area outlined below:

Institutional arrangement

- Preparatory work and implementation strategies
- Consultative processes
- Technical support
- Capacity building initiatives
- Project outputs
- Assumptions and risks
- Project related complementary activities

Outcome, results and impacts

- Efficiency of all project activities under the three major components
- Progress in the achievement of the immediate objectives (include level of indicator achievement when available)

Partnerships

- Assessment of national level involvement and perception
- Assessment of local partnerships, and involvement of stakeholders
- Assessment of collaboration between government, intergovernmental and non-governmental organisations

Risk management

- Were problems/constraints, which impacted on successful delivery of the project identified at the project design stage?
- Were there new threats/risks to project success that emerged during project implementation?
- Were both kinds of risk appropriately dealt with?

Monitoring and Evaluation

- Assess the extent, appropriateness and effectiveness of adaptive management at all levels of the project implementation
- Has there been a monitoring and evaluation framework for the project and how was this developed?
- Is the reporting framework effective/appropriate?
- Is this framework suitable for replication/continuation for any future project support?

Project Implementation

- Review the project management and implementation arrangements at all levels, in order to provide an opinion on its efficiency and cost effectiveness. This includes:
 - i. Processes and administration:
 - Project related administration procedures
 - Milestones(Log-frame matrix)

- Key decisions and out puts,
 - Major project implementation documents prepared with an indication of how the documents and reports have been useful
- ii. Project oversight and active engagement by: UNDP and project steering committee
 - iii. Project execution by the executing agency Sichuan Environmental Protection Bureau
 - iv. Project implementation: UNDP as the GEF Implementing Agencies

Project Finances

How well and cost effectively have financial arrangements of the project worked? This section will focus on the following three priority areas:

1. Project disbursements
 - Provide an overview of actual spending against budget expectations
 - Critically analyse disbursements to determine if funds have been applied effectively and efficiently.
2. Budget procedures
 - Did the Project Document provide adequate guidance on how to allocate the budget?
 - Review of audits and any issues raised in audits and subsequent adjustments to accommodate audit recommendations;
 - Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and provide an opinion on the appropriateness and relevancy of such revisions

6. EXPECTED OUTPUT

The TE evaluators will be expected to produce:

A) An evaluation report, of approximately 40-50 pages, structured along the outline indicated in Annex 1.

- A detailed record of consultations with stakeholders will need to be kept and provided (as part of the information gathered by the evaluators), as an annex to the main report.
- If there are any significant discrepancies between the impressions and findings of the evaluation team and stakeholders these should be explained in an Annex attached to the final report.

B) A Power Point Presentation (circa 20-25 slides) covering the key points of the TE.

C) A presentation to the Project Steering Committee including the UNDP

A draft of both A) and B) above should be submitted within two weeks of the end of the in-country component of the evaluators' mission, and a final copy within two weeks after

receiving written comments on the drafts.

7. Methodology/Evaluation Approach

In accordance with the GEF Guidelines for Implementing and Executing Agencies to Conduct Terminal Evaluations, the evaluation consultant/team will undertake the following activities and methods to assess the achievements of the project:

- 1 Documentation review (desk study): including Project Document, Project implementation reports, quarterly progress reports and workplans, audit report, other substantive reports including:
 - ✓ Final Summary Report of Outputs & Outcomes
 - ✓ Report of Biodiversity Survey and Impact Evaluation in Wenchuan Earthquake Hit Area in Sichuan Province;
 - ✓ Ecological Restoration and Construction Plan for Wenchuan Earthquake Hit Area in Sichuan Province;
 - ✓ Action Plan for Ecological Monitoring and Evaluation Demonstration;
 - ✓ Ecological Function Regionalization in the Wenchuan Earthquake Hit Area in Sichuan Province;
- 2 Interviews and consultations with relevant stakeholders;
- 3 Field visits to the selected project sites (at least two sites);
- 4 Debriefing at the UNDP CO on the preliminary findings after the meetings and visits with participation of key stakeholders;
- 5 Preparation and finalization of evaluation report by incorporating any additional comments from the UNDP CO and SFA

4. Time Table Consultations

The duration of the evaluation will be a total of 30 working days and will commence towards 21 March 2011 with the following tentative schedule for the critical milestones:

- ✓ Draft Evaluation Report by 18 Apr. 2011;
- ✓ Final comments on the draft evaluation report by 25 Apr. 2011;
- ✓ Final Evaluation report by 1 May.2011.

5. Qualifications

The terminal evaluation consultant/team is expected to have relevant academic qualification and evaluation experiences as indicated below:

- 1) Demonstrable project evaluation experience;
- 2) Familiarity with natural resources management, protected area management and biodiversity mainstreaming;
- 3) Expertise in economic and social development issues;
- 4) Knowledgeable about the relevant policies of the GEF and UNDP reporting frameworks;
- 5) Demonstrable experience in institutional analysis

- 6) Good communications and excellent writing skills in English;
- 7) Demonstrable ability to assess complex situations in order to succinctly and clearly distill critical issues and draw forward looking conclusion;
- 8) Knowledge of capacity building concept and process in particular mainstreaming of environment into economic decision making process;
- 9) Knowledge of GEF projects and project requirements;

DISCLOSURE

Although the evaluation consultant/team is free to discuss with the authorities on anything relevant to the assignment, under the terms of reference, the consultant is not authorized to make any commitments on behalf of UNDP or the Government of PRC.

Annex 1: Terminal Evaluation Report – Sample Outline

1. Executive summary

- Brief description of project;
- Context and purpose of the evaluation;
- Main conclusions, recommendations and lessons learned;

2. Introduction

- Purpose of the evaluation;
- Key issues addressed;
- Methodology of the evaluation;
- Structure of the evaluation.

3. The project and its development context

- Project start and its duration;
- Problems that the project seeks to address;
- Immediate and development objectives of the project;
- Main stakeholders;
- Results expected.

4. Findings and Conclusions

4.1 Project Formulation

- ✓ Implementation
- ✓ Stakeholder participation
- ✓ Replication approach
- ✓ Cost effectiveness
- ✓ Linkage of the project and other interventions within the sector
- ✓ Indicators

4.2. Project Implementation

- ✓ Delivery
- ✓ Financial management
- ✓ Monitoring and evaluation
- ✓ Execution and implementation modalities
- ✓ Management by UNDP and other partners
- ✓ Coordination and operational issues

4.3 Results to date

- ✓ Attainment of Objectives
- ✓ Sustainability
- ✓ Contribution to upgrading skills at National level

5. Lessons learned

6. Conclusions and recommendations, including overall rating of project implementation and the achievement of project outcomes and objective.

7. Evaluation report Annexes

- Evaluation TORs , Itinerary and list of persons interviewed
- Summary of field visits, including evaluators findings, issues raised and recommendations by different stakeholders
- List of documents reviewed
- Questionnaire used and summary of results if any

- Comments by stakeholders (only in case of discrepancies with evaluation findings and conclusions)

Annex 2: Explanation on Terminology provided in the GEF Guidelines to Terminal Evaluations

Implementation Approach includes an analysis of the project's logical framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management.

Some elements of an effective implementation approach may include:

- The logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool
- Effective partnerships arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country/region
- Lessons from other relevant projects (e.g., same focal area) incorporated into project implementation
- Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management.

Country Ownership/Drivenness is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements where applicable. Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans

Some elements of effective country ownership/drivenness may include:

- Project Concept has its origin within the national sectoral and development plans
- Outcomes (or potential outcomes) from the project have been incorporated into the national sectoral and development plans
- Relevant country representatives (e.g., governmental official, civil society, etc.) are actively involved in project identification, planning and/or implementation
- The recipient government has maintained financial commitment to the project
- The government has approved policies and/or modified regulatory frameworks in line with the project's objectives

For projects whose main focus and actors are in the private-sector rather than public-sector (e.g., IFC projects), elements of effective country ownership/drivenness that demonstrate the interest and commitment of the local private sector to the project may include:

- The number of companies that participated in the project by: receiving technical assistance, applying for financing, attending dissemination events, adopting environmental standards promoted by the project, etc.
- Amount contributed by participating companies to achieve the environmental benefits promoted by the project, including: equity invested, guarantees provided, co-funding of project activities, in-kind contributions, etc.
- Project's collaboration with industry associations

Stakeholder Participation/Public Involvement consists of three related, and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF-financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project.

Examples of effective public involvement include:

Information dissemination

- Implementation of appropriate outreach/public awareness campaigns

Consultation and stakeholder participation

- Consulting and making use of the skills, experiences and knowledge of NGOs, community and local groups, the private and public sectors, and academic institutions in the design, implementation, and evaluation of project activities

Stakeholder participation

- Project institutional networks well placed within the overall national or community organizational structures, for example, by building on the local decision making structures, incorporating local knowledge, and devolving project management responsibilities to the local organizations or communities as the project approaches closure
- Building partnerships among different project stakeholders
- Fulfillment of commitments to local stakeholders and stakeholders considered to be adequately involved.

Sustainability measures the extent to which benefits continue, within or outside the project domain, from a particular project or program after GEF assistance/external assistance has come to an end. Relevant factors to improve the sustainability of project outcomes include:

- Development and implementation of a sustainability strategy.
- Establishment of the financial and economic instruments and mechanisms to ensure the ongoing flow of benefits once the GEF assistance ends (from the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and market transformations to promote the project’s objectives).
- Development of suitable organizational arrangements by public and/or private sector.
- Development of policy and regulatory frameworks that further the project objectives.
- Incorporation of environmental and ecological factors affecting future flow of benefits.
- Development of appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) .
- Identification and involvement of champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society who can promote sustainability of project outcomes).

- Achieving social sustainability, for example, by mainstreaming project activities into the economy or community production activities.
- Achieving stakeholders consensus regarding courses of action on project activities.

Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). Examples of replication approaches include:

- Knowledge transfer (i.e., dissemination of lessons through project result documents, training workshops, information exchange, a national and regional forum, etc).
- Expansion of demonstration projects.
- Capacity building and training of individuals, and institutions to expand the project's achievements in the country or other regions.
- Use of project-trained individuals, institutions or companies to replicate the project's outcomes in other regions.

Financial Planning includes actual project cost by activity, financial management (including disbursement issues), and co-financing. If a financial audit has been conducted the major findings should be presented in the TE.

Effective financial plans include:

- Identification of potential sources of co-financing as well as leveraged and associated financing¹.
- Strong financial controls, including reporting, and planning that allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, allows for a proper and timely flow of funds, and for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables
- Due diligence due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.

Co-financing includes: Grants, Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate), Credits, Equity investments, In-kind support, Other contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries. Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6.

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations,

¹ Please refer to Council documents on co-financing for definitions, such as GEF/C.20/6. The following page presents a table to be used for reporting co-financing.

governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

Cost-effectiveness assesses the achievement of the environmental and developmental objectives as well as the project's outputs in relation to the inputs, costs, and implementing time. It also examines the project's compliance with the application of the incremental cost concept. Cost-effective factors include:

- Compliance with the incremental cost criteria (e.g. GEF funds are used to finance a component of a project that would not have taken place without GEF funding.) and securing co-funding and associated funding.
- The project completed the planned activities and met or exceeded the expected outcomes in terms of achievement of Global Environmental and Development Objectives according to schedule, and as cost-effectively as initially planned.
- The project used either a benchmark approach or a comparison approach (did not exceed the costs levels of similar projects in similar contexts)

Efficiency: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Wherever possible the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

The evaluation of relevancy, effectiveness and efficiency will be as objective as possible and will include sufficient and convincing empirical evidence. Ideally the project monitoring system should deliver quantifiable information that can lead to a robust assessment of project's effectiveness and efficiency. Since projects have different objectives assessed results are not comparable and cannot be aggregated. To track the health of the portfolio project outcomes will be rated as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall outcome rating of the project may not be higher than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

The evaluators will also assess positive and negative actual (or anticipated) impacts or emerging long term effects of a project. Given the long term nature of impacts, it might not be possible for the evaluators to identify or fully assess impacts. Evaluators will nonetheless indicate the steps taken to assess project impacts, especially impacts on local populations², local environment (e.g. increase in the number of individuals of an endangered species, improved water quality, increase in fish stocks, reduced greenhouse gas emissions) and wherever possible indicate how the findings on impacts will be reported to the GEF in future.

Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes

The GEF Monitoring and Evaluation Policy, 2006, specifies that a TE will assess at the minimum the “likelihood of sustainability³ of outcomes at project termination, and provide a rating for this.” The sustainability assessment will give special attention to analysis of the risks that are likely to affect the persistence of project outcomes. The sustainability assessment should also explain how other important contextual factors that are not outcomes of the project will affect sustainability. Following four dimensions or aspects of sustainability will be addressed:

- **Financial resources:** Are there any financial risks involved in sustaining the project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project’s outcomes)?
- **Sociopolitical:** Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- **Institutional framework and governance:** Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits? While assessing on this parameter also consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency, and the required technical know-how is in place.

² Impacts are positive and negative, primary and secondary long-term effects produced by a development intervention, directly or indirectly, intended or unintended. *Glossary of key terms in evaluation and results based management*. OECD, Development Assistance Committee. For the GEF, environmental impacts are the main focus.

³ Sustainability will be understood as the likelihood of continued benefits after the GEF project ends.

- **Environmental:** Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example, construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralizing the biodiversity related gains made by the project.

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated as follows on each of the dimensions:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system

Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation