****

**WWF GEF Project Closeout Report**

**General Project Information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Project Title:  |  |
| WWF GEF Agency Number: |  |
| GEF PMIS Number: |  |
| Executing Agency: |  |
| GEF Focal Area(s): |  |
| Project Objective: |  |
| List of Project Components: |  |
| List of GEF Financed Sub-Grantees:  |  |
| List of Other Partners: |  |

**Project Finance Information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Budget Approved by GEF:[[1]](#footnote-2) |  |
| Total GEF Budget Spent (USD): [[2]](#footnote-3) |  |
| Total Co-financing Approved at Project Start (USD): |  |
| Materialized Co-finance at Project Completion (USD ): |  |

**Project Report information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Report Author(s): |  |
| Report Completion Date: |  |
| Project Start Date: |  |
| Project End Date: |  |

**Project Contacts:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Contact Person** | **Name, Title** | **E-mail** |
| Project Manager (PMU):  |  |  |
| Project Finance & Administration (PMU): |  |  |
| Project Monitoring & Evaluation (PMU): |  |  |
| Technical Specialist (PMU): |  |  |
| Designated Project Manager at WWF GEF AMU: |  |  |
| Safeguards Specialist at WWF GEF AMU: |  |  |
| Other: |  |  |

**Supporting Documents:[[3]](#footnote-4)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **File Type** | **Location and Description of Document** |
| Completed GEF Tracking Tool(s): \*[[4]](#footnote-5) | Part III of report. |
| Final Project Results Framework:\* | Part III of report. |
| Other M&E Documents: |  |
| Completed Work Plan Tracking Documents: |  |
| Project Map (s): |  |
| Photos of Project Sites: |  |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Communication Pieces (news/media internal or external to project): |  |
| Field Reports or Surveys (as applicable): |  |
| List of Participants in Closeout Interviews or Workshops: |  |
| Gender Related Documents: |  |
| Environmental and Social Safeguards Documents (Assessment/Compliance): |  |
| Financial Reports: |  |
| Mid-term Review Report: |  |

Instructions:

Objective: The WWF GEF Project Closeout Report (PCR) is a **required report** designed to help GEF-funded projects meet WWF Network standards as well as Global Environment Facility (GEF) - Secretariat and Independent Evaluation Office (IEO) requirements. The closeout report should **summarize the entire duration of the project**, such that achievements, impact and lessons learned reflect what was cumulatively achieved during the course of the project. This document allows the Executing Agency to describe or assess:

* Project progress and impact;
* Project Implementation;
* Project Executing Agency support;
* Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment;
* Safeguard compliance;
* Project exit plan and potential for sustainability; and
* Lessons learned for future projects.

Reporting Deadline: Unless otherwise specified in the WWF GEF project grant agreement, the Project Closeout Report must be submitted to the WWF GEF Agency Management Unit within one month of project completion.

Required Documentation: The Project Closeout Report document should be accompanied by supporting documentation, such as those listed as “Supporting Documents” on the first page of this Report. The final Tracking Tool (GEF-5 only) and Project Results Framework should be included in Part III of this report and all other supporting documents should be annexed.

Best Practice: It is recommended that project teams host a **reflection exercise** prior to filling out the PCR. Ideally, this exercise should be attended by the Executing Agency, the PMU, and key partners. The feedback from the exercise should feed into this report.

Submission: Please delete the italicized instruction text on each page prior to submission. Please submit the WWF GEF Project Closeout Report and all additional documentation to the designated WWF GEF Agency Project Manager.

# Executive Summary

*Please provide a high level overview of the project theory of change and the key achievements and impacts that resulted from project interventions. Provide a brief assessment of the project using GEF/PPMS core criteria of: relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results/impact, sustainability, and adaptive capacity. See Annex I for definitions of these criteria. Recommended length: 2 page(s) or less.*

|  |
| --- |
|  |

# Part I: Project Ratings and Mitigations

***Please remove this instruction text (italics) for each section before finalising your report***

### Overall Project Development Objective Self-Ratings

*Please insert the Development Objective (DO) ratings previously submitted with annual Project Progress Reports (PPRs). Please note that each rating should have been determined by averaging the percent achievement of the indicator targets in the Results Framework. These averages should be compared with the GEF Rating Scales and Guidance provided in Annex II. The Project Close rating should only be provided if activities were completed after the final planned year of the project (during a project extension period) and would be assessed according to the achievement of the final cumulative indicator targets in the Results Framework. Below the table, please describe the justification and reflections on the ratings.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 1 Rating** | **Year 2 Rating** | **Year 3 Rating** | **Project Close Rating** |
|  |  |  |  |

### A-1. Justification and Reflection on the Provided Ratings:

### Overall Project Implementation Progress Self-Ratings

*Please provide the Implementation Progress (IP) ratings previously submitted with annual PPRs. The IP ratings should have been calculated by averaging the percent achievement of the indicator targets in each annual work plan and comparing that average with the GEF Rating Scales and Guidance provided in Annex II. The Project Close rating should only be provided if activities were completed after the final planned year of the project (during a project extension period) and would be assessed according to the achievement of the additional activities or revised work plan. Then, below the table describe the justification and reflections on the ratings.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 1 Rating** | **Year 2 Rating** | **Year 3 Rating** | **Project Close Rating** |
|  |  |  |  |

### B-1. Justification and Reflection on the Provided Ratings:

### Summary of Risk Ratings and Mitigation Actions Taken

*Risks, which are internal or external factors that may (have) prevent(ed) the success of the project, were identified in the annual PPRs. All of those risks rated as “Substantial” or “High” required mitigation actions and affected the determination of the risk rating (see Annex II). Please provide the annual risk rating as provided in the PPRs. Then, below the table describe the justification and reflections on the ratings.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Year 1 Rating** | **Year 2 Rating** | **Year 3 Rating** |
|  |  |  |

### C-1. Justification and Reflection on the Provided Ratings:

### C-2. Summary of Risk Mitigation Actions and Results:

*In the annual PPRs, the project team was asked to identify project mitigation actions for all risks identified as “Substantial” or “High.” Please identify those individual “Substantial” and “High” risks and describe the subsequent mitigation activities. Please note if there were any changes (positive or negative) that resulted from those mitigation activities. Finally, if any lessons were learned from the mitigation activities, please describe them here. While an optional table has been provided, the team is welcome to write in narrative form.*

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Risk Factor Description** | **Mitigation Actions taken** | **Impact (Positive or Negative) of Mitigation Actions on Risk** |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

# Part II: Summary of Project and Exit Plan

***Please remove this instruction text (italics) for each section before finalising your report. This report should be cumulative and summarize the achievements, challenges and lessons learned as a result of the entire duration of the project.***

### Summary of Expenditure and Achievements

*Please fill out the following table. All measurements should be for the end of the project (including extension period, as applicable). The percent implementation should be based on the percent achievement of work plan targets (and completion of extension activities). The percent achievement of outcomes is based on the achievement of outcome indicator targets in the Results Framework. The achievement of the Project Objective is based on the percent achievement of Project Objective indicator targets in the Results Framework. Finally, please list the total number of indicators in the Results Framework that have reached 100% achievement of the indicator targets (per objective or component) and compare that number to the total number of indicators in that objective or component. [[5]](#footnote-6)*

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|   | **% Expenditure at End of Project[[6]](#footnote-7)** | **% Implementation at End of Project** | **% Achievement of Outcomes****at End of Project** | **% Achievement of Project Objective****at End of Project** | **# of indicators with 100% achievement in Results Framework / Total** |
| Project Objective | -- | -- | -- |  |  |
| Component 1 |  |  |  | -- |  |
| Component 2 |  |  |  | -- |  |
| Component 3 |  |  |  | -- |  |

### Summary of Outcomes and Impacts Achieved

*Please summarize the major outcomes and impacts[[7]](#footnote-8)at the objective level and also per project component. Describe how they contribute to the GEF Global Environmental Benefits. You may refer to the project theory of change (results chains) when describing these results. Specifically state what role the Executing Agency and executing partners played in bringing about the results. If there were unexpected outcomes (positive or negative), please note those with particular attention to Environmental and Social Safeguards. Please note any major positive or negative effects on beneficiaries and where possible, quantify the number of project beneficiaries with data disaggregated by gender and indigenous group. Finally, describe situations where scaling-up may have occurred. Please do not summarize progress at the output level as this will be part of the work plan tracking documents annexed to this report. Recommended length: 1-2 pages.*

1. Objective Level Impacts
	* Overall -
	* Unexpected -
	* Beneficiaries -
	* Scaling up -
2. Component Level Outcomes and Impact
	* Overall -
	* Unexpected -
	* Beneficiaries -
	* Scaling up -

### Major Challenges and Strengths Affecting Project Execution / Impact

*Discuss briefly the internal factors (e.g. impacts and relevance of original design, M&E design, attention to and capacity to address environmental and social safeguards, stakeholder engagement, institutional set up, management processes, capacity, donor support) and external factors (e.g. stakeholder behaviour, natural disasters, politics or policy change) that served as challenges and/or strengths that hindered or enabled project implementation and impact. Were there any issues with compliance to WWF and GEF policies as a result of the key challenges? Recommended length: max. 1-1.5 pages.*

### Summary of Key Changes in Project Design during Implementation

*Briefly describe any major variations/changes that were made to the project results (project objective, components or outcomes) and strategies as compared to the project document (Prodoc). Explain why the changes were made, including any instances of adaptive management where the team reflected on gathered data (such as from M&E) or lessons learned to adjust the project strategies or work plans to achieve better results. Did the new information have implications for the project theory of change? Did the changes made ultimately improve the project’s management or results? Recommended length: max. 1 page.*

### Finance and Administration

*Briefly describe any major variations/changes to the budget or financial management of the project as compared to the Prodoc. Please further describe any challenges or lessons in the F&A of the project. Recommended length: 2-4 paragraphs.*

### Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment

### *Please describe the major accomplishments achieved, the main challenges encountered, and any lessons learned relating to the project’s gender strategy/action plan (suggested length: 2-3 paragraphs).*

### Assessment of GEF Agency Support during Project Execution

*Please assess the performance of the WWF GEF Agency during the execution of the project. Please describe what was successful and what could be improved. Recommended length: 2-3 paragraphs.*

### Summary of Major Lessons Learned

*Describe the major lessons that the project team learned and believe are important to share with others for future projects. Please use this opportunity to reflect on what has worked and not worked with the project and how that has compared with expectations and assumptions at the planning stage. These lessons may relate to your theory of change and the strategies or approaches used. Lessons may also be based on the implementation arrangement, governance, internal capacity, coordination, experiences with partners and stakeholders, policy engagement, replication, understanding of (and responses to) potential climate change impacts, or any other issue. Recommended length: .5-1 page.*

### Knowledge Management

*Briefly describe how project documents and lessons learned have been made available, stored and shared with project stakeholders and beneficiaries. Recommended length: 2-3 paragraphs.*

### Exit Plan and Sustainability of Results

*Describe the exit plan for the project and how this will contribute to the sustainability of project results. Please explain how the project management unit will bring closure to the activities in the field and perform due diligence with beneficiaries and other project stakeholders (e.g. equipment handover, informing beneficiaries that the project is closing the plan for maintenance of small infrastructure, etc.). Will there be a transfer of responsibilities and contacts? How will the team avoid negative impacts on beneficiaries in the short or long-term? How will the project team maximize benefits, including sustainability and replication of project interventions? Recommended length: max 1 page.*

# Part III: Results Framework and Tracking Tool[[8]](#footnote-9)

*Insert here or attach the final Results Framework and Tracking Tool (if applicable) for submission to the GEF Secretariat.*

**Annex I**: Criteria for Overall Evaluation of Project

1. **Relevance** – the extent to which the project design, outcomes, indicators and targets remain valid and consistent with local and national development priorities and organizational policies, including the context of the changing circumstances of the country (e.g. political context);
2. **Effectiveness** - the extent to which the outputs, outcomes and project objective have been or are likely to be achieved, taking into account their relative importance. Identify the major factors which have facilitated or impeded this achievement. Review the management structure of the project and determine whether the organizational structure of the project, the resources, the distribution of responsibilities and coordination mechanisms are appropriate for achieving progress towards project outcomes;
3. **Efficiency** - the extent to which results have been delivered with the least costly resources possible. This includes efficiency of: funding availability, project management and human resources, coordination and information flow among the project partners;
4. **Results/Impact** – the extent of intended or unforeseen effects that project interventions or strategies will have on the project objective, conservation targets and GEF global environmental benefits, whether positive or negative. Assess the project’s logic or theory of change and the potential to scale up or replicate the project outcomes and impact.
5. **Sustainability** - the likely ability of an intervention to continue to deliver benefits, progress and impact after external support has ended. Determine the degree of support and buy-in given to the project at the national and local level;
6. **Adaptive capacity** –the extent to which the use of M&E, lessons learned and adaptive management are used to meet indicator targets and mitigate project issues (such as design flaws or any adverse impacts of the project).

**Annex II:** **WWF - GEF Rating Scales and Guidance**

Every year, the WWF GEF Agency reports to the GEF Secretariat on the status of projects under implementation, which includes submission of annual ratings for Development Objective, Implementation Progress and Risk. These ratings should be reported in the Annual (12-month) Project Progress Report (PPR). It is important to note that while the rating scales provided allow an objective calculation for the project rating, flexibility may be granted to adjust for a fair rating. The WWF GEF Agency will then submit the project ratings to the GEF Secretariat in the Project Implementation Report (PIR) and Annual Monitoring Report (AMR). Below are the scales and guiding examples for determining these annual ratings.

**Development Objective Rating**

The project Development Objective (DO) rating is quantified by analyzing the percent achievement of annual indicators in the project Results Framework (RF) and comparing the average achievement of those indicators against the DO rating scale below. In addition, it may be considered whether the project is on track to meeting targets that are measured at later intervals (e.g. indicators measured at midterm and project close, rather than annually. See below for the rating scale and an example of how this is calculated. Please note that for all indicators in the RF where achievement is below 80%, an action plan is requested in the PPR. This will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency for a no-objection following their review of the PPR.

**Development Objective Rating Scale\***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | % Achievement of Results Framework targets (averaged) |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 100 |
| Satisfactory (S)\* | 80 – 99 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 70 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 60 – 69 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 50 – 59 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | 49 and below |

\*Note that remedial action is needed for all indicator-targets not achieving 80% (Satisfactory).

**Guiding Example: How to calculate DO Rating from Results Framework**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Objective/Component/****Outcome** | **Indicator** | **Unit** | **Target Y1** | **Achieved Y1** | **Percent achieved Y1** |
| Project Objective | Indicator 1 | # policies | 5 | 4 | 80 |
|  | Indicator 2 | # ha | 1,000,000 | 900,354 | 90 |
| Component 1 |
|  Outcome 1.1 | Indicator 3 | # beneficiaries | 500 | 410 | 82 |
|  Outcome 1.2 | Indicator 4 | # sites | 10 | 12 | 100 |
| Component 2 |
|  Outcome 2.1 | Indicator 5 | % score | 80% | 75% | 93.75 |
|  Outcome 2.2 | Indicator 6 | # protected areas | n/a | n/a | -- |
| Component 3 |
|  Outcome 3.1 | Indicator 7 | # strategies | 4 | 0 | 0 |
|  Outcome 3.2 | Indicator 8 | Ratio m/f | 1:1 | 1:1 | 100 |
|  | Indicator 9 | # cases filed | 5 | 0 | 0 |
| Average of total | 68.2% |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | % Achievement of Results Framework targets (averaged) |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 100 |
| Satisfactory (S) | 80 – 99 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 70 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 60 – 69 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 50 – 59 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | 49 and below |

Rating determined is Moderately Unsatisfactory. An action plan is required for indicators 7 and 9. The rating and action plan will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency following their review of the PPR.

**Implementation Progress Rating**

The project Implementation Progress (IP) rating is quantified by analyzing the percent achievement of targets in the annual workplan and comparing their average achievement against the IP rating scale provided below. See below for the rating scale and an example of how this is calculated. Please note that while the Project Progress Report (PPR) will request that workplan targets be averaged by component, the IP rating will be based on a total average of all workplan targets. For all components where the average achievement of workplan targets is below 80%, an action plan is requested in the PPR. This will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency for a no-objection following their review of the PPR.

**Implementation Progress Rating Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | % Achievement of annual workplan targets (averaged) |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 90 – 100 |
| Satisfactory (S)\* | 80 – 89 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 65 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 50 – 64 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 40 – 59 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | 39 and below |

\* Note that remedial action is needed for all components averaging less than 80% (Satisfactory) achievement of indicator targets.

**Guiding Example: How to calculate IP rating from work plan tracking**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Activities Y1** | **Unit** | **Target** | **Achieved** | **Percent Achieved** |
| Component 1 |
|  Activity 1.1.1 | Sites | 5 | 4 | 80 |
|  Activity 1.1.2 | Households | 120 | 122 | 100 |
| Average Component 1 | 90 |
| Component 2 |
|  Activity 2.1.1 | Events | 3 | 3 | 100 |
|  Activity 2.1.2 | Visits | 2 | 2 | 100 |
| Average Component 2 | 100 |
| Component 3 |
|  Activity 3.1.1 | Trips | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  Activity 3.1.2 | Trainings | 4 | 3 | 75 |
|  Activity 3.1.3 | Report | 1 | 1 | 100 |
| Average Component 3 | 58.3 |
| Average of total workplan | 82.78 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | % Achievement of annual workplan targets (averaged) |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 90 – 100 |
| Satisfactory (S) | 80 – 89 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 65 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 50 – 64 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 40 – 59 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | 39 and below |

Rating determined is Satisfactory. Action plan is required in PPR for Component 3. The rating and action plan will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency following their review of the PPR.

**Risk Rating**

Risk can be thought of as an uncertain event or condition, which if it occurs, could have a negative impact on the project (e.g. the political situation deteriorates, which affects the potential passing of a policy, etc). Assumptions are statements that we believe to be true in the face of uncertainty. The project strategies that are designed to affect change are based on assumptions, which is why projects have a ‘theory’ of change. Assumptions are related to risks, since if those assumptions fail to hold, it means the risk occurred and may have a negative impact on the success of the project (e.g. awareness raising events do not lead to the desired behavior change as expected, etc.). Once the team has reflected on individual risks or assumptions that could have a high potential impact on the project, they will list these in the PPR and rate them based on the scale below, using their best available knowledge. An average rating will be based on the individual ratings and submitted with the PPR. See below for the rating scale and an example of how this is calculated. Please note that all individual risks that are considered Substantial or High should be accompanied by an action plan in the PPR to prepare for and address those risks. This will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency for a no-objection following their review of the PPR.

**Risk Rating Scale**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating |  |
| High Risk (H) | There is a probability of greater than 75% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/or the project may face high risks. |
| Substantial Risk (S) | There is a probability of between 51% and 75% that assumptions may fail to hold, and/or the project may face substantial risks. |
| Modest Risk (M) | There is a probability of between 26% and 50% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks. |
| Low Risk (L) | There is a probability of up to 25% that assumptions may fail to hold or materialize, and/ or the project may face only modest risks.  |

**Guiding Example: How to determine the risk rating**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Risk Description | External/Internal | Rating | Notes |
| Lack of government support for zoning | External | Substantial\* | Main supporter is at district level. National level has no support and therefore may not be able to pass national policy as hoped. |
| Turnover - Change of ministry and district focal and institutional heads | External | Modest | Training and engaging new focal persons about the project is time consuming and project activities are likely to be delayed. |
| Bad weather affecting access to remote areas | External | Modest | If access is not possible, project activities will be delayed or cancelled. |
| Prolonged strike and blockade | External | High\* | This may redirect government attention, restrict access to project sites, and make getting necessary supplies difficult, which may delay or stop workplan activities. |
| Total average risk: | Substantial |

Rating determined is Substantial. Action plan is required in PPR for the risks with ‘\*’. The rating and action plan will be discussed with the WWF GEF Agency following their review of the PPR.

1. This amount will not include the GEF Agency fee. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
2. This amount will not include the GEF Agency fee. [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
3. Documents with “\*” should be included in Part III of the report as applicable. All other supporting documents should be annexed. [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
4. Tracking tool is only required for GEF-5 projects. GEF-6 and GEF-7 projects will use core indicators in their Results Framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
5. *For example, if there is a target under Component 1 of 500 hectares of land with innovative land management and an achievement of 500 hectares, that is one indicator in Component 1 with 100% achievement. If there are two total indicators under that component and the other indicator was not achieved at 100%, then “1 / 2” indicator targets were achieved in Component 1.* [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
6. *This figure is the percent of total spent per component as compared to the budget approved in the CEO Endorsement of the Prodoc.* [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
7. A result is linked to the desired future state of a target (e.g. goals) or factor- e.g. objectives associated with threats, drivers, opportunities. Results include *impacts,* which are linked to targets or goals, *outcomes* that are linked to threats, drivers and opportunities and associated objectives. *Outputs* are linked to activities. Not all projects will demonstrate an outcome or impact every year – impacts, in particular, usually take a few years to achieve. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
8. Tracking tools are only required for GEF-5 projects. Otherwise, measurements for core and sub-indicators should be submitted as part of the Results Framework. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)