**WWF GEF Agency**

**Project Closeout Report**

**Title (GEF ID)**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **1. General****Information** | **Agency Approval Date** |  |
| **Fiscal Year** |  |
| **Implementation Status (1st PIR, 2nd PIR, Final PIR)** |  |
| **2. Ratings** | **Overall DO rating** |  |
| **Overall IP rating** |   |
| **Overall Risk rating** |  |
| **3. Key dates** | **Actual Implementation Start Date** |  |
| **Expected Mid-Term Review Date** |  |
| **Expected Closing Date** |  |
| **Expected Financial Closure/TE Report Date** |  |
| **4. Budget** | **Total Project Budget** |  |
| **Total GEF Budget Spent (USD) for given project year** |  |
| **Materialized Co-finance** |  |

**Project Report information:**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Report Author(s)** |  |
| **Report Completion Date** |  |

**Project Contact information:**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Position** | **Name** | **E-mail** |
| Project Manager |  |  |
| M&E Officer |  |  |
| F&A Officer |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Please submit the closeout report to the Project Manager, along with:

* Completed Results Framework
* Annual Work Plan and Budget Tracking (for final project year)
* Tracking Tool (for GEF 5&6 projects)

**I. GEF Project Implementation Report (for this final project year)**

### Complete for the final project year (e.g. project Y2).

### Ratings

Provide the following ratings according to the Rating Scale provided in Annex II.

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Year 1** | **Year 2** | **Year 3** | **Justification** |
| **Project Implementation**  |  |  |  |  |
| **Project Development** |  |  |  |  |
| **Risks** |  |  |  |  |

### Information on Progress, Challenges and Outcomes on Project Implementation Activities

|  |
| --- |
| Describe the key outcomes and impacts achieved in the project, using the AWP&B and Results Framework as reference. Organize by component; include project objective. |

### Progress, Challenges, and Outcomes of Stakeholder Engagement (based on Stakeholder Engagement Plan included at CEO Endorsement)

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Information on Progress on Gender-Responsive Measures as Documented at CEO Endorsement in the Gender Action Plan or Equivalent

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Knowledge Activities / Products (When Applicable), As Outlined in Knowledge Management approved at CEO Endorsement

|  |
| --- |
|  List knowledge products (including links) developed for the project year.  |

**II. Closeout Reflections (for life of the project)**

### Summary of Key Changes in Project Strategy and/or Budget

|  |
| --- |
| Note whether any outcomes/outputs/activities changed or dropped; was there a project extension? |

### Summary of Major Challenges and Successes

|  |
| --- |
| Describe the major lessons that the project team learned and believe are important to share with others for future projects. Include any challenges, successes, adaptive management measures over the life of the project. |

### Reflection on the Original Project Design

|  |
| --- |
|  |

### Exit Plan and Sustainability of Results

|  |
| --- |
| Describe the exit plan for the project and how this will contribute to the sustainability of project results.  |

### Assessment of GEF Agency Support during Project Execution

|  |
| --- |
| Please assess the performance of the WWF GEF Agency during the execution of the project.  |

### Other

|  |
| --- |
| Optional |

**Annex 1: Rating Scale**

### Development Objective Rating

The project Development Objective (DO) rating is quantified by analyzing progress against the Results Framework according to the rating scale below.

***DO Rating scale***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Rating** | **% Achievement of Results Framework targets (average)** |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 100%  |
| Satisfactory (S) | 80 – 99 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 60 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 40 – 59 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 20 – 39 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Below 20% |

***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 |
| Average of total | 89.15 |

### Implementation Progress Rating

The project Implementation Progress (IP) rating is based on progress against the annual workplan, based on the rating scale provided below.

***IP Rating scale***

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Rating | % Achievement of annual workplan targets (average) |
| Highly Satisfactory (HS) | 100 |
| Satisfactory (S) | 80 – 99 |
| Moderately Satisfactory (MS) | 60 – 79 |
| Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) | 40 – 59 |
| Unsatisfactory (U) | 20 – 39 |
| Highly Unsatisfactory (HU) | Below 20% |

***Guiding Example: How to calculate IP Rating from AWP&B***

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **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 3 |
|  Activity 3.1.1 | Trips | 2 | 0 | 0 |
|  Activity 3.1.2 | Trainings | 4 | 3 | 75 |
| Average Component 3 | 37.5 |
| Average of total workplan | 63.75 |

### Risks

Examine whether the project faces substantial risks in terms of the sustainability of project results

***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.  |