

1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	1022
IA/EA Project ID	GEF/GFL/2328-2770-4889
Focal Area	Multi-Focal
Project Name	Integrated Ecosystems Management in the Transboundary Areas between Nigeria and Niger: Phase I: Strengthening of legal and institutional frameworks for Collaboration and Experimental demonstration of Integrated Ecosystem Management (IEM)
Country/Countries	Federal Republic of Nigeria and Republic of Niger
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	UNEP
Executing Agencies involved	ICRISAT
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Not involved
Involvement of Private Sector	No- Not Involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	OP 1: Arid and Semi-Arid Zones Ecosystems OP 12: Integrated Ecosystem Management OP 9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operational Program
TER Prepared by	Nelly Bourlion
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	Dr. Winston Mathu, Mr. Kano Namata, Pr. Ayobami Salami
Review Completion Date	16/08/2005
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	17/01/2006
Project Implementation Start Date	01/06/2010
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	01/11/2010
Actual Date of Project Completion	31/12/2011
TE Completion Date	N/A
IA Review Date	01/01/2011
TE Submission Date	16/08/2005

2. Project Financing

Financing Source	At Endorsement (millions USD)	At Completion (millions USD)
GEF Project Preparation Grant	0.38	0.38
Co-financing for Project Preparation		
Total Project Prep Financing	0.38	0.38
GEF Financing	5.00	5.00
IA/EA own		
Government	9.12	1.26
Other*		
Total Project Financing	14.12	6.26
Total Financing including Prep	14.50	6.63

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

3. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF Evaluation Office TE Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	S	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	ML	ML
Monitoring and Evaluation	S	S	S	MS
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	S	S	S
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	S	HS

4. Project Objectives

4.1. *Global Environmental Objectives of the project:*

According to the project appraisal document, the project's overall objective is "to establish sustainable conditions for integrated ecosystem management for improvement in the livelihoods of the local communities and preservation of globally significant ecosystems in the trans boundary catchments between Nigeria and Niger".

The activities to achieve these objectives are focused on improvement of knowledge of the resource base through establishment of a long-term information management system, the formulation of common strategies for managing shared water and forest resources, institutional capacity building, investments in land reclamation and sequestration of carbon through restoration and protection of vegetation cover.

The expected impact is that this project will become a policy instrument for guaranteeing equitable sharing in development, conservation and utilization of resources in the four shared catchments (Maggia-Lamido, Gada-Gulbin Maradi, Tagwai-El Fadama and Komadugu Yobe) covered by the Maiduguri Agreement.

No change was reported by the terminal evaluation team.

4.2. *Development Objectives of the project:*

According to the project appraisal, the expected outcome of a successful execution of the project is to "strengthen local economies and alleviate poverty, transfer expertise to local populations, and ensure good governance in the sustainable management of shared natural resources".

The project appraisal report separates the objectives into three main components as follow:

(1) "Sub regional integration, harmonization and cooperation in strategies for the management of trans boundary natural resources".

This component is expected to create the conditions necessary for implementing the project. It should find solutions to the institutional and operational problems. The legal and legislative framework for institutional operations and natural resource management, including conflict prevention, will be strengthened. Sub regional, catchment level, and community-based planning and implementation will be set up. Coordinated financing between the two countries and partners will be enabled.

(2) "Strengthened capacity to harness indigenous and research-based knowledge to support the conservation and equitable sharing of natural resources, and reduce vulnerability to environmental variability and change."

This component focuses on improving local knowledge and values, together with research-based knowledge on the causes and impacts of degradation, as a basis for designing, testing and implementing land management activities by communities. The objective is to minimize vulnerability to environmental change and variability through developing and promoting sustainable practices. Communities will participate in evaluating ecosystem services, identifying and promoting good practices (for managing biological diversity, land development, improving production systems, rehabilitating degraded land, and managing conflict). The indirect incentives for investing in conserving or sustaining the productivity of natural resources will be identified and strengthened. Capacity building for local partners will be provided. A sub regional mechanism for exchanging and disseminating good practices will be established.

(3) "Enhanced planning and implementation of cooperative and participatory management strategies for sharing natural resources, reversing ecosystem degradation, conserving biodiversity and increasing productivity to improve rural livelihoods."

This component focuses on involving all stakeholders in developing common strategies for integrated and participatory management of shared natural resources, with the aim to improve rural livelihoods. At the catchment level, bilateral protocols and plans for conserving and exploiting shared water resources, protecting priority habitats and managing degraded sites will be implemented. Community-based plans for natural resources that integrate local and appropriate new knowledge will be developed and implemented in 24 pilot areas. Direct incentives for participation will be strengthened. New and profitable technologies for sustainable use of natural resources will be identified and developed.

The Development Objectives as described by the terminal evaluation team were to "improve the incomes of local people and alleviate poverty". Therefore, no significant change was reported by the terminal evaluation team.

4.3. *Changes in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities:*

Criteria	Change?	Reason for Change
Global Environmental Objectives	No	
Development Objectives	No	
Project Components	No	
Other activities	NA	

5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

5.1. *Relevance – Satisfactory*

The outcomes of the IEM project is rated satisfactory in terms of relevance for several reasons; (1) the IEM objectives are consistent with the key national development and environmental policies and priorities in both countries, (2) at a sub-regional level, IEM remains relevant to the mandates of NNJC, it has given visibility and credibility to NNJC (3) the project stays relevant to GEF’s OP 12 on Integrated Ecosystem Management, and is generating benefits in “land degradation, biodiversity and international

waters, with secondary benefits in climate change”,(4) the projects is also relevant to the Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems (OP 1) and the GEF strategic priority on mainstreaming of biodiversity in production landscapes, Integrated Land and Water Management (OP 9) and the Sustainable Land Management Programme (OP 15), and finally (4) the project is in line with the Land Use Management and Soil Conservation Policy of UNEP.

5.2. *Effectiveness – Satisfactory*

The overall effectiveness of the outcomes was considered satisfactory. The expected outcomes of the project were “to contribute to sustainable management of globally significant ecosystem resources” through the implementation of three projects components. However this is a project designed with 2 phases and only the first phase has been implemented so far. It will take therefore more time for the project’s impacts to be visible.

One objective of the IEM was strengthening the NNJC’s capacity for gathering processing and disseminating data and information. This objective has been achieved by the implementation of several systems such as GIS/data gathering system, diagnostic studies, website, and newsletter. According to the Evaluation team, “this project strategy is an important contribution towards the achievement of the intended impacts- Strengthen capacity at all levels (local, national and sub-regional).”

The IEM project was also focused on implementing pilot activities to demonstrate good practices for managing access to and benefits from natural resources. The pilot demonstrations were consistent with the project strategy and objectives, but the interventions were small in scale with “minimal socio-economic and environmental impacts on the target communities and with minimum or indirect impacts on livelihoods” according to the Terminal Evaluation report.

Moreover, the project design did not fully appreciate the complex nature of IEM-type project. Strengthening institutions such as the NNJC requires legal and institutional reforms which normally take time, and the process is not always under the control of the project but of political systems. Community participation in the target areas for IEM face special challenges: there was nearly a total absence of other development partners before the IEM.

However, according to the Terminal Evaluation team opinion the achievements have a high likelihood of leading to the intended impacts.

5.3. *Efficiency* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

According to the Terminal Evaluation report the efficiency of the project is rated moderately satisfactory.

The technologies promoted by the project are those that have been proven successful in similar environments elsewhere. The terminal evaluation team estimates that the resources mobilization for co-financing has been effective concerning the two Governments-Niger and Nigeria, but it has not been entirely successful since the Global Mechanism has not materialized. Moreover, IEM had to set up new implementation structures. However, they found that the least efficient part was that IEM project utilized 25% of project resources on staffing, way above the average of 8% usually considered in other projects. They also noted the very expensive wire fencing being used in the Nigerian side of the project, with “70% of the field investment on woodlots devoted to provision of boreholes for irrigation and construction of fence”. The project was completed in a timely manner except for the 2 year delay in starting the field activities. However the Terminal Evaluation team did not report any major consequences from these delays.

5.4. *Sustainability* – **Low to Moderate Risk**

An overall assessment of Low to Moderate risks to sustainability of the project can be justified as follow:

According to the terminal evaluation report, the sustainability of the financial resources is rated as Likely. One of the main reasons is that they found a "high commitment to coordinate and spearhead the implementation of integrated cross-border projects and programs relating to natural resource management" by both countries. This commitment can be seen with the endorsement of the Bilateral Agreement, as well as the budget allocation by both countries to Phase II of the project. Moreover an Ecological Fund has recently been established.

There are low risks to the Socio-Political Sustainability since policies and institutional frameworks have been established and developed and both countries will see more resources going to implementation of integrated cross-border projects.

Institutional sustainability has moderate risks, the main reason is that the "capacity of other key institutions involved in the IEM implementation remain weak" according to the Terminal Evaluation report.

Finally, the terminal evaluation team estimates that the environmental sustainability as low risk. IEM is about conservation and sustainable management of natural resources and in particular the water, land, biodiversity, wildlife and livestock resources in the trans boundary area between Niger and Nigeria. In the long run, the project is expected to lead to better environmental stewardship and conservation of natural resources. However, the main impact of the project will come from awareness, skills training and community involvement in decision making. The people themselves will ensure the sustainability of the project interventions long after external support is gone. However, some risks could be raised by governance and conflict issues.

6. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

6.1. Co-financing

6.1.1. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by co-financing well integrated into the project?

The resources mobilization for co-financing has been effective concerning the two Governments-Niger and Nigeria. The two governments already committed to funding phase II, this will lead to a functional Project Program Management Support unit by the end of Phase II. However, the expected additional resources have not materialized for the global mechanism component.

6.1.2. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The total actual co-financing was US\$ 1,440,000, instead of the expected amount of US\$ 9,122,500 according to the Terminal Evaluation report. The UNCCD- GM was in charge of mobilizing co-financing to GEF projects contributing to the implementation of the UNCCD, but this did not materialize.

However, the potential for additional resources is high now that other donors (e.g. UNDP, AfDB, FAO, IDB) can see some results from IEM Project.

6.2. Delays

6.2.1. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The delay of close to 2 years in launching field activities of IEM was due to the time needed to establish implementation structures (Local Project Units in the field). This led to delay in meeting expected targets.

This delay should have been expected since the project was to take place in a generally remote trans-boundary zone with few ongoing development activities, and should have been noted as part of the project baseline.

Moreover, according to the Finance officer, ICRISAT, and the Regional Project Coordinator 67, there were occasional delays in the quarterly cash advances release due to delay in submission of financial reports from the field. These delays had adverse effect on the project implementation and result in disruption of project activities in the field. To mitigate the situation, ICRISAT had to release advance funds from its own resources.

6.3. Country ownership

6.3.1. 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:

Conservation and sustainable management of the environment is central to national development agenda of Niger and Nigeria, therefore according to the terminal evaluation report, both countries "embraced IEM as one of the vehicles towards achievement of sustainable development objectives".

The role played by the concerned ministries in the committee meetings (RTC, RSC, NTC) to monitor and to be involved in the decision making process was important. The Government's contribution (in cash and in kind) to the project is an evidence of country ownership of IEM. The Bilateral Agreement between both countries reinforces this evidence. Moreover, the two governments already committed to funding Phase II of the project.

However, according to the Terminal Evaluation team studies, the sense of ownership has not reached community level. The community engagement is more function of the received benefits from the project.

7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

7.1. M&E design at entry- **Moderately Satisfactory**

A monitoring and evaluation plan was included in the Project Document and was focused on 3 aspects; (1) project execution, (2) project performance, and (3) impact evaluation. This plan identified a set of impact indicators primarily focused on environment. However, these indicators are defined as "general, and largely unquantifiable" by the terminal evaluation team.

According to their analysis, the project logical framework includes objectively verifiable indicators of progress performance, along with indications of frequency and timeframe for the monitoring of the various performance parameters. However, they estimated that some of the project targets were too broad and unattainable within the four year time frame.

The project design at entry also provided the setting up of a Monitoring and Evaluation Unit within the NNJC/RCU that is functioning effectively. The unit has an internal system for data collection, processing, and storage, to allow easy retrieval.

7.2. *M&E implementation- Moderately Satisfactory*

The project implementation mechanisms worked effectively to inform the project on organizational and management issues. Monitoring of the project execution and performance was conducted according to the Monitoring and Evaluation plan, particularly with respect to oversight and progress reporting.

The Terminal Evaluation team noticed the significant contribution of the internal reflection workshops ("Technical Meeting on Activities Evaluation") that reviewed and agreed on how to improve the delivery of the expected project outputs. These workshops brought together all the IEM staff from the two national coordinating units, and the RCU.

However, some aspects of the original plan were not implemented; the external mid-term evaluation (expected to take place every 2 years) did not take place. This led to a missed opportunity to learn from experience and provide feedback to planning. Moreover, very little effort at documentation and dissemination of lessons from IEM were made.

Nevertheless, the terminal evaluation report concludes that "the implementation of the M&E plan contributed significantly to keeping the project on course and ensuring focus on project objectives and expected results".

8. **Assessment of project's Quality of Implementation and Execution**

8.1. *Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution – Satisfactory*

8.2. *Overall Quality of Implementation- Satisfactory*

The quality of Implementation is satisfactory. There were no significant administrative, operational, or technical issues affecting project implementation. Only some occasional delays in the submission of the quarterly financial reports arose from institutional factors. The Mid-Term Evaluation for Phase I did not take place, denying the project an important learning opportunity.

8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution- Moderately Satisfactory*

The quality of execution for the executing agencies can be rated as moderately satisfactory.

ICRISAT is the Executing Agency of the project and has effectively facilitated project implementation, including receiving quarterly progress, financial reports, annual summary progress reports and copies of all substantive reports from the NNJC/RCU on behalf of UNEP-DGEF. The Terminal Evaluation team however found that ICRISAT's role has been limited to financial reporting and accounting. As the Executing Agency, ICRISAT is expected to carry out a program of regular visits to project sites to supervise activities, and to ensure integrity of procurement and funds management in the field. This however has not happened so far.

Moreover, according to the Terminal Evaluation team, the change in execution arrangement (from UNOPS to ICRISAT) was weighty enough and should have involved the RSC.

9. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

Criteria	Rating	GEF EO Comments
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Satisfactory	The Terminal Evaluation report is pretty strong in terms of explaining the relevant outcomes and impacts from the project. However, it is a 2 phase project and therefore it is not always clear if some outcomes or impacts were expected to happen in Phase I but did not realize, and will be realized in Phase II or if they were expected to happen only at the end of Phase II.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Highly Satisfactory	The Terminal Evaluation report is consistent and the evidence are complete and convincing. An impact pathway of the project is presented as a figure to facilitate the comprehension of the linkages between the outputs, outcomes, and impacts.
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Highly Satisfactory	The Terminal Evaluation report explains in a detailed manner the potential sustainability of the outcomes. It also underlines the major risks that could affect the outcomes sustainability. The most important information is that it is a 2 phase project and therefore sustainability is very important but will be fully assessed at the end of phase II.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Highly Satisfactory	There are three main lessons learnt from the project. Each of these lessons as described by the Terminal Evaluation team and are supported by evidence and detailed examples from the project.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		The Terminal Evaluation reports a brief project budget as decided at project inception. The allocation among countries and units are reported as well as an analysis on staffing expenditures. A co-financing table is also available as well as a detailed cumulative budget and expenditures through June 2010. However, it is not really clear how the budget is shared among activities.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Highly Satisfactory	The Terminal Evaluation report includes an assessment of the quality of M&E at entry, at implementation, and describes in details the limitations of the system.

10. Other issues to follow up on

This is a 2 phase project; Phase 1 for institutional strengthening, capacity building and pilot projects, and Phase 2 for out- and up-scaling across the shared catchments. It is expected that the main outcomes will start being realized at the end of the 2nd phase.

11. Sources of information

Annex I – Project Impacts as assessed by the GEF Evaluation Office

Did the project have outputs contributing to knowledge being generated or improved?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO KNOWLEDGE BEING GENERATED OR IMPROVED?

The outputs that contributed to knowledge being generated or improved were (1) the identification, reconnaissance, and diagnostic studies in 24 pilot sites (12 in Niger, 12 in Nigeria), and (2) the training of respective local communities in NR management and techniques (tree nursery management, tree planting techniques, production and use of improved cooking stoves targeting women groups, agroforestry, sand-dune fixation techniques, improvement of pastureland and eco-farm).

Is there evidence that the knowledge was used for management/ governance?

Yes

HOW WAS THIS KNOWLEDGE USED AND WHAT RESULTED FROM THAT USE?

There is evidence that the knowledge being generated from this project was used for (1) the rehabilitation of about 400 ha of degraded lands, (2) the on-site training of women group members on manufacture of improved cooking stoves (30 from the Niya Da Kokari Women Group- Konni trained in Niger), and (3) the awareness creation and catalyzing support for CBNRM (UNDP, ADB, State Governments, etc.).

Did the project have outputs contributing to the development of databases and information-sharing arrangements?

Yes

WHAT OUTPUTS CONTRIBUTED TO INFORMATION BEING COMPILED AND MADE ACCESSIBLE TO MANY?

Three outputs contributed to the information made accessible: (1) a GIS/data gathering system as a facility for mapping, diagnostic studies to document major issues and challenges facing the ecosystems in the trans boundary areas between Niger and Nigeria, (2) a website (www.nnjc.net) for information dissemination and knowledge sharing, and (3) a Newsletter (MUHALLI- meaning Environment) whose focus is on major issues facing trans boundary areas between Nigeria and Niger.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

No

**TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?
WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?**

Did the project have activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

The terminal evaluation team found that the development of a web site: www.nnjc.net, the preparation of a IEM Newsletter MUHALLI (meaning environment), and the presentation by the RPC on IEM to the second Lagos State Summit on Climate Change, were activities that contributed to awareness and knowledge being raised.

Was any **positive** change in behavior reported as a result of these activities?

Yes

WHAT BEHAVIOR (POSITIVE OR NEGATIVE) HAS CHANGED AS A RESULT?

Behaviors changed in a positive way, according to the terminal evaluation report; *"In Gochalo pilot site in Tagwai El Fadama Catchment area – Zinder in Niger, 15 individual farmers have already picked the new sand dune fixing technology and are applying it on their own farms. The farmers were able to assimilate this technology because basic inputs were made available by the project."*

Did the project activities contribute to building technical/ environmental management skills?

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO **TECHNICAL/ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGEMENT SKILLS** BEING BUILT OR IMPROVED?

The main activities that contributed to technical and environmental management skills being built were the demonstration of agroforestry practices, the sand dune fixation, and the improved cooking stove technologies.

Is there evidence of these skills being applied by people trained?

Yes

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

According to the terminal evaluation, the gained skills have been applied by individual farmers and households that are already adopting these practices on their own land and households.

Did the project contribute to the development of legal / policy / regulatory frameworks?

Yes

Were these adopted?

Yes

WHAT LAWS/ POLICIES/ RULES WERE ADOPTED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

As a result of the project, the "*Bilateral Agreement on Regulatory and Institutional Framework for the Management of the transboundary Ecosystems between the Federal Republic of Nigeria and the Republic of Niger*" was endorsed. Moreover, the Terminal Evaluation estimates that IEM has accelerated several national programs such as the WB supported Community Action Programme, the Danida/EU programme, and the Rural Development Strategy.

The project has allowed the introduction of the "*Regulatory and Institutional Framework for the Management of the transboundary Ecosystems between the Federal Republic of Nigeria and the Republic of Niger*". This framework has not yet been tested but according to the Terminal Evaluation report, its implementation will generate important lessons and experiences of benefit to other countries with shared ecosystems.

Did the project contribute to the development of institutional and administrative systems and structures?

Yes

Were these institutional and administrative systems and structures integrated as permanent structures?

UA

WHAT OFFICES/ GOVERNMENT STRUCTURES WERE CREATED AS A RESULT OF THE PROJECT?

According to the terminal evaluation report, the highest decision making body in the implementation mechanism was the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) supported by the Regional Technical Committee (RTC) and the National Technical Committees (NTCs). A regional coordination unit (RCU) was created to manage the day to day execution of the entire project at the administrative, technical and financial levels. The structures called Local Project Units (LPU) were also created under the National Project Coordination Units, and were responsible of the project execution at a local level.

Did the project contribute to structures/ mechanisms/ processes that allowed more stakeholder participation in environmental governance?

Yes

Were improved arrangements for stakeholder engagement integrated as permanent structures?

UA

WHAT STRUCTURES/ MECHANISMS/ PROCESSES WERE SUPPORTED BY THE PROJECT THAT ALLOWED MORE STAKEHOLDERS/ SECTORS TO PARTICIPATE IN ENVIRONMENTAL GOVERNANCE/ MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES?

The project has given NNJC visibility and credibility through awareness and publicity through the Newsletter and the Website which serve to enhance its role in catalyzing partnerships for resource mobilization towards programs and projects for the target areas.

Did the project contribute to informal processes facilitating trust-building or conflict resolution?

Yes

**WHAT PROCESSES OR MECHANISMS FACILITATED TRUST-BUILDING AND CONFLICT RESOLUTION?
WHAT RESULTED FROM THESE?**

The terminal evaluation team estimates that the "project made significant progress in creating awareness among policy makers on issues relating to integrated ecosystem management in the trans boundary areas between Niger and Nigeria in the course of consultations and advocacy during the development of the Bilateral Agreement, and preparation of several project proposals targeting other partners (AfDB, IDB, FAO, UNDP)". The establishment of CPICs constitutes a mechanism for building local consensus on equity in access to and benefits from sustainable management of natural resources.

Did the project contribute to any of the following:		Please specify what was contributed:
Technologies & Approaches	Yes	agroforestry and sand-dune techniques, production of improved cooking stoves
Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies	UA	
Financial Mechanisms	Yes	knowledge about linkages between environmental management and livelihoods among the rural communities

Did **replication** of the promoted technologies, and economic and financial instruments take place?

SPECIFY WHICH PLACES IMPLEMENTED WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH.
WHAT WAS THE RESULT IN THOSE PLACES (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **scaling-up** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

SPECIFY AT WHAT ADMINISTRATIVE & ECOLOGICAL SCALE AND WHICH TECHNOLOGIES/APPROACHES OR ASPECTS OF A TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS ADOPTED.
HOW WAS IT MODIFIED TO FIT THE NEW SCALE? WHAT WAS THE RESULT AT THE NEW SCALE/S (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **mainstreaming** of the promoted approaches and technologies take place?

SPECIFY HOW (MEANS/ INSTRUMENT) AND WHICH ASPECTS OF THE TECHNOLOGY/APPROACH WAS INCORPORATED INTO THE EXISTING SYSTEM. WHAT WAS THE RESULT OR STATUS (ENVIRONMENTAL & SOCIOECONOMIC)?

Did **removal of market barriers** and sustainable market change take place?

SPECIFY HOW DEMAND HAS BEEN CREATED FOR WHICH PRODUCTS/ SERVICES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO GEBs.

Based on most of the project's components and/or what it generally intended to do, what type of project would you say this is?

<--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

& <--dropdown menu

*QUANTITATIVE OR ANECDOTAL DETAILS ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **PRESSURE HAS BEEN REDUCED/PREVENTED** OR ON HOW ENVIRONMENTAL **STATUS HAS CHANGED** AT THE DEMONSTRATION SITES AS A CONTRIBUTION/RESULT OF PROJECT ACTIVITIES. FOR SYSTEM LEVEL CHANGES, SPECIFY THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND/OR ECOLOGICAL SCALES.*

Was stress reduction achieved?

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? Measure d Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status?

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? Measure d Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **local level**

The terminal evaluation team found evidence such as the creation of an enabling environment for integrated ecosystem management, and the improvement in grazing or water resources, that shows that stress reduction was intended and achieved at a local level.

Evidence of intended stress reduction at a **systemic level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of intended changes in environmental status at a **systemic level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **local level**

Evidence of unintended changes in stress or environmental status at the **systemic level**

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place during the project?

Environmental

Socioeconomic

To what extent were arrangements in place and being implemented during the project? Briefly describe arrangements.

The terminal evaluation report shows that significant progress on the technical implementation of Community Based Development Plans for sustainable use and conservation of natural resources have been realized. However, the monitoring effectiveness is constrained by limited baseline data, and limited learning opportunities (e.g. mid-term Review provided for but not implemented). The terminal evaluation team estimates that the "project does not have the capacity, nor the resources needed to systematically carry out the large-scale monitoring of ecosystem resources at catchment level".

To what extent did these arrangements use parameters/ indicators to measure changes that are actually related to what the project was trying to achieve?

The monitoring plan identified a set of general, and "largely unquantifiable" impact indicators, according to the Terminal Evaluation team. These indicators are defined as follow; (1) the status of natural ecosystems, their conservation and capacity for production of goods and services; (2) the evidence of positive changes in the management and use of biodiversity and natural resources; (3) the reduction in soil erosion and improvements in land productivity, and (4) the reduction of poverty.

Were arrangements to collect data on stress reduction and environmental & socioeconomic status in place to function after the project?

UA

To what extent were arrangements put into place to function after GEF support had ended? Briefly describe arrangements.

Was there a government body/ other permanent organization with a clear mandate and budget to monitor environmental and/or socioeconomic status?

The Monitoring and Evaluation Unit within the NNJC/RCU was the only organization mandated to monitor environmental and socioeconomic status.

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

UA

How has the data been used for management? Describe mechanisms and actual instances.

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

No

How has the data been made accessible to the public? Describe reporting systems or methods.

According to the terminal evaluation report, there was very little effort at documentation and dissemination of lessons from IEM, at least in a format ready for external consumption (besides the NNJC website and the Newsletter).

"SOCIOECONOMIC" REFERS TO ACCESS TO & USE OF RESOURCES (DISTRIBUTION OF BENEFITS), LIVELIHOOD, INCOME, FOOD SECURITY, HOME, HEALTH, SAFETY, RELATIONSHIPS, AND OTHER ASPECTS OF HUMAN WELL-

BEING .AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE, INCLUDE "BEFORE" AND "AFTER" NUMBERS, YEARS WHEN DATA WAS COLLECTED, AND DATA SOURCES.

Did the project contribute to **positive** socioeconomic impacts?

 Yes

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Local	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? Measured Anecdotal

Did the project contribute to **negative** socioeconomic impacts?

 No

If so, at what scales? Please mark 'x' for all that apply

<input type="checkbox"/> Local	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (local)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (local)
<input type="checkbox"/> Systemic	<input type="checkbox"/> Intended (systemic)	<input type="checkbox"/> Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained? Measured Anecdotal

Evidence on intended socio-economic impacts at the **local level**

The awareness creation and the establishment of enabling conditions for more effective management of trans boundary resources is an evidence of intended socio economic impacts at the local level. However, according to the terminal evaluation team, the socioeconomic impacts are minimal because of the low participation of the community in the project implementation. The objective was an increase of 10% in the income of households within the 24 pilot sites due to improved management of natural resources by end of phase 1, the terminal evaluation team thinks that it was clearly not achievable.

Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report

The key lessons to be learnt from this project are:

- (1) take the politics of bilateral relations into account in project design,
- (2) allocate adequate time at the preparatory state of the project to allow for the creation of enabling conditions,
- (3) specifically include an analysis of the development context of the project as part of the baseline, and ensure that this is taken into account in the work planning and budgeting opportunities for complementarity and process,
- (4) take into consideration the enhancement of the local level decision making and development of new knowledge and skills together with providing the necessary basic inputs. In order to enhance this uptake, some key intermediate states must be fulfilled: financial resources need to be available; and community participation and involvement need to be enhanced in order to promote ownership at local community level.

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The following recommendations as given in the Terminal Evaluation report are:

- (1) GEF/UNEP should move quickly to communicate the status of phase II to release the funding,
- (2) UNEP-DGEF-Task Manager in collaboration with NNJC should undertake a review and revision of project document as well as the project's Logical Framework in readiness for Phase II, in order to harmonize and realign activities to the expected outputs and objectives,
- (3) NNJC should move quickly to prepare the IEM NN Work plan for 2010/2011 with associated budget, taking into account the proposed adjustments to the project's Logical Framework in readiness for Phase II. It is therefore recommended that UNEP-DGEF, in collaboration with the NNJC/RCU convene a Regional Steering Committee meeting (RSC) which would serve also as a launching workshop for Phase II of IEM. This should take place by end of February 2011 (to ensure cross-border and/or inter-community coordination of activities and exchange of information on the status and present use of the cross-border natural resources in Phase II of the IEM project.)