

## 1. Project Data

GEF Project ID	1093
IA/EA Project ID	WB: 70256; UNDP: 260
Focal Area	International Waters
Project Name	Reversing Land and Water Degradation Trends in the Niger River Basin
Country/Countries	Benin, Guinea, Mali, Nigeria, Burkina Faso, Cameroon, Chad, Cote d'Ivoire, Niger
Geographic Scope	Regional
Lead IA/Other IA for joint projects	WB and UNDP
Executing Agencies involved	UNDP, UNOPS, WB
Involvement of NGO and CBO	Among the executing agencies
Involvement of Private Sector	Not involved
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	#9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operation Program
TER Prepared by	Anoop Agarwal
TER Peer Review by	Neeraj Negi
Author of TE	UNDP: Paul Kerkhof, Marthe Diarra; WB: Amal Talbi, Johannes Geert Grijzen
Review Completion Date	12/20/2012
CEO Endorsement/Approval Date	4/26/2004
Project Implementation Start Date	10/5/2004
Expected Date of Project Completion (at start of implementation)	8/31/2009
Actual Date of Project Completion	2/28/2011 (WB)
TE Completion Date	8/25/2011 and 1/1/2012
IA Review Date	
TE Submission Date	4/6/2012

## 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	13.00	12.80
IA/EA own	22.04	33.36
Government	7.21	28.25
Other*	0.38	
Total Project Financing	42.64	74.41
Total Financing including Prep	43.01	74.79

\*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	Ratings not compatible	Ratings not compatible	Not provided	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A		Not provided	MS
Monitoring and Evaluation	Ratings not compatible	MS	Not provided	MU
Quality of Implementation and Execution	N/A	MS	Not provided	MS
Quality of the Evaluation Report	N/A	N/A	Not provided	S

### 4. Project Objectives

#### 4.1. Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

This was a joint project with the WB and UNDP both involved as implementing agencies, however, no joint document was prepared for the project. The following are the Global Environmental Objectives as per each agency:

WB Grant Agreement:

The objectives of the Project are: (a) to strengthen the capacity of the Recipient to promote and improve coordinated and sustainable land and water management in the Basin; (b) to strengthen institutional mechanisms in Member Countries for management of transboundary land and water issues; (c) to develop a Strategic Action Program (SAP) to improve the conservation and management of land and water resources in the Basin; and (d) to assist the recipient in coordinating donor support for implementing the Strategic Action Program and an effective transboundary management.

UNDP (Prodoc) and WB (PAD):

The global environmental objective of the Project is to “reduce and prevent cross-border ecosystem degradation associated with water, preventing land degradation, to protect a globally significant biodiversity, through sustainable integrated management and cooperation in the basin, while ensuring greater involvement of people in decision making about the basin”

No changes to objectives

#### 4.2. Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project is to “provide riparian countries with a cross-border framework for sustainable development of the basin, with capacity building, and through a better understanding of land and water resources of the basin “. No changes to objectives

#### 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	No	

## 5. GEF EO Assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

### 5.1. *Relevance* – **Satisfactory**

The project and its objectives were in line with the strategic objectives of the GEF and remain relevant to sectoral strategies of the member governments, the NBA, the Bank and the UNDP. The project spans over several countries and the Niger River is socio-economically and environmentally important to the 110 million people living in the basin due to its functioning as a critical source of water.

The TE agrees that "the project is fully consistent with the updated strategic priorities for GEF-IW projects under GEF-4, and remains relevant under GEF-5. It specifically fits with the Strategic Program #3 on Balancing overuse and conflicting uses of water resources in surface and groundwater basins that are of transboundary nature. At the time of project preparation, the GEF still required the use of the Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis/Strategic Action Program (TDA/SAP) process as instruments for IW projects. These assessments were carried out to fill a substantial knowledge gap in a participatory process." The project is also in line with OP #9: Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area Operation Program.

### 5.2. *Effectiveness* – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The effectiveness of the RLWDT (Reversing Land and Water Degradation Trends) was expressed in this evaluation in terms of achieving specific objectives or expected results, as indicated in project documents. While there were some successes, there were a fair number of failures as well, hence the Mostly Satisfactory rating.

Successes:

\*The evaluation of the Pilot Demonstration Project (PDPs) and micro-grant projects yielded some positive results. To quote, "The PDPs evaluated by the mission evidently did not achieve the expected result of shared models for large-scale application. But some PDPs showed good performance in relation to some outcomes, particularly in the agricultural sector."

\*The Niger Basin is the only basin in which all the nine member countries (via the NBA) approved a development scenario path and a 20-year investment program, at the highest political level (i.e. Heads of State and Government), thereby supporting the institutional building outcome of the project and increasing the future investment into this region by an additional \$8 billion USD.

\*This project contributed to the success of the Shared Vision Process that resulted in the completion of the Sustainable Development Action Plan (SDAP) in 2007, the Investment Program in 2008, and the Water Charter, effective in 2010.

Failures:

\*Component 4 has not resulted in the kind of publication that can reach an audience outside of the NBA and its projects and therefore is rated poorly for effectiveness.

\*Workshops used a "one solution fits all" type of approach and did not address the individual concerns and challenges of the countries. The takeaways are said to be less effective and less applicable, according to the terminal evaluations.

There were 6 different components of the project that were split between the Bank and UNDP:

1) Institution Building Component (WB)- This component was to focus on strengthening the regional and national institutional capacity throughout the duration of the project and to promote good management practice and good governance. At the regional level, a Project Management and Coordination Unit (PMCU) was established jointly with the African Development Bank (AfDB) funded project to optimize human and financial resources. The PMCU and NPTs managed to engage stakeholders in micro-grant supported interventions.

2) Capacity Building and Public Awareness Component (UNDP)- As the name suggests, this component was set-up to increase the stakeholders' ownership of project interventions. It included increased capacity at various levels to address the Basin's environmental problems, and public education and awareness programs and training at regional, national and local levels. The public education and awareness programs were successful, with having several lessons addressed through various workshops scheduled. One concern was that the message of the workshops did not respond to the diversity of the countries.

3) Data and Knowledge Management Component (Bank)-- aimed to:

(i) build a partnership to manage land and water data at the Basin level

(ii) identify the institutional modalities for improved data collection, compatibility, processing, dissemination for decision-makers, sharing, exchange and monitoring in all nine countries

(iii) conduct training at local, national and regional levels

(iv) develop a framework for an Environmental Information System (EIS)

(iv) supplement a basin-wide economic model with an environmental dimension

The project has led to improved knowledge base and data sharing at the Basin level such as the hydrological and economic models that were used for decision making. This has led to changes in government policy. "A shared framework for

land and water data, and Basin degradation indicators is adopted, a Basin-wide Environmental Information System is being established and basin-wide land and water data are generated for the proposed SDAP economic model."

4) Regional Forum Component (UNDP)-- aimed to exchange lessons and good practices Sub-Saharan Africa, expand on IW, learn and organize a regional study tour and a Regional Forum to strengthen the relationship with existing Pan-African and international networks of Basin Organizations. The planned activities were (1) workshops to share lessons learned, (2) study tours to visit other International Waters projects, and (3) the publication and dissemination of reports on best practices and lessons learned. National teams organized workshops to review and learn from the implementation of the project including components 2 and 5. The workshops were held in late 2010 and early 2011. The TE does not provide any concrete evidence on the effectiveness of this component, but generally states, "Exchanged good management practices with other regional lake and river basin programs, and defined processes and practices to minimize land and water degradation, and support environmental conservation and sustainable development."

5) Demonstration Pilots and Micro-grant Program Component (UNDP)-- This component tried to assist communities in tackling local environmental issues to improve livelihood. It was one of the more successful aspects of the UNDP involvement, even though much of the success came through the work of local stakeholders, as 33 LCMCs were made operational, 7 out of the 9 PDPs were satisfactorily achieved, and 108 successful micro-grant supported interventions were financed. However, there were some financing delays that affected the overall impact.

6) TDA and SAP Preparation Component (WB)-- This was achieved as the regional and national TDAs were completed and validated in an inclusive process at national and regional levels in 2009. "The nine national action plans were completed in 2010, while the SAP was validated at a regional workshop (August 2010), prior to endorsement by the 29th Council of Ministers of NBA (CoM) in November 2010. The CoM issued a resolution requesting the NBA to ensure that the SAP is mainstreamed in the SDAP and IP in a timely manner."

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

As mentioned in the WB TE, the operational and project management costs of the project were high due to the project's focus on institutional strengthening and the high operational costs of travel, field visits, workshops, meetings and communications between the nine member countries. There were some synergies, such as combined traveling to field site between members of different organizations, that justify the rating of MS.

Below are some efficiency concerns highlighted in the terminal evaluation.

- Because there were two different organizations involved in the project, the roles and responsibilities were sometimes unclear. Additionally, there were delays in funding

because of a lack of coordination, which decreased efficiency. Some PDPs did not receive money in time which resulted in the start date being postponed.

- The project documents in English and French have significant differences, which often led to confusion. Additional time and funds needed to translate documents reduced efficiency. While this was mentioned as an inefficiency in the TE, due to many of the countries being French speaking, this might be unavoidable, as a lack of translation would have resulted in additional problems. The extent to which translating documents reduces efficiency is not clearly demarcated and is open to subjectivity.
- Location concerns and project related travel has demonstrated inefficiencies. The remoteness of sites from the capital (NPT headquarters), has led to significant costs for the services provided and thus decreased efficiency.

#### 5.4. Sustainability – Low/Moderate Risks

There is institutional stability due to the existence of NBA (Niger Basin Authority). The NBA was one of the main executing agencies and has retained its strength as a convening source at the projects end. According to the WB TE, "NBA is also now ready for the next level of capacity building dealing with the increase resilience of the Basin to climate variability and change". The Bank is working jointly with the NBA on the climate risk management of the SDAP and the IP, which focuses on how the SDAP and IP activities are resilient to climate variability and change. The NBO will continue to be strengthened via funding from AFD, EU, CIDA, and GIZ. About \$8 billion USD of funding has been secured. Also, the micro-grant projects have "carried out actions that are still visible" and it is suggested that impact and sustainability are likely.

## 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?

There is limited information on the exact use of the co-financing funds and how essential they were to the achievement of GEF objectives. One note made in the terminal evaluations was that funding was provided fairly equally to the 9 countries involved in the project, despite the varying requirements; it was recommended by the evaluator that it make be more effective to determine the funding needs by country instead to assuming equivalent needs per recipient. The process of funds channeling through 2 different agencies, the WB and UNDP, led to confusion and delays in project implementation-- especially to PDPs. Financing from other agencies will continue to play an important role in the sustainability of the NBO as AFD, EU, CIDA, and GIZ have all pledged funds.

According to the project appraisal document, "The Project's co-financing funds, both of in-kind counterpart contributions and donor-supported parallel funds as they contribute

to the Project components, are indicative of the on-going Project activities to contribute to the GEF Project."

- 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?

By the end of the project, the French Cooperation Agency had increased its co-financing by \$15.54 million USD from endorsement. Most other agencies dedicated their pledged amounts, or very close to it (see Annex 1, WB TE for the breakdown).

## 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 WB components of the project were completed 18 months after the estimated date at the start of implementation (2/28/11 instead of 8/31/2009), due to activities not being completed in time. An extension to allow the final SAP document to be endorsed by the 29th Council of Ministers meeting in Nov 2010 was granted. Also the last 6-month extension of the WB component was due to the fact that the SAP was to be submitted to the CoM for endorsement and hence the NBA had to wait for the CoM to take place.

According to the WB TE, the UNDP had also extended its closing date till December 2011 to provide sufficient time to organize the regional forum (held in June 2011), and to support the NBA in (i) mainstreaming the SAP in the SDAP and (ii) funding some key activities of the SAP (through the preparation of a follow up GEF project).

Delays in disbursement resulted in delayed implementation of the PDPs.

Resignations of officials and remoteness of the sites have been quoted as reasons for inefficiencies: "There have been a number of resignations over the years, in the NBA and in the countries, and a change of personnel at UNDP (regional officer) and UNOPS. The lack of continuity may well be an efficiency constraint of RLWDT."

The delays do not seem to have affected the project outcomes or sustainability, rather some of the extensions were made to strengthen the project and completed the initial goals.

## 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:

Nine different countries were involved in this project, to varying degrees. Country ownership has been significant, as evidenced by the continuous participation in the regional and national planning for the project. According to the terminal evaluation, "Annual work plans were validated each year in August at the Regional Steering Committee (RSC) and National Steering Committee (NSC) levels, and then adopted by the subsequent CoM meetings, indicating the countries' keen interest in the project at a high political level." Governmental budget planning requirements, imposed reductions in means and goods, weak organization, and insufficient funding, which initially delayed project achievements at the local level, also affected performance of National Project Teams (NPTs) and Local Coordination and Monitoring Committees (LCMCs) in assisting local Community Based Organizations (CBOs). The TE rated Government Performance as Moderately Satisfactory, but acknowledges the important role country ownership plays in project outcomes and sustainability. Because of the diversity of the countries involved on the project, it is hard to assess country ownership for each of the nine countries based on the information provided in the TE.

## **7. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system**

### **7.1. M&E design at entry – Moderately Satisfactory**

M&E expectations were laid out in the Project Appraisal Document (for CEO Endorsement). As per the appraisal document, "The NBA/PMCU will prepare an annual work plan at the same time as the annual procurement plan and include monitoring and evaluation criteria for activity performance which comply with M&E procedures that follow the IAs' institutional guidelines. The NBA will report to UNDP and the World Bank, who will evaluate and review Project progress according to their institutional requirements." Since the proposal did not discuss or suggest a unified terminal evaluation, the rating of MS has been given.

### **7.2. M&E implementation – Moderately Satisfactory**

M&E plan implementation could have been improved. One of the independent evaluation review reports that the regional specialist recruited for M&E of the project (one of the six shared experts between the project and the AfDB funded project) did not make supervision missions. Based on the UNDP terminal evaluation, there were very few components under monitoring that were recorded and could be used for the evaluation. One success, however, has been that the Niger Basin Observatory monitors hydrological status and is expected to monitor the remaining 28 indicators that have been identified and validated at the Basin level under component 3.

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

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



### 8.2. *Overall Quality of Implementation* - **Moderately Satisfactory**

There were 6 components of the project - split between the WB and UNDP (see effectiveness section for more details). Overall, based on evidence provided in the respective terminal evaluations, the WB components focused on macro level issues, while the UNDP components balanced out the local level implementation and execution. For example, most of the WB components dealt at the national level and focused on capacity building and leveraging the NBA. The UNDP, on the other hand, oversaw the public awareness component and the PDP project. Also, while this was a joint project, there was no joint document at the design phase. The focus on results, while mentioned in the project design, was not closely monitored throughout the project. There was nothing to suggest an incorrect assessment on the quality of risk management, candor, and realism in supervision reporting.

The evaluators gave the project a Moderately Satisfactory rating, which seems reasonable.

### 8.3. *Overall Quality of Execution* - **Moderately Satisfactory**

The main executing agency in this case would be the NBA. The NBA existed prior to the start of this project, but its ability to convene stakeholders and improve impact was enhanced during this time-period. There were several workshops held, and the NBA was able to garner input from all 9 countries involved in the project. There are no significant areas of concern, however, the NBA will be expected to continue the work that has begun.

The micro-grant projects supported by the UNDP component seemed to be quite successful and one recommendation was to increase funds to that area of the project. It used to local stakeholders that contributed to its success.

## 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?	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	The terminal evaluation written for the World Bank components has a different standard than the one presented for the UNDP components. It seems that WB was more involved with the impact side of the project, and therefore the TE was more substantive. The TE for UNDP did address the 5 components separately and the combination of both reports discussing relevant outcomes and impacts deserves a Moderately Satisfactory rating.
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	<p>The report summarizes a 6-year project that had components in 9 different countries. Understandably the report is unable to capture all the details of the project and must assess many of the components at a macro-level. However, the terminal evaluations do use examples from the local context to substantiate their arguments. No major evidence gaps are apparent.</p> <p>The World Bank TE rates the M&amp;E as MS. The justification from the WB TE was that M&amp;E was not as strong of a focus at the time of project creation as it typically is now. Therefore, the rating of Mostly Satisfactory given by the WB's TE seems a bit optimistic. The assessment of the project's M&amp;E systems in the UNDP's TE points out several weaknesses in the M&amp;E system. According to the UNDP's TE, "The M &amp; E plan should have been developed, specified and updated, with indicators along the lines of the GEF." Other than the M&amp;E section, the IA ratings seem to be substantiated.</p>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>	The TEs did not discuss project sustainability or exit strategy in specific detail. It simply address the fact that the NBA is still available, and strengthened, and that several of the impacts of the PDPs are likely to continue.
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	<b>Satisfactory</b>	Clearly identified and presented, but could be deeper in terms of how these lessons can be applied to future projects.
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	<b>Satisfactory</b>	The WB TE clearly communicates this, however, the UNDP TE does not.
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	<b>Satisfactory</b>	The reports provide satisfactory detail on the M&E system. It addresses indicator 2, which talks about establishing an institutional and management system. Pages 9-11 in the WB TE and pages 18-21 in the UNDP go into detail about the M&E systems.

## 10. Other issues to follow up on - No

## 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 Regional Forum mission, supported by the UNDP, facilitated the exchange of lessons and good practices. These included: (1) workshops to share lessons learned, (2) study tours to visit other International Waters projects, and (3) the publication and dissemination of reports on best practices and lessons learned. The effect of these activities are difficult to ascertain.

Additionally, in the context of the SDAP, several hydrological and economic models of the Niger Basin were developed and used for decision making.

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

Yes

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

Yes, the hydrological and economic models were used for decision making. According to the WB TE, "The results of the models allowed the Niger CoM meeting to choose a specific development scenario and the Heads of State Summit, in April 2008, approved the investment program (IP) related to this specific development scenario. Without the modeling it would have proven difficult to compare and justify the choice of one of the nine potential development scenarios. The modeling allowed to have specific results in terms of impacts (on the inner delta (wetland in Mali), reduction of flow in the river, etc), and benefits (job creation, higher economic return, higher rice production, 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?

An online data catalogue (<http://geopertoire.abn.ne/>) with information on biophysical and socio-economic indicators were completed in 2009 and endorsed at the regional level. Access to this website is hampered by local electricity and server maintenance problems.

An EIS framework prototype is available, but the follow up on the EIS continues to be funded under a separate FFEM project. The prototype EIS is on-line ([www.sie.abn.ne](http://www.sie.abn.ne)) and covers 28 priority indicators. IT infrastructure has been provided for the NBO, but local electricity and server maintenance problems also affects access.

The NBO supplemented the existing basin-wide economic model with an environmental dimension as part of the river basin system model developed in 2007 for the SDAP. The NBO training on the integration of environmental aspects in the Basin's economic model has been conducted in the context of the SDAP.

Is there evidence that these outputs were used?

Yes

TO WHAT EXTENT HAVE THESE OUTPUTS BEEN USED?

WHAT HAS RESULTED FROM INFORMATION BEING MADE ACCESSIBLE TO OTHERS?

As discussed above, the outputs from the models were used to expand knowledge for appropriate development decisions at the Basin level. The project activities also contributed to the capacity building of the Niger Basin Observatory. The strengthened credibility seems to have led to stronger collaboration and yielded "to the development of a sustainable strategic action plan and a 20-year investment program for the Niger Basin for an amount of US\$8 billion."

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

Yes

WHAT ACTIVITIES CONTRIBUTED TO AWARENESS AND KNOWLEDGE BEING RAISED?

According to the completion report, 69 workshops were held (but only 44 have been confirmed through the reports provided by PMCU).

At the regional level, the following activities were carried out:

- Production and distribution of pamphlets on the NBA / RLWDT;
- Production of a documentary film about the state of the basin in the 9 countries
- Training on management (such as results oriented management)

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

No

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

None reported

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

UA

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

It seems possible that there were some technical/environmental management skills being built, but it is not documented in the TE and it is unclear exactly what the workshops discussed.

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

No

HOW HAVE THESE SKILLS BEEN APPLIED BY THE PEOPLE TRAINED?

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

Yes

Were these adopted?

No

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

The regional and national TDAs were completed and validated in an inclusive process at national and regional levels in 2009. As previously quoted, "The nine national action plans were completed in 2010, while the SAP was validated at a regional workshop (August 2010), prior to endorsement by the 29th Council of Ministers of NBA (CoM) in November 2010. The CoM issued a resolution requesting the NBA to ensure that the SAP is mainstreamed in the SDAP and IP in a timely manner."

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

No

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

NA

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

The NBA existed prior to the project, but the project strengthened collaboration and dialogue between the NBA and the member countries. This was the first project the NBA led that involved all 9 Niger Basin countries.

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?

Yes

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

The Niger Basin, through the cooperation of the 9 member countries and NBO, developed a 20-year investment program at the highest political level (i.e. Heads of State and Government), which has been accepted and includes \$8 billion USD of additional funding to flow to this region.

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?

As described previously, the project strengthened the collaboration and trust between the NBA and the 9 member countries through the adoption of the Shared Vision process.

As a part of Component 2, Capacity Building and Public Awareness, a film documentary and brochures on the NBA and the status of the Basin's land and water resources were produced. Consultation meetings, workshops on conflict prevention and resolution of IWRM related issues, as well as public debates and radio talks were conducted.

Did the project contribute to any of the following:

Technologies & Approaches

No

Please specify what was contributed:

Implementing Mechanisms/Bodies  
Financial Mechanisms

No
No


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

No
----

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?

No
----

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?

No
----

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?

No
----

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?

Combination
-------------

<--dropdown menu

If "combination", then of which types?

Institutional Capacity (governance)
-------------------------------------

&

Knowledge & Information
-------------------------

<--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? No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local  Intended (local)  Unintended (local)

Systemic  Intended (systemic)  Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?  Measured  Anecdotal

Was there a change in environmental status? No

If so, at what scales?

Please mark 'x' for all that apply

Local  Intended (local)  Unintended (local)

Systemic  Intended (systemic)  Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?  Measured  Anecdotal

Evidence of intended stress reduction achieved at the **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.

Evidence shows that impact monitoring was poor. The TE on the UNDP components says, "Many national teams have noticed the lack of field monitoring by UNDP". UNOPS was not able to, according to the TE, monitor field activities and therefore monitor the project's impact.

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

Not specified, but the TE generally marks them as low.

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.

Unclear as to the M&E responsibilities given to the NBA and member countries.

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

No

Has the monitoring data been used for management?

No

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

Has the data been made accessible to the public?

UA

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



*“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

Local     Intended (local)     Unintended (local)

Systemic     Intended (systemic)     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

Local     Intended (local)     Unintended (local)

Systemic     Intended (systemic)     Unintended (systemic)

How was the information obtained?     Measured     Anecdotal

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

Several PDPs contributed to positive socio-economic impact at the local level. One example cited in the UNDP's TE is the PDP in Cameroon: The PDP Cameroon is “improving techniques and cultural practices for irrigated land” using essentially the use of compost. The mission observed the proper functioning of compost pits in two fields and the satisfaction of both owners met. There appears to be good efficiency at this level, and good socio-economic impact in terms of actual increase in rice production, and income level of farmers, are noted."

Another example mentioned is that of PDP in Niger, although it is not a driver of socioeconomic impact today, it was a destination for foreign tourists in the early stages of the project. That tourism drove positive socioeconomic impact, but has since been lost.

Generally speaking, the Niger River is socioeconomically important to about 110 million people living in the Basin, and so some indirect benefits might have occurred that are not directly visible. It does highlight the importance of the project as a potential stimulate to economic activity.

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

According to the TE, the GEF and respective agencies should be more realistic in their expectations from projects, and should take into account low capacities of the recipients. According to terminal evaluation "The project implemented many broadly scattered activities in nine countries at multiple institutional levels, compounded by the strongly centralized and cumbersome disbursement procedures for grass-root level activities."

The evaluators (that conducted the terminal evaluation) had concerns that the process of sharing costs between agencies should be careful not to hinder the progress of the project. In regards to staff, different benefits among institutions resulted in staff with different level of salaries and benefits, which created some tension during the implementation. "It is recommended hence that either one partner funds all the positions or ensuring that the same benefits are provided across development partners." To save on cost, joint supervisions (with personnel from other agencies) were conducted.

The GEF-SGP was significantly more efficient than RLWDT. "Possible future support of GEF to NBA micro-projects should comply with the set-up planned in 2006, in order to improve efficiency."

Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The detailed recommendations can be found on pgs. 43-45 of the UNDP TE. The WB TE did not provide any specific recommendations. Below is a summary

- \*Develop a concept that takes into account the social, political and environmental dynamics in member countries, and takes into consideration all support provided to member countries in the reversal of trends in land and water degradation, at regional and country level.
- \*Encourage more focus on funding and publication of innovative results, such as those from the micro-grant projects. However, it should not play the role of a research and development agency.
- \*The mission strongly recommends avoiding the dichotomy of RLWDT.
- \*The micro-grant projects should be anchored in the GEF SGP units to ensure efficiency.
- \*More robust communication component, and stronger M&E framework and systems-- with archiving.
- \*Gender issues should be on the agenda.
- \*Financial support aiming at equality between the nine member countries may be diplomatic but is be misguided in terms of efficiency. Targeted support is recommended.
- \*Produce documents and reports in one language to improve efficiency.