

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1152	
GEF Agency project ID		GEF 01	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Biodiversity Conservation and Participatory Sustainable Management of Natural Resources in the Inner Niger Delta and its Transition Areas, Mopti Region	
Country/Countries		Mali	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP1- Arid and Semi-arid zone ecosystems OP2- Coastal, Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems OP12- Integrated Ecosystem Management OP13- Conservation and Sustainable Use of biological Diversity Important to Agriculture OP15- Operational Program on Sustainable Land Management	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture Ministry of Environment and Sanitation	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		secondary executing agency	
Private sector involvement		secondary executing agency	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		3/10/2005	
Effectiveness date / project start		1/25/2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		3/31/2013	
Actual date of project completion		7/31/2013	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.33	0.33
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		6.0	6.0
Co-financing	IA own	11.93	4.93
	Government	1.66	1.02
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		6.33	6.33
Total Co-financing		13.59	5.95
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		19.91	12.28
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		12/2013	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Alain Onibon	
TER completion date		01/16/2015	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	

TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Joshua Schneck
---------------------------------------	----------------

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	N/A	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	N/A	N/A	UA
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
Quality of Execution	N/A	MS	N/A	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			N/A	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective, as stated in the Project Document (PD), is the integrated and participatory restoration, conservation, and management of the ecosystems and natural resources of the Inland Delta of the Niger River and flood recession areas surrounding it (called transition zones) in Mali. The project will include the in-situ conservation of the ecosystems of threatened sites of global significance, the natural resources management, and the development of sustainable agro-sylvo-pastoral and fish production systems, including the exploitation of agro-biodiversity. In addition to biodiversity conservation, the project will contribute to achieving global environmental objectives with respect to international waters, soil degradation and carbon sequestration (PD, pg.73).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

This project has been designed to complement and enhance the second and third phases of SADeF (the IFAD-financed Sahelian Area Development Fund), and has a duration of 6 years to cover the entire period of SADeF's activities in the Mopti Region. The SADeF program was launched in 1999 for a ten-year period and aimed at establishing, in three phases, a participatory and sustainable development process for the Sahelian regions of Mali. Its overall objective was to reduce poverty by improving incomes and living conditions for rural households, in particular by providing access to health services, education and food security (PD, pg.1).

This GEF project aims at implementing an "improved" SADeF programme, incorporating the activities relating to ecosystem and natural resources management. The improved SADeF programme is designed both to deal with the immediate socio-economic needs of the local population and the longer-term challenges of sustainable ecosystem conservation/ management by and for the communities that depend on them (PD, pg.73). The PD states that the overall objective of the GEF resources is *"the restoration, conservation and sustainable management of the ecosystems and their biodiversity in the Inner Delta of the Niger River and its transition zones."* (PD, pg 2).

PD states that GEF resources would be used primarily under Components 1 and 3 of the SADeF program, as defined below:

Component 1: Capacity building and institutional strengthening in integrated ecosystem and sustainable natural resources management:

- strengthen the organizational, technical and financial capacities of the full-range of stakeholders (national, regional and local levels) in integrated ecosystem and natural resources management. Training and capacity-building at the local level will be given particular emphasis to ensure the participation of the local and indigenous groups in the design and implementation of the project site/ecosystem action plans and the management and monitoring of the activities that promote biodiversity conservation and sustainable use;
- support the Government of Mali's decentralization process in the area of environmental management and biodiversity conservation through the preparation of Community Environmental Action Plans (PCAEs) for incorporation into the Community Development Plans (PDCs); and
- create an enabling policy and regulatory environment and promote the incorporation of sustainable natural resource management and biodiversity considerations into sectoral plans and policies.

Component 3. Sustainable Natural Resources Management and Biodiversity Conservation:

- Restoration and development of the agro-sylvo-pastoral and fisheries potential through integrated natural resources management and biodiversity conservation;
- Community-based conservation and management of biodiversity at the most threatened ecosystems (hotspots) of national and global importance; and
- Establishment of a monitoring and evaluation system on the state of biodiversity and natural resources of the Inner Niger Delta

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

Some changes in project components are evident between the PD to the terminal evaluation report. In the PD there are 5 components:

1. Capacity Building
2. Support for Local Development
3. Sustainable Natural Resources Management and Biodiversity Conservation
4. Support to decentralised financial services.
5. Project Management

While in the TE there are only 4 components:

1. Capacity Building
2. Support to decentralized Financial Services
3. Support to Local Development/Sustainable Management of the Natural Resources
4. Project Management

There is no explanation given in the TE and/or the PIR to why components were modified. It seems that Component 4 of the PD became component 2 of the TE, and components 2 and 3 of the PD were merged into component 3 of the TE.

According to the PD, GEF financial support was to go to Component 1 and 3 (PD, p.30) of the FODESA Phase 3 project. The PD also states that “the GEF activities would support participatory diagnostic [...]” which is linked to component 4 “Support to Decentralized Financial Services” (PD, pg.39) but “No GEF increment is foreseen is support of this component” (PD, pg.41). GEF support was also to go to Component 5 “project management”.

However, as shown in the “effective costs” table of the TE (p.7), the GEF funds went to Component 3 and Component 4 “Project management”. Therefore there was a change in implementation in use of GEF funding: there has been no funding for component 1 as initially expected. No explanation is given in the TE or PIRs.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The TE assesses a satisfactory rating to project Relevance and this TER concurs.

According to the PD (pg.4), Mali ratified the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) on 30 September 1992, the Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD) on 31 October 1995, and the Convention on Climate Change (FCCC) on 28 December 1994. The Ramsar Convention on Wetlands came into force in Mali on 25 September 1997. The project contributes to national efforts to implement the CBD in that it promotes capacity-building, conservation and sustainable use of natural resources through adaptive management of grassland landscapes, and supports the agricultural biodiversity work programme and the knowledge, innovations and practices of local and indigenous communities.

GEF’s intervention in the Mopti region aims at restoring, conserving and managing in a sustainable manner the biological resources and complex ecosystems located both in aquatic (freshwater) and in arid/semi-arid zones. Therefore, this project complies with the GEF focal area for biodiversity conservation and addresses the priorities of GEF Operational Programmes 1 (arid and semi-arid ecosystems) and 2 (coastal, marine and freshwater ecosystems). The project combines productive and socio-economic goals and that of combating land degradation and conserving biological diversity. The

project also contributes to the attainment of objectives of Operational Programme 13 (conservation and sustainable use of agricultural biodiversity), as well as to the achievement of the goals on the GEF Operational Programme 15, aimed at combating land degradation through sustainable land management. The GEF intervention in Mopti also contributes to the objectives of other focal areas: sustainable land management, international waters, and climate change.

The project complies with the GEF Strategic Priorities for the Focal Area of Biodiversity, especially priority 2: Mainstreaming Biodiversity in the Production Landscapes and Sectors. One of the main activities of the project is to develop and implement demonstration activities with a high replication value. The project also promotes the goals of Strategic Priority 1 Catalyzing Sustainability of Protected Areas.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
--------------------------	----------------------

The TE assesses a satisfactory rating to project Effectiveness and this TER concurs.

According to the TE, the project has delivered tangible and good results for people and ecosystems. Overall, it was successful in making a strong case for linkages between environmental sustainability and income generation. The project benefited a total population estimated at 57,000 people (farmers, herders, and fishers). Women represent 49% of the beneficiaries. Through their local organizations, these different categories of beneficiaries expressed their needs and they successfully led the design and exploitation of their productive, community relations, and / or natural resource management micro-projects.

GEF support was to go to Components 1 and 3, however as mentioned above it did not go to Component 1. Therefore, only component 3 results are assessed.

The targets for component 3 are set forth in the logical framework in the Annexes of the PD (p. 21-23).

The achievements of the project are as follow:

- At the end of the project, there were 19 PCAE/NRM plans developed and adopted by Committees set up at local level and integrated into PDC (vs.20 planned in the PD logframe).
- The project restored 2044 ha of bourgou pastures and 7376 ha of doumeraie and flooded forest (vs. 1300ha and 1250ha respectively stated in the logframe).
- There were also 18.26 ha of local varieties of vegetation (biodiversity restoration) re-introduced (vs. 800ha planned in the logframe).
- 901.23 ha were restored against erosion (vs. 750ha planned in the logframe)
- 50 technical agents were trained (vs.40 planned)
- 2107 community stakeholders trained (vs. 4000 planned)

Another target was the quantification of the number and spatial distribution of water birds (crown crane, purple heron, cormorant), fish (tilapia, clarias) and mammals (manatees, hippopotami, gazelles) and an annual increasing trend of 5% as from Year 2 is targeted for the population of water birds, fishes and mammals. 127 465 water birds were quantified (15 415 in Lac Korientzé, 87 111 in Debo, and 24 939

in Walado), 32 hippopotamus were quantified (9 in Debot amount, 11 in Korientzé area, 12 in Walado Area). However, there is no information on the annual increase of those populations.

Other results that did not have specific targets in the logframe were also achieved:

- 7381 ha of land were restored and/or preserved (closed for protection) by local communities
- 20 socio-community Micro Projects were developed
- 72 local workshops were organized to inform and train participants about Natural Resources management
- 17 conventions were elaborated and endorsed by local stakeholders
- 83 farmers/producers organizations were regularly conducting NRM activities based on joint planning and appropriate management tools
- 16 farmers and 97 fishermen were trained in new technologies
- 49% of women farmers organization benefited from micro project funding.

Overall the project has effectively contributed to the improvement of household living conditions by securing income, access to basic social services, and reducing conflicts over natural resources. It has helped to strengthen the capacity for action and participation of farmers' organizations in local development. And it effectively contributed to improving the management of natural resources and the protection of biodiversity and ecosystems in the Inner Niger Delta (TE, pg.19).

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The TE assesses a Moderately Satisfactory rating to project Efficiency and this TER concurs.

According to the TE, 87% of the funding was disbursed, which is very satisfactory, taking into account the context in which the project has worked since 2011 (the political situation and the war in the north of the country). The structure of program expenditures was as follows (1) micro (production) for beneficiaries 22%; (2) preparation activities (awareness, mobilizing action planning) and support (training, follow-up) 45%; and (3) coordination and program management 33%.

While the empowerment of beneficiaries was important, the TE states that the preparatory and accompanying activities for communities were oversized, which added expenses, while delaying the start of investments. The economic rate of return is estimated at 39%. The bourgou pastures account for 31% of this rate. Moreover, the insecurity generated by the socio-political crisis experienced in the region, disrupted the achievement of the project investments in the Mopti region, and therefore had an impact on the efficiency. The TE believes that the project was also too much focused on process over results and therefore pulled down return rates (TE, pg.18).

There was a delay in the implementation of the agreement with ANICT (National Investment Agency for Local Communities) and the political crisis in the project area in 2012 and 2013 have penalized the funding of some activities (especially the micro-projects activities) (TE, pg.33).

Moreover, according to the TE, there has been a lack of cash planning and a lack of expertise in the development of DRF/DPD (request for fund withdrawal/request for direct payment) which negatively

impacted the mobilization of financial resources from donors and penalized efficiency by limiting the financing of planned investment activities (TE, pg.33).

Finally, the TE states that the project poorly explored the possibilities of co-financing activities with other partners (IMF, other projects, the private sector, etc.), which would have allowed for resource savings and increase the number of achievements (TE, pg.34).

Therefore, the overall efficiency of the project is rated Moderately Satisfactory.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unable to Assess
---------------------------	--------------------------

The TE does not assess a rating for project Sustainability, and this TER finds insufficient information in the TE narrative to assess a sustainability rating.

According to the TE, the project' sustainability is positive in the sense that the beneficiaries appropriated the flagship actions such as the exploitation of market gardens, management of bourgou pastures, plantations of local fruit trees, water conservation and soil. However, the global governance system for the environmental management of the Delta is not yet in place. In the absence of such a system, rational management of natural resources and biodiversity of the Delta ecosystem cannot be ensured. Accompanying measures are needed to strengthen the sustainability of achievements in the environmental field, and it is necessary to complete the installation of environmental information system of the delta (TE, pg 11).

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes are further assessed along the following dimensions:

Financial Sustainability: (Unable to assess)

The TE discusses elements of financial sustainability but does not provide a rating. There is insufficient information in the TE narrative to provide a sub-rating here, although the following points are noted regarding financial risks:

- (1) The enthusiasm of the population for the recovery of potential wood resources is strong, but further financial support is required. Creating eucalyptus plantations with the support of World Agroforestry Centre to counter the lack of firewood as well as regenerating doum palm and palm groves have been highly appreciated by the beneficiary populations. However, further support is needed in order to consolidate and expand on this dynamic.
- (2) The sustainability of the Mopti Regional Association (ARM) was not achieved. This association was responsible for co-steering the project; the State delegated, through an agreement, the implementation of the programme to this association. The ARM had also the role to leverage more funds to continue the project, however this could not happen. The functions of the association and its budget are tied to the project, therefore its sustainability after the programme will be achieved only if further financial support is found.
- (3) The project helped the beneficiaries to increase their income through different activities (market garden plots, cultivation etc.) and according to the TE, the beneficiaries are enthusiastic

and motivated to continue these activities, therefore, the micro-projects are expected to be financially sustainable.

Sociopolitical Sustainability: Moderately Likely

According to the TE, the use of market garden plots will continue, but support will be required for their consolidation and extension. Female beneficiaries have greatly appreciated the impact on their lives and are thus likely to continue supporting these activities..

The regeneration and cultivation of bourgou pastures will most probably continue, and support will allow to accelerate this dynamic because the population believes in the positive impacts of this activity. The activity has expanded rapidly with the strong cooperation of the livestock farmers. Regeneration techniques are well assimilated, and endogenous mechanisms of the community management of these resources seem to work well.

One of the major risk in terms of sociopolitical sustainability, is the political crisis and the war happening in Northern Mali. Therefore, this could harm the sociopolitical sustainability of the project.

Institutional and Governance Sustainability: Moderately Unlikely

The ownership of activities by the beneficiaries is an important factor for sustainability, and the mobilization of stakeholders and their involvement in the process, design, planning, implementation, operation and management of the micro project, and the application of simple techniques and technologies using local materials and traditional knowledge promoted the sustainability of these activities at the technical and institutional levels.

The inter-communal organizations were strengthened and this is an important factor for institutional sustainability.

One of the main risk in terms of institutional sustainability is that the global governance system for the environmental management of the Delta is not yet in place. In the absence of such a system, the rational management of the natural resources and the biodiversity of the ecosystems of the Delta cannot be ensured (TE, pg 11). According to the TE, consideration should be given to providing the Inner Niger Delta with a plan and institutional mechanisms for its implementation.

Environmental Sustainability: (Unable to Assess)

The TE does not assess environmental risks to the sustainability of project outcomes.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

GEF resources were utilized to incorporate natural resource management and biodiversity awareness-raising and training activities into IFAD program strategy (PD, pg.31). Without GEF resources, the SAdEF activities would most likely have continued without any support to natural resources management activities, and may not have been extended to the Mopti region.

SAdEF (IFAD funds), as co-financer for the GEF project, made its contribution for the involvement of the village communities/groups/populations by financing priority social/community micro-projects of a productive nature or natural resources management activities which have been included in the Community Development Plans (TE pg.16).

The budget for this project was as follow (TE, pg.31):

- (1) IFAD : US\$4,9 million, around 40% of the project's costs;
- (2) GEF : US\$6 million, around 48,8% of the project's cost;
- (3) Mali government: \$US1,0 million, around 8,3%;
- (4) Beneficiaries participation: US\$0.3, around 2,7% of project's cost.

There is no specific information in the TE, that says precisely how co-financing was essential to achieve GEF objectives.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. 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 so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

There were some minor delays in the project due in part to the political conditions and the war in the last 2 years of the project (TE, pg.17).

There also was a delay in the implementation of the agreement with the National Investment Agency for Local Communities, a delay in the transfer of funds by the National Department of Agriculture to its Regional Directorate in Mopti, and a delay in launching the investments.

Those slightly affected the implementation, especially the financing of the microprojects.

5.3 Country ownership. 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:

The country ownership was strong, and the investment of the project's stakeholders allowed a satisfactory performance of the project. Local authorities have played a significant role in the strong implementation of the program. After preparing their development plans and their environmental

action plans, they have extracted the priority actions to be funded. Overall, they led effectively the realization of these investments. The Government's performance is also satisfactory at national level and more mixed regionally. The collaboration with the technical services of the State (agriculture and environment) was generally beneficial. However, the TE notes weaknesses in the provision of services (public and private), particularly regarding the empowerment of beneficiaries (TE, pg.20).

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	----------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for Quality of M&E Design at entry. This TER assess a rating of Satisfactory based on the design presented in the PD, and assessment provided in the TE narrative.

As per the PD (pg.42), the M&E design at entry includes monthly and quarterly reporting by the project coordination Unit; and bi-annual progress reporting at commune, circle and national. There will also be external supervision by IFAD, including regular supervision missions twice a year to identify technical implementation as well as financial management and loan disbursement issues; follow-up mission to ensure that recommendations are implemented; IFAD/Government of Mali joint mid-term reviews at the end of each implementation phase; annual project implementation review for GEF; and terminal evaluation.

The PD includes a preliminary plan for M&E that was expected to be completed during the 1st year of the project. In the Annexes of the PD (p. 21 to 23), the logframe is detailed, however, SMART indicators are given only for the 3 main components of the FODESA project. Component 4 “Decentralised Financial Services” (implemented by IFAD) and Component 5 “Coordination and Management” are not described. Annex 4 of the PD, gives a detailed description of the components, of the baseline data (e.g. “A preliminary inventory of potentially manageable sites was undertaken during project formulation” PD Annexes pg. 29), and of the results to be achieved (e.g. “It is expected that 20 communal Environmental Action Plans would be developed and adopted” PD Annexes pg. 29). There is also a detailed planning of the M&E activities in the PD Annexes pg. 49. Finally, Component 5 is entirely dedicated to M&E and coordination therefore there is a budget allocated to this activity.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for Quality of M&E Implementation. This TER assess a rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory based on the assessment provided in the TE narrative. According to the last PIR, the project worked in accordance with its M&E procedures. An M&E software system was

purchased (TE, p.22), an audit of the 2012 financial statements was completed, regular meetings with the project management unit were held, socio-community micro supervision mission, and several supervision missions by IFAD were performed, etc. (PIR, pg.11) However, in the TE or in the PIR, the M&E system was not further developed during implementation as mentioned in the PD.

The TE notes that the M&E system was not able to sufficiently respond to the problems encountered in the implementation nor to the shortcomings in the interventions (TE, pg.11). The support from specialized technical operators was not sufficiently focused on capacity-building of the unions in adapting their business offer to the demand; and in promoting maturity and institutional autonomy. This was due to the lack of a microfinance specialist in the programme coordination, M&E findings could not be taken properly into account.

Moreover, the Steering committee was involved in the orientation and monitoring of the programme, however, the members of this Steering Committee did not participate in the monitoring and supervision missions (TE, pg.41).

The M&E system failed to correct design errors recorded during the project about the structure and functioning of the regional associations (especially the ARM). This is according to the TE, due to insufficient continuity in SADEF monitoring (lack of close monitoring by SADEF's Steering Committee, turnover of the project managers and staff, and the rapid turnover of the CPMs during certain periods, etc.), therefore, the lessons learned were not capitalized on (TE, pg.44), and the sustainability of the project was not ensured .

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	---------------------------------

The TE does not provide a rating for Quality of Project Implementation. This TER assess a rating of Moderately Satisfactory rating based on the assessment provided in the TE narrative. IFAD ensured close supervision of the project but the implementation could have been more successful if the instrument 'Flexible Lending Mechanism' (FLM) had been used more wisely. For example, a review of the status of the regional association could have been initiated earlier. Instead, the same pattern was repeated in the third phase and it was too late to rectify the situation. This FLM approach failed to properly develop the

project and in particular to correct design errors recorded during the project (regional associations). These regional associations (RA) were part of the project objectives to assist communities (associations and/or groups) in assessing, on their own, their needs and identifying microprojects for which they would have to provide a variable contribution in cash and/or in kind to implement them. The State delegated the execution of the programme to those associations.

However, the ability of those RA to operate without the technical and financial support of the programme is weak. The RA are not autonomous in steering the interventions. Moreover, other issues are also recorded in the RA functioning; lack of hierarchical links between the National Association and the Regional and Local Associations; weak human resources in the decision-making and management bodies of the associations; and gaps in intra-and inter-association information. The revision of the design of SADEF to have autonomous RA has not been completed.

According to the TE, this is due to insufficient continuity in SADEF monitoring (lack of close monitoring by SADEF's Steering Committee, turnover of the project managers and staff, and the rapid turnover of the CPMs during certain periods, etc.); therefore, the lessons learned were not capitalized on. (TE, pg.37)

<p>However, the TE notes, that IFAD offered sound recommendations during the project, in particular the transfer of activities related to financial services. SADEF was under the direct supervision of IFAD and supervision missions were carried out regularly. They helped to make useful recommendations for the project, although they have not always been followed by immediate effect. For example, the replacement of the Administrative and Financial expert has taken a long time to materialize and has not resulted in an improvement in the financial management of the project. Supervision missions have insisted on studying the project disengagement terms in 2011 and this useful reflection on the post-project exercise was only completed in 2013. 7.2 Quality of Project Execution</p>	<p>Rating: Moderately Satisfactory</p>
---	--

The TE assesses a rating of Moderately Satisfactory to Quality of Project Execution, and this TER concurs.

The project execution responsibility was shared among several actors. The administrative responsibility was taken by the Ministry of Agriculture. The technical responsibility was taken by the Ministry of environmental and sanitation. The execution was piloted by a National Guidance Committee (NOC), A Regional Association FODESA Mopti (AR-M) and a Regional Executing and Managing Agency (AREG)

The quality of execution from the Ministry was satisfactory at national level, but moderately satisfactory at regional level. The Ministry of Environment and Sanitation through its focal point organized

supervision missions twice a year in the project area. The supervision reports are prepared with recommendations to ensure project success (PIR, pg.13). The government has consistently ensured the provision of national counterpart resources planned in the financing agreements and has allocated additional resources to support the program. Its contribution has been 119% compared to initial plan. Through the establishment of the Steering Committee, the government was involved in the direction and monitoring of the program and encouraged the involvement of other government departments, civil society and the decentralized services of the State. The members of the Steering Committee have actively participated in some missions but not enough in the monitoring and supervision missions (TE, pg.45).

On the other hand, local authorities have played an important role in the execution of the program. After preparing their development plans and their environmental action plans, they have extracted the priority actions to be implemented through this project.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate below that this is indeed the case. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

More details are given in the Annex 7 of the TE.

Reduction of $\frac{3}{4}$ of the smoking wood amount with chorkor furnace. Reduction of the smoking time to 5h30mn for smoking 210 kg of fish instead of 22heures with traditional oven, a time saving of 16h30mn (PIR, pg.6)

Beneficiaries of the project found the return of some species of birds, fish, reptiles and others like hippos who had disappeared; delineation of a enclosure (the development and implementation of local conventions, brigades surveillance) helped to conserve natural resources; enclosure plots are free of bushfires and allow seedlings to grow;

The resilience of farming communities to natural disasters and change has been enhanced through erosion control devices (stony bunds cords, etc.), plowing techniques perpendicular to the slope, improved seeds; building of groups and associations has empower local communities that have conducted agroforestry activities enabling them to mitigate, adapt or prevent the effects of climate change and natural disasters; regeneration bourgou allowed the recovery of degraded lands (PIR, pg.9).

Development and restoration of 2,000 ha of bourgou pastures (1,994 ha in Lake Korientzé) by the Cooperative breeders Korombana. These areas are comparable to restored habitats for birds, fish, insects and amphibians. It

was also noted the appearance of caterpillars promoting improvement in the food chain, the reappearance of rare fish species and endangered Citharinus genres Heterotis, Gymnarchus and bird species such as summer Sarcelles (PIR, pg.9).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

More details for the socio-economic changes are given in the graph of the TE pg.37.

A total of 57000 people were reached by the project.

The main benefits have been increasing income and improving the level of food security through: (1) the increase in cereal production as a result of the recovery of degraded lands; (2) introduction of vegetable production that liberates additional revenue to purchase grain; (3) improving the productivity of livestock due to the access facilitation to fodder for animal feed (Bourgou and pastoral wells) and health services (vaccination parks); (4) supporting the emergence and / or strengthening of income generating activities (fish farming, fish smoking) (PIR. pg.6).

16 masons were trained to chorkor ovens construction.

50 chorkor ovens were built across the three villages and two hundred and fifty trays were distributed to different processors organizations.

125 women were trained in the use of chorkor oven.

Women became members of natural resource management committees of the village increasing the income of women related to the processing and marketing of milk; the contribution of women in the management of household expenses (house building, purchase of food) contributed to their consideration in decision making at the household level; reduction of conflicts at the household level (PIR, pg.9).

Introduction of a system of local governance (Local convention) which all cooperative members have joined (which allowed greater efficiency of the cooperative's activities)

The market gardens have enabled 1620 women to earn, an additional average income estimated at 133,750 CFA (higher than the national average annual income, estimated at about 128,000 FCFA at the time of the formulation). In addition, part of the market garden produced is self-consumed. Thus, these women have improved their status within their households (TE, pg.19).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change.

“Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

There has been a lot of training activities that are directly linked to the increase in economic and living conditions described above (training of women for the utilization of oven, training about some agricultural techniques, training of men to build ovens etc.).

b) Governance

Capacity building for the development of local conventions on natural resources management: 14 local conventions drawn on more than 3505 ha (PIR, pg.4).

Development of community maps of Environmental Action (PSCP) has emerged as a planning tool and linking economic development and preservation of the environment. Better integration of environmental considerations into local planning through the integration of the Commons Plans Environmental Action (PSCP) in Economic Development Plans, Social and Cultural (ICESCR) at 17 towns of the region (PIR, pg.9).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impact are reported in the TE and/or the PIR.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

According to the TE, the Partnership between the local community and basic peasant organization is a guarantee of continuity of any action in terms of local development.

The Existence of a strategy for communication and dissemination of experience has contributed to its extension and replication in other locations.

The Scope of Syn has now become a reference in the delta in agroforestry and the pride of women farmers (PIR, pg.15).

With the support of FIDAFRIQUE and FDI, cap sheets were created on the Management of bourgou pastures and strengthening the resilience of farmers, of fores facilities, and the establishment of woodlots in Ténenkou and Djenne. The integration of the environmental dimension in the local development planning and the Four chorkor, a tool for rationalizing the use of natural resources, are also an example of adoption of GEF initiatives (TE, pg.43).

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The key lessons given in the TE are:

- Poverty can be reduced while restoring the natural resources of unique ecosystems of the Inner Niger Delta
- FODESA highlighted the potential impacts of bourgou cultivation on the population and the local economy.
- the promotion of market gardens (associated with tree crops) also have strong potential impact on food security and household income. It is the same for fish farming and fish smoking.
- the use of the on-demand approach has proven effective in the FODESA but it requires a better balance between the resources for physical achievements and those affected with the preparation and accompaniment to improve the efficiency of the operation
- The project / program must ensure (i) that all contracts or agreements signed with public or private providers, are linked to objectives, consistent results and activities, along with objectively verifiable indicators; and (ii) reporting obligations for the provider, based on indicators and an agreed frequency (accountability).
- The use of decentralized mechanisms in the implementation of investment has strengthened democracy at the base and allowed the realization of collective infrastructure focused on better management of natural resources.
- The involvement of farmers' organizations in the program, rightly regarded as an innovation behind the project, has had mixed results due to a mis-conception in the creation of Regional Associations (TE, pg.49)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

There is no specific recommendations given in the TE. They are mixed with the lessons.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains a thorough assessment of outcomes and project achievements. The impacts are given, and details are given in the annex with specific impacts; environmental, socio-economic etc. The TE, however, does not explain why GEF funds did not support component 1 as expected in the PD.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent. Evidences are presented, and a lot of precise information and data is given. However, some ratings are missing such as quality of implementation.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Elements of sustainability are discussed in the TE but the TE provides no rating for sustainability nor clear assessment.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learnt are supported by the evidences given throughout the report. The TE mentions several times that the lessons learned from previous phases of the programme were not integrated enough in this last phase. Therefore, the TE shows important consideration to draw useful and well-grounded lessons from Phase III of the FODESA project.	MS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The budget and costs are discussed in the TE, however, there is not enough details on the precise amount per activity, per cofinancers, actual vs. planned etc.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E at entry is only briefly assessed in the TE, there is only one sentence, and no specific examples to support the affirmation. M&E implementation, on the other hand, is more thoroughly assessed, especially the lack of involvement of the implementing agency in this activity. However, more details and examples would have been needed to have a complete assessment of the M&E system..	MU
Overall TE Rating		MS

$$0.3*8 + 0.1*(2+4+3+3) = 2.4+1.2 = 3.6$$

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).