

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:	1325		Review date:	12/18/07
IA/EA Project ID:	PMIS 1276	GEF financing:	<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Institutional Strengthening and Resource Mobilization for Mainstreaming Integrated Land and Water Management Approaches into Development Programs in Africa	IA/EA own:	1.0	UA
		Government:		
		Other*:		
Country:	Madagascar, Niger, Ethiopia	Total Cofinancing	0.3	UA
Operational Program:	12	Total Project Cost:	1.3	UA
IA:	WB	Dates		
Partners involved:	-	Work Program date		
		CEO Endorsement		07/31/01
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		03/20/03
		Closing Date	Proposed: March 2006	Actual: Feb 2008
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 59 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 23 months
Author of TE: Samuel G. Wedderburn		TE completion date: 04/02/07	TE submission date to GEF OME: 04/02/07	Difference between TE completion and submission date: No difference

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

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	S	-	-	UA
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	-	-	UA
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	-	-	-	UA
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	HU

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

No. The TE available for review pertains only to the activities carried out in Niger as part of this project, specifically the activities in the Goroual and Dogol River Basin. Therefore, there is no information on the achievement of objectives, impacts, sustainability, replicability and M&E of this regional project as a whole. In addition, the PIR 2006 for this project that was available for review only contains information about the

Demonstration Phase of the ALWI project in Madagascar (Integrated Land and Water Management in Anjevy).
Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? UA

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the Project Brief, the Global Environmental Objective of this project is to support institutional strengthening and prepare the groundwork for investments under the African Land and Water Initiative (ALWI) in the contexts of the respective countries'/sub-regions/regional development programs, the CCD, the CBD and other relevant financing instruments.

Unable to assess if there were any changes during implementation.

- **What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to the Project Brief, the development objectives for this project are:

- Develop a credible monitoring and evaluation (M&E) methodology to track and document ALWI performance and impacts;
- Compile and disseminate Best Management Practices (including policies) in community-based integrated land and water management at selected 5 sites;
- Formulate guidelines to incrementally manage basin/sub-basin issues in the selected sites;
- Compile and synthesize natural resource management data and develop diagnostic principles of basin/sub-basin management in the selected sites;
- Develop mechanisms for effective stakeholder participation in integrated land and water management in the targeted areas;
- Capacity building at basin/watershed, country, and community levels in the targeted areas;
- Develop mechanisms for awareness raising, partnerships and operational networking within and between the selected sites;
- Catalyze resource mobilization from donors, governments and private sector for further program implementation (expansion phase) for the 5 sites.

Unable to assess if there were any changes during implementation.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What major project outcomes and impacts are described in the TE?**

Unable to assess.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

A Relevance	Rating: S
Land and Water management feature high in the African rural and environment strategies, thus explaining the interest and commitment of these countries. In addition, the project would make direct linkages to, contribute towards the effective implementation of, and be supported by the respective National Biodiversity Strategies and Action Plans (NBSAPs), National Environmental Action Plans (NEAPs), agriculture and food policy programs, Poverty Reduction Strategy Papers (PRSPs) and National Poverty Eradication Plans (NPEPs), and national, sub-regional and regional action plans (NAPs, SRAPs, and RAPs) to combat desertification	
B Effectiveness	Rating: UA
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: UA

4.1.2 Impacts

-

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

A Financial resources	Rating: UA
B Socio political	Rating: UA
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: UA
D Environmental	Rating: UA

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good Unable to assess
b. Demonstration Unable to assess
c. Replication Unable to assess
d. Scaling up Unable to assess

4.4 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

A. M&E design at Entry	Rating (six point scale): U
Indicators were identified for project objectives and outcomes but no baselines were identified and few targets were specified. Because the ALWI is a long term program of which this MSP is just an initial part, a Steering Committee was created to carry out long term oversight and co-ordination. Supervision activities would include data on performance indicators, a mid-term review, a description and analysis of stakeholder participation in the project design and implementation and an explanation of how the monitoring and evaluation results will be used to adjust the implementation of the project, if required, and/or to replicate project results to other sites during the expansion phase of the ALWI.	
B. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): UA
The TE does not address this issue.	
C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?	
According to the Project Brief \$145,000 were budgeted for project management and \$175,000 for meetings and workshops of all the 5 intervention areas to disseminate experiences, exchange lessons, learn from each other and obtain feedback.	
C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?	
Unable to assess	
C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?	
Unable to assess	

4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?
No lessons mentioned.
List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation
No recommendations given.

4.6 Quality of the evaluation report Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.	
-	
4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings

<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives? This TE only presents an assessment of outcomes in Niger, not of the project as a whole.</p>	<p>HU</p>
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated? Evidence presented only pertains to activities carried out in Niger.</p>	<p>HU</p>
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? No information on project sustainability is included.</p>	<p>HU</p>
<p>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? Lessons</p>	<p>HU</p>
<p>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? No information on project costs is included.</p>	<p>HU</p>
<p>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems? No assessment of project M&E systems is included.</p>	<p>HU</p>

4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<p>Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. 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, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?</p>
<p>Unable to assess</p>
<p>Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?</p>
<p>Unable to assess</p>

4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended? Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

<p>Yes: X</p>	<p>No:</p>
----------------------	-------------------

Explain: The analysis provided in the TE does not refer to the regional project as a whole, but only provides information on the implementation of activities in Niger.

4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)

<p>Project Brief, PIR 2006</p>
