

**GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4**

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 1344		Review date: _____		
IA/EA Project ID:		<b>GEF financing:</b>	<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Conservation of Gramineae and Associated Arthropods for Sustainable Agricultural Development in Africa	IA/EA own:	.97	.97
Country:	Regional (Ethiopia, Kenya, Mali)	Government:	.26	.23
		Other*:	1.31	1.31
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	1.56	1.54
Operational Program:	OP1: Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	2.54	2.51
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	International Centre of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE); International Plant Genetics Research Institute; Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization (EARO); Institut d'Economie Rurale (IER), Mali; Hyacinth Crafts, Kisumu, Kenya; Green Development Group, Kisumu, Kenya; The Institute of Biodiversity Conservation and Research, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; The National Herbarium at the University of Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; The Ministry of Agriculture, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia; Crop Plant Genetic Resources Centre, Genebank of Kenya (GBK), Kenya, Agricultural Research Institute; The National Museums of Kenya; East African Herbarium; Environment Liaison Centre International	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		2001 July
		Closing Date	Proposed: 2004 September	Actual: 2006 September
Prepared by: Shaista Ahmed	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 50 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 24 months
Author of TE: Luca Fornasari		TE completion date: November 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: July 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 8 months

\* 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 AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	MS	MS	MS	MS
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	ML	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	MS	MS	MU	MU
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	MU
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	MS

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?

The terminal evaluation report should not be considered good practice for this project because while the report provides sufficient information on project activities and outcomes it does not present it in a coherent manner. The report does not provide sufficient information on the key issues and shortcomings the project faced which lead to varying results among the participating countries.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?

No.

## 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the project document the global environmental objective of the project is:

“To identify and implement conservation and management measures necessary to prevent loss of biodiversity of certain Gramineae and their associated insects, and to conserve these valuable genetic resources in and around agro-ecosystems in Ethiopia, Kenya and Mali for self-regulatory pest management and sustainable agriculture.”

According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the global environmental objectives during the implementation of the project.

**b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

According to the project document the following are the development objectives of the project:

- a. “Diversity, distribution and relationship of grasses and insects in and around selected agro-ecosystems assessed.”
- b. “Wild grasses that may act as reservoirs of key pest and beneficial insects, and those that may protect and promote arthropod diversity identified.”
- c. “Complementary conservation of important grasses and associated arthropods developed and promoted.”
- d. “Best practices and lessons learned on conservation of Gramineae and associated insect diversity made available.”

<p>e. "Capacity and capability of national agricultural research and extension systems and non-governmental organizations in monitoring, protecting, and promoting biodiversity of Gramineae and associated insects strengthened."</p> <p>f. "Public awareness at all levels (including school children, farmers, and the wider scientific community) of the importance and values of biodiversity increased."</p> <p>According to the terminal evaluation report there has been no change in the development objectives during the implementation of the project.</p>				
<b>Overall Environmental Objectives</b>	<b>Project Development Objectives</b>	<b>Project Components</b>		<b>Any other (specify)</b>
<b>c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)</b>				
<b>Original objectives not sufficiently articulated</b>	<b>Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives</b>	<b>Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious</b>	<b>Project was restructured because of lack of progress</b>	<b>Any other (specify)</b>

**4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY**

**4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)**

<b>a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities)</b>
<b>Rating: S</b>
A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:
(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges? The project's outcomes regarding biodiversity conservation and sustainable development are relevant to Ethiopia's sustainable development agenda as articulated in its Conservation strategy, which is part of the overarching national Environmental Policy. Home to a biosphere reserve, nine wildlife reserves, 2 partial reserves and about 100 classified forests, biodiversity conservation is an issue of foremost importance to Mali. According to the project document, Mali's economy is based mainly (86%) on its biodiversity resources. Thus the project's sustainable development goals are of significant importance to Mali's biodiversity-driven economy. Similarly, the project's outcomes are germane to the Kenya's national strategies for biodiversity conservation, sustainable agriculture and food security which the project document indicates are articulated within Kenya's National Environment Action Plan (NEAP).
(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities? According to the project document, three of the four national goals of Kenya's strategic plan for biodiversity conservation relate directly to the project's developmental objectives. The project's outcomes are also relevant to Ethiopia's Environmental Policy as part of its larger, overarching Conservation strategy which focuses on the protection and sustainable use of the country's natural resources. Additionally the project is supported by Ethiopia's Institute of Biodiversity Conservation and Research which was designated by the government to investigate and pursue issues with respect to its national biodiversity conservation agenda. As mentioned before, biodiversity conservation is issue of key interest for Mali. As indicated in the project document, Mali is in the process of elaborating its National Strategy and Plan of Action and has expressed interest in developing "more suitable and adaptive agricultural systems" which will be fostered by the project.
(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate? One of the project's main goals is to integrate conservation of the native Gramineae into traditional farming practices. By integrating the conservation of the Gramineae, the project will integrate sustainable conservation of native grasses into the traditional farming culture. These project's outcomes are in line with the GEF OP1 Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems which focuses on the conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity in dryland ecosystems including grasslands. Additionally one of the main development

objectives of the project focuses on dissemination of the best practices and lessons learned on conservation of Gramineae and associated insect diversity which is in line with SP4 (Generation and dissemination of best practices for addressing current and emerging biodiversity issues) .
(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)
Kenya ratified the CBD – Convention on Biological Diversity in 1994 and also signed and ratified the Convention on Desertification. Ethiopia and Mali have also ratified the CBD. The project will facilitate all three nations in meeting their obligations under the CBD.
A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership <sup>1</sup>
The TE does not provide sufficient information to gauge the level of cooperation amongst the three participating countries.
<b>b. Effectiveness</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Rating: MS</b></span>
<p>According to the TE the project faced many problems that limited its performance and prevented the achievement of the project’s objectives. While the project’s objectives and components were clear and the overall design was scientifically sound the TE reports that the project document was too ambitious. The regional nature of the project made it difficult to complete the desired objectives within the 3 year project timeframe. Also the TE indicates the project required the piloting of activities which were largely experimental. Before the technology could be adopted the necessary research results first needed to be collected and examined. Additionally the project had an “indefinite management structure” and was plagued from a high turnover of staff which contributed to significant delays in implementation of project activities.</p> <p>However, it is important to note that project outcomes differed across Kenya, Mali and Ethiopia due the different situations that were encountered in each region. Kenya achieved the best outcomes of the three countries as it was able to build technical capacity, collect germplasm, document and identify biodiversity of native grasses and associated insects, conduct field studies and identify best agricultural practices and disseminate results. UNEP, as well as the two main executive agencies, the International Center of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) and International Plant Genetic Resource Institute (IPGRI), were headquartered in Nairobi. As result the project may have been better supervised in Kenya, which may have contributed to better results in comparison to the two other countries.</p> <p>Limited results were obtained in Mali due to local administrative problems that delayed the access to funds and the implementation of activities. Additionally droughts in Mali affected the collection of the data on the field. The TE indicates although the results of the tests from grass-rows technology were only partial in Mali “relevant catalytic effects were [still] generated”. The least results were achieved in Ethiopia. The project was prematurely terminated in Ethiopia due to “financial irregularities” and lack of proper execution by the implementing agency.</p>
<b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b> <span style="float: right;"><b>Rating: MU</b></span>
<p>Although two “no-cost” extensions to the project extended the life of the project by two years, not all the project outputs were achieved. Additionally, according to the TE, the distance amongst participating countries was not “adequately” taken in consideration in the project design. In turn this complicated supervision and coordination of project activities and increased the projects costs thus reducing the project’s overall cost-effectiveness.</p> <p>Poor fiscal management reduced the funds available for other activities that had been originally planned. According to the TE, proper financial planning and adherence to the planned budget did not occur as the project lacked a “clear and transparent” budget. This in turn also hampered the effective management of the project across the participating countries. The project also lacked the necessary procedure for UNEP to verify and approve expenses prior to the purchase. This would have aided the UNEP in determining if activities received adequate resources or if expenses exceeded planned budgets.</p>
d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.

<sup>1</sup> Please consider for regional and global project only

From the TE, the project did not result in trade-offs between the environment and development priorities.

**4.1.2 Results / Impacts<sup>2</sup> (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)**

**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= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

<b>a. Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: UA</b>
The TE does not provide sufficient information to properly gauge the future fiscal sustainability of the project outcomes. What is evident from the TE is the budget was not properly managed which could have facilitated the implementation of the project activities.	
<b>b. Socio-economic / political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
According to the TE, the project's existence and its outcomes helped to "sensitize" scientists, research and extension institutions, the general public (more so in Kenya) and as well as policymakers to the importance of conserving Gramineae and their associated insects. The TE reports the project helped to build knowledge and "triggered processes" (the TE doesn't specify which processes) which will help policymakers and institutions to continue the project activities. The TE also mentions that farmers have shown interest in the conservation of the grass species and have to some extent adopted the technology of grass-rows proposed by the project. In Mali farmers recognized the importance of grass species as an effective method to prevent soil erosion and farmers in Kenya showed similar interest in the alternative uses of wild grasses. However, the TE cautions the long-term sustainability of the grass-rows technology requires a change in the attitude of farmers which can only be achieved by integrating grass-rows technology in local farming systems and taking proper measures to engage relevant stakeholders.	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
Farmers have to a certain extent showed interest and some, two communities in Mali and three in Kenya, adopted the grass-rows technology. However the TE indicates for the project outcomes to be sustainable and for the grass-rows technology to be widely adopted requires the direct involvement of local research and "extension" institutions which can provide farmers with information and technical support. According to the TE at least one research institution in Mali has been involved in providing support to local farmers.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: NA</b>
No environmental risks were identified.	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The TE indicates that grass-rows technology is sustainable and easy to implement by farmers and requires little input – other than labor - and utilizes wild grasses that grow naturally in local areas. The risks related to the promoted technology are, therefore, limited.	

**4.3 Catalytic role<sup>3</sup>**

<b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders</b>
According to the TE, the project was able to generate "catalytic effects" on the sustainable and environmentally friendly agricultural practices in the conservation of Gramineae. Recognizing that grass species are effective against soil erosion and has a positive impact on crop yields, farmers in Mali and Kenya have indicated interest in maintaining the protection and continuing the use of grass species beyond

<sup>2</sup> Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

<sup>3</sup> Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

the project's completion. One such example is Mali's Sikasso area where studies similar to those conducted for the project were initiated using wild grasses against rice pests.

While it appears that the project activities may have contributed to catalyzing changes in some stakeholders it is important to note the TE also mentions the level of involvement of the relevant stakeholders in the implementation of the project after the capacity building stage was limited. Although appropriate stakeholders were identified during the project design some were never involved (i.e. IITA) or marginally involved (i.e. Biodiversity International). Thus without the proper level of involvement across relevant institutions and stakeholders, it is difficult to determine to what extent the project's activities have produced incentives to contribute to any 'catalyzing' changes amongst them.

**b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors**

According to the TE the project activities generated information and built institutional capacity particularly in Kenya and Mali which will allow for more informed and better decision-making with regard to the sustainable agriculture and the preservation of biodiversity across agro-ecosystems. The TE asserts the results of this project provide the basis for future actions in the preservation of biodiversity and sustainable agriculture in these two countries.

**c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?**

See 4.3a & b

**d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)**

The TE did not identify any follow-on (catalytic) financing as a result of the project.

**e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?**

The TE did not specify any particular project champions.

**4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.**

**a. Co-financing.** To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The total co-financing that was proposed in the project document was \$1.56 million. According to the TE, the total co-financing that had been received to date was \$1.54 million. Based upon the limited information provided in the TE it is difficult to assess how essential co-financing was to the achievement of GEF objectives.

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

From the outset, delays in the approval and after the approval of the project affected the project's outcomes. The initial proposal for the project was submitted to the GEF in 1995 and the project was approved by the GEF on 30 July 2001. According to the TE, by the time the project was approved the situation, environmentally and personnel-wise, had changed. The significant delay in the project start date led to "less than ideal" conditions for project implementation.

Additionally, after the project's approval the project's implementation was plagued by numerous delays due to the following reasons:

- a) late start-up of the project
- b) overoptimistic project design
- c) originally project was designated to be implemented over 5 years but was shortened to three years
- d) imperfect project design lacking detailed management structure and clear and adequate budget
- e) high turnover of project management and project staff
- f) limited involvement by project by the project coordinator
- g) drought during 2002 which effected Ethiopia and Mali
- h) delayed receipt of funds received by Mali which pushed activities to start one year later

As a result two no-cost extensions to the project extended the project by two years so that the total project was conducted over 5 rather than three years. However, even with these extensions, the TE indicates not all of the activities were completed or the planned objectives were met. A new logframe and a detailed management structure were established to address some of these issues.

**c. 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.<sup>3</sup>

Participating countries have had the opportunity to actively engage in the implementation of the project through the involvement of key institutions such as the Kenyan Agricultural Research Organization (KARI), Mali's Institute of Rural Economy (IER), and the Ethiopian Agricultural Research Organization (EARO). The TE reports that significant communication problems as well as "various administrative shortcomings" between the leading executing agency, the ICIPE and the EARO contributed to escalating problems and the premature termination of the project activities in Ethiopia. However, the TE provides limited information to assess the extent to which country ownership, through the participation of key institutions in Mali and Kenya affected project outcomes and sustainability.

#### 4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE.

<b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): MU</b>
<p>The M&amp;E plan included in the project appraisal document was weakly developed. The M&amp;E plan comprised: a series of quarterly operational reports, half-yearly progress reports on all activities in each country, and a terminal evaluation report. Additionally the M&amp;E plan provided for the implementation of baseline survey within the first year of the project which would be conducted at 6 month intervals until the project's end and be used to obtain feedback on the project's progress. However the project document did not specify a data collection or an analysis system and did not provide a logframe. Most importantly, from the outset the project did not designate funds towards the implementation of M&amp;E activities.</p>	
<b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): MU</b>
<p>According to the TE, the M&amp;E plan in the project document was weak which the TE attributes to the fact GEF requirements were different at the time the project was approved. In 2004, the M&amp;E system was revised which, according to the TE, helped to facilitate the monitoring of the project's results and track the project's progress. The revision of the M&amp;E system led to the establishment of annual reviews, the introduction of a new logframe, and led to the designation of specific management, supervision and reporting responsibilities. Quarterly reports were produced for the first three years of the project however part of the revision to the M&amp;E system led to the reformatting of the quarterly reports which the TE indicates were often incomplete. Additionally the TE indicates the 2002 third quarter evaluation report was never submitted.</p> <p>The lack of an adequate budget for M&amp;E activities also effected the implementation of evaluation and monitoring activities. The TE reports that while the UNEP/DGEF provided guidance for the management structure and for revisions in the M&amp;E system, the TE indicates closer involvement of UNEP in the field and implementation activities in general would have benefited in monitoring the project's outcomes.</p>	
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document? The budget included in the project document does not allocate resources for M&amp;E activities.</p>	
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation? According to the TE, funding for M&amp;E did not appear to be sufficient (especially) during the second half of the project for both the executing and implementing agencies of the project due to the fact the project was extended by two years.</p>	
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? While unplanned, quarterly reports were incomplete and one quarterly report was never submitted which may have made it difficult to respond to project's outstanding issues. However, this is a small weakness in the project's M&amp;E system in consideration of fact the project was medium-sized and originally planned to be completed in three years.</p>	

b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.  
 No. The original M&E system was weak and lacked the proper feedback mechanisms and management structure to monitor the project's progress. Additionally, the M&E system did not receive proper funding from the outset of the project which affected the continuation of M&E activities.

**4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution**

**a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): MU**

**b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): MU**

According to the TE, UNEP provided “useful guidance” especially with regards to the revision of the M&E system and the proposition of a management structure. However, the TE mentions the project could have benefited from UNEP’s closer involvement through field supervision activities. The quality of implementation was also affected by issues beyond the implementing agency itself. The TE claims the project design was “overambitious” and had certain shortcomings such as the lack of an appropriate management structure. Although a management structure was introduced, it was introduced three years after the project began the structure had never really been implemented. As a result the roles and responsibilities of project managers still remained unclear. Also, TE indicates from the outset the project lacked “a clear and adequate budget” which would have facilitated the effective implementation of the activities and would have allowed UNEP to realize if activities received adequate resources. The project was also plagued by a high turnover of staff across partner organizations which contributed to difficulties and delays in the project’s implementation.

**c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>4</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale): MU**

Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency.

According to the project document the project had two main executive agencies, the International Center of Insect Physiology and Ecology (ICIPE) and International Plant Genetic Resource Institute (IPGRI), both headquartered in Nairobi. According to the TE, involvement of IPGRI was very limited. During the five years of the project the agency did not produce any report and the person in charge of the project at the agency changed three times. IPGRI’s involvement faded altogether when the project was reorganized in 2004. One of the participating institutions IITA, International Institute of Tropical Agriculture, mentioned in the project document, was never involved.

The project suffered from a high turnover of staff which according to the TE led to a host of problems: loss of knowledge, lack of project ownership, loss of previously built capacity and also led to delays and difficulty in the project’s implementation. Additionally the management structure was established in 2004, 3 years after the project began.

The quality of execution differed across countries. The coordination and involvement of the executing agencies fared better in Kenya and as a result greater results were achieved. In Ethiopia’s case executing agencies did not properly handle personnel issues which led to serious problems that contributed to the premature termination of the project. While the turnover of staff was high in all of the 3 countries, it was particularly so in Ethiopia. The TE indicates executing agencies failed to identify field sites which were easy to reach and supervise by country coordinators, especially in Mali’s case. According to the TE, the distance discouraged “frequent trips” to field sites and the monitoring of the project’s activities which may have contributed the poor results from the grass-rows experiments in Mali.

**5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

<sup>4</sup> Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.



- i. At the project design stage should take into consideration agricultural projects, which are more vulnerable to climate conditions, when deciding the project's duration.
- ii. Project goals should not be overambitious, rather focused on specific objectives, realistically achievable within the project lifetime to help avoid recurrent project extensions.
- iii. To facilitate management and supervision, and contain costs pilot projects requiring experimental field work and dealing with non-validated studies, should be conducted in one country first and, upon validation, technology should be exported to other countries.
- iv. Including the Terms of Reference for the key staff in the Project Document, facilitates the start-up of the project and implementation of the project.
- v. Terminal Evaluations should be conducted slightly before the end of the project as key project staff will be available to provide critical project information necessary to conduct a proper evaluation.
- vi. Implementing agencies should allow for the verification and approval of expenses (compared to pre-existing ceiling) prior to their purchase in order to prevent undue expenditures.

**b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation**

- i. UNEP follow-up with pending outputs and activities, including the activities designated in the project document to be completed after project's end.
- ii. UNEP and GEF should partner to promote actions and projects to build upon the results obtained by this project and enhance this approach for future programs.
- iii. Transfer all the nonexpendable items of equipment still with executing agencies (ICIPE and IPGRI) to the local governmental institutions involved in the project (e.g. KARI, GBK and Museums of Kenya).
- iv. To ensure the sustainability of the project's outcomes, essential outputs, such as the databases for germplasm collected and properly managed, databases for the wild grasses identified and insects associated, be finalized by ICIPE and Biodiversity International.
- v. All the specimens of insects and plants collected by the project - still at field stations in Kenya and Mali - be deposited by ICIPE and IER in national Museums and central collection stations (e.g. National Museums of Kenya and IER) and officially documented.
- vi. Participating institutions should (a) continue the sensitization and dissemination of the grass-rows technology to farmers; and (b) complete the experiments validating the technology using normal size plots (fields) and integrate the technology in suitable farming systems.

**6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT**

**6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.**

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 terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

<b>6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>            While the report attempts to assess the achievement of outcomes the report fails to specify in a coherent manner the differing levels of achievement across the three countries in which the project was implemented. For example it claims the Ethiopia wasn't able to produce the desired level of outcomes as compared to those achieved in Mali and Kenya but provides insufficient (and scattered) information to support this.</p>	<p>MU (3)</p>

<p><b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b></p> <p>While the report is not is presented in a coherent manner, there were no major evidence gaps the IA ratings were in general supported by the evidence that was provided.</p>	S (5)
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b></p> <p>While the TE devoted a section regarding project sustainability, the information that was provided was limited and not sufficient to conclusively assess the project's sustainability.</p>	MU (3)
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b></p> <p>For the most part the lessons learned are comprehensive and are supported by the evidence presented in the report.</p>	S (5)
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b></p> <p>The TE provides an extensive breakdown of the co-financing used and actual project costs by activity in two separate annexes.</p>	S (5)
<p><b>g. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b></p> <p>The report could have benefited with a more detailed assessment rather than the brief evaluation of the project's M&amp;E system the report provides.</p>	MU (3)

**7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.**

**8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)**

**9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)**