

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		10/30/2006
GEF Project ID:	1394		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	1191	<b>GEF financing:</b>	0.70	0.70
Project Name:	Climate, Water and Agriculture: Impacts on and Adaptation of Agro-Ecological Systems in Africa	IA/EA own:		
Country:	Regional	Government:	0.10	
		Other*:	0.44	
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	0.54	0.49
Operational Program:	OP 12	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	1.24	1.19
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Governments, Research Institutions and Non governmental organizations.	Work Program date		NA
		CEO Endorsement		12/14/2001
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		NA
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
Prepared by: Neeraj Negi	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 12/31/2005	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 12/31/2005	Difference between original and actual closing: 0 months
Author of TE: NA		TE completion date: 12/31/2005	TE submission date to GEF OME: 6/29/2006	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 6 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

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" 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	NA	NA	<b>MS</b>
2.2 Project sustainability	<b>N/A</b>	NA	NA	L
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	NA	S
2.4 Quality of the	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	NA	MS

evaluation report				
-------------------	--	--	--	--

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

No

The report is good in presenting a detailed account of project outcomes and impacts; however, what have been listed as outcomes and impacts are merely project outputs. The TE report fails to make a distinction between the two. It is internally consistent. It is, however, weak in discussing issues related to risk that might affect sustainability of project outcomes, in assessing the M&E system, and in discussing cost effectiveness of the outcomes. Over all it is a satisfactory report but not good enough to be termed as a good practice.

**Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?**

No such issues have been flagged by the TE.

**3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES**

**3.1 Project Objectives**

**• What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the TE the global environmental objectives of the project were:

- To develop multipliable analytical methods and procedures for assessing the impact of climate change on agriculture in Africa.
- To estimate how climate affects the current agricultural systems.
- Project how climate change might affect this system in the future.
- To assess adaptation options open to African farmers to cope with climate change.

But for the fourth Global Environmental Objective, which has not been listed in the Project Appraisal Document, all the objectives listed in the TE report were listed in the Project Appraisal. The TE report doesn't explained when the fourth objective was included among the Global Environmental Objectives of the project.

**• What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

According to the TE the development objectives of the project were to:

- Conduct national level economic analyses of impact and adaptation.
- Conduct cross-national analysis and extrapolate results to countries not included in the sample.
- Include water supply in the analysis.
- Enhance the capacity of country experts.
- Facilitate an intra-country exchange of findings and policy alternatives, among various levels of decision makers from each country.
- Develop inter country exchanges between all the country teams participating in the project.

The development objectives listed in the Project Appraisal Document are exactly the same as those listed in the TE report. Thus, there have been no changes in the development objectives of the project during its implementation. It is another issue that the results that are listed as development objectives are actually just outputs. For example, conducting national level economic analyses of impact and adaptation is just a product of this focused research intervention. An expected outcome in this case could have been that the national level economic analyses of impact and adaptation leads to formulation of better national or international strategies for climate change impact mitigation.

**3.2 Outcomes and Impacts**

**• What were the major project outcomes and impacts described in the TE?**

According to the TE following were the major outcomes and impacts of the project:

- National level analyses have been conducted to assess climate change impact on the agriculture sector and adaptation alternatives.
- Inferences drawn from the regional level analysis of Climate Change impact to assess impact on agriculture sector and local and regional adaptation alternatives in the sampled and non sampled countries within the region.
- A working hydrological model that provides inputs for economic analysis has been developed using data on various hydro-climatic variables.
- The project has allowed many graduate students from different countries and institutions to complete their thesis interests by being involved in the studies undertaken as part of the project.
- Workshops with participation from study teams, policy makers and government officials have been conducted to facilitate exchange of results and deliberation over policy options.
- Knowledge created as part of this study is being disseminated through a website. Full exchange of data, findings and methodology is being done through the website.

The listed outcomes, however, are just project outputs. The TE fails to make this distinction.

#### 4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

##### 4.1 Outcomes

<b>A Relevance</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
--------------------	-------------------

- **In retrospect, were the project's outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The project is listed under OP12, integrated ecosystem management. The research related outcomes primarily look into the impact (especially on agriculture) and economic implications of climate change in Africa. Although the outputs, which have been listed as outcomes, are consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies their linkage with it is not direct.

<b>B Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
------------------------	------------------

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

Based on the information provided in the TE it could be inferred that the project's outcomes, which are actually just outputs, are commensurate with the expectations. Being a research project, only research related outputs had been promised and most have been achieved. The TE has not linked how these outputs will lead to global environmental benefits.

Although little direct evidence on level of achievement for expected outcomes has been cited, based on the observations of various agencies and stakeholders and survey findings listed in Section V, Monitoring and Evaluation, of the TE report it could be inferred that the project outputs could be leading to outcomes that are consistent with the global environmental benefits that are focus of GEF's attention. For example, about 80% of the respondents felt that the project had led to improved knowledge and information on impacts of and adaptation to climate change. Similarly, 85% of the respondents felt that project has enhanced capacities of the country experts on assessment of impacts of and adaptation to climate change.

<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: UA</b>
--	-------------------

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?**

This issue has not been addressed in the TE report.

<b>Impacts</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?</b></li> </ul> <p>According to the project appraisal document and the TE report the project aimed at developing analytical tools and procedures that could be used for assessing impact of climate change in agriculture in Africa, for estimating how climate affects the current agriculture systems, for projecting how future changes may affect the agriculture systems, and for assessing adaptation options open to farmers to cope with climate change. The TE report informs that project has been successful in developing the expected products and has led to generation of new knowledge (33 papers based on the research conducted as part of the project have been published in peer reviewed journals) that is being shared with other stakeholders. These trends suggest that the achieved outputs may lead to outcomes that are consistent with the Global Environmental Objectives of the project.</p>

**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.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
The comments by various stakeholders included in the TE report indicate that many African countries are developing similar projects to know the impact of climate change on local agriculture and expanding the scope of issues studied under the given project. Further, similar projects are being replicated in Latin America. According to TE, University of Pretoria has established a post graduate research and training program on impacts and adaptation to climate change in which a number of PhD students are currently enrolled and a couple of collaborative research projects are currently underway within this program. The TE also mentions that the World Bank is keen to support similar projects. These trends suggest that the financial risks to sustainability of the outcomes are low.	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
The TE report has not addressed this issue directly. However, the project appraisal document does mention that there is a risk of political instability in some of the host countries. This risk is likely to remain for the future sustainability of outcomes as well.	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
According to the TE, the Center for Environmental Economics and Policy in Africa (CEEPA), University of Pretoria, has been the key agency involved in implementation of this project. CEEPA has an academic program in place to ensure sustenance of many of the project outcomes.	
The TE also informs that project stakeholders that participated in a questionnaire survey to assess performance and impact of the project overwhelmingly felt that the project led to enhancement of capacities of country experts. This is likely to help the participant countries to be able to address the issues related to assessment of climate change impact and adaptation options.	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
The TE report has not addressed this issue directly. However, given the nature of the project and project outcomes and the information given in the TE, very few environmental risks are anticipated.	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>

### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>1. Production of a public good</b>
Based on the information provided in the TE it could be inferred that the project created new knowledge pertaining to impact of climate change and the resultant adaptation issues. Thirty three papers based on the research conducted under this project have been published in the peer reviewed journals. Many other products that could be instrumental in conducting analysis for climate change adaptation have also been developed.

<b>2. Demonstration</b>
<b>3. Replication</b> According to the TE report, three annual workshops were held in Cape Town, Cairo and Zaragoza to facilitate exchange and discussion of results. The TE report also informs that a final conference for African policy makers was rescheduled for latter part of 2006. The evidence cited by the TE suggests that many other countries are also developing similar projects and/or are extending the scope of their present efforts on assessing climate change mitigation.
<b>4. Scaling up</b>

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

<b>A. In retrospect, was the M&amp;E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&amp;E activities)</b> <b>Rating: MU</b>
The TE has not appraised the quality at entry of the M&E plan. The M&E plan listed in the project appraisal document is rudimentary at best. The indicators are primarily output oriented. The M&E plan does analyze risks to the project and also broadly describes the responsibility centers for M&E activities.
<b>B. Did the project M&amp;E system operate throughout the project? How was M&amp;E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</b> <b>Rating: S</b>
According to the TE, the project implemented a comprehensive M&E process. It informs that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- contractual arrangements with various vendors clearly defined specific deliverables and time lines;</li> <li>- biannual workshops were conducted to take stock of progress and to redefine targets;</li> <li>- Yale and CEEPA provided technical backstopping to all the research teams on data cleaning, coding and analyses</li> </ul> <p>As a result of the above listed efforts, TE notes, there was consistency in analytical approaches and empirical methods applied by all teams implementing unified frameworks for research across all countries and continentally. The TE further informs that projects performance has been continuously evaluated throughout the project implementation.</p>
<b>C. Was M&amp;E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</b> <b>Rating:</b>
This issue has not been adequately addressed.
<b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b>
No.
The quality at entry of the M&E plan is not sufficiently good. While the information provided by the TE is sufficient to indicate that implementation of the M&E system was satisfactory it does not provide enough insights on what was good about the system.

#### 4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<b>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?</b>
Major lessons listed in the TE are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The experience in using monitoring and evaluation mechanisms in implementing the project indicates the importance of effective</li> </ul>

coordination of the technical and methodological activities of multi-country and multi-sector teams.

- It may be better to time and fund dissemination of results earlier on during project implementation so as to reduce the time lag in communication of the research findings to policy makers, researchers and civil and professional societies.

**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 the “Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

<b>4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings</b>
In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.
No such information was available to the reviewer.

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> Although the project reports on performance in terms of achievement of project outputs, which have been described as outcomes in the project documents, it does not go a step further and assess whether the expected outcomes are actually outcomes or are just outputs. It also lacks an analysis of how the described outputs link up with the global environmental benefits.	MU
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> The report is internally consisted, however, some of the issues have either not been covered comprehensively and/or in adequate detail. Does not provide the ratings.	MS
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The report does include a separate section on sustainability but it has not covered the key dimensions comprehensively and in adequate details.	MS
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b>	MS
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b>	HS
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b>	MS

**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.

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

Explain:  
The outputs of the project are quite simple. It will still take considerable time for the project's impact to be evident.

**4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**  
PIR 2004, 2005. Project Appraisal Document.

