

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		1420	
GEF Agency project ID		GF/4030-02-19	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Reducing Dependence on POPs and other Agro-Chemicals in the Senegal and Niger River Basins through Integrated Production, Pest and Pollution Management	
Country/Countries		Benin, Guinea, Mali, Mauritania, Niger and Senegal	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		International Waters and Persistent Organic Pollutants	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP 3 on demonstration of innovative and cost-efficient technologies; OP 10 of International water contaminants; OP 14 on POPs reduction	
Executing agencies involved		FAO	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NGOs were involved as stakeholders	
Private sector involvement		[Indicate as: Lead executing agency; secondary executing agency; one of the beneficiaries; through consultations]	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		April 28 th , 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2012	
Actual date of project completion		December 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.372,500	-
	Co-financing	0.369,350	-
GEF Project Grant		4.547,330	-
Co-financing	IA own		-
	Government		-
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	4.458,160	-
	Private sector		-
	NGOs/CSOs		-
Total GEF funding		4.919,830	4.061,762
Total Co-financing		4.827,510	-
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		9.747340	4.061,762

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	May 2016
Author of TE	Alexandre Diouf
TER completion date	August 10, 2017
TER prepared by	Spandana Battula
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Watts

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	-	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		U	-	ML
M&E Design		MS	-	MS
M&E Implementation		MS	-	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	-	MU
Quality of Execution		-	-	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was to “protect transboundary waters in the Niger and Senegal rivers basins through eliminating the use of POPs pesticides and a substantial reduction and elimination of other toxic pesticides used for agriculture and increase agricultural productivity and net economic benefits for farmers” (CEO endorsement pg 1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project was to introduce a new form of agricultural training for farmers, through capacity building within government agencies, non-governmental organizations and especially community based farmers’ organizations, which will engender major changes in farming practices and substantial reductions in the use of chemicals for pest control, while increasing production levels, profitability and sustainability. By putting effective alternative methods at the disposal of grower communities through proven discovery learning methods, they will be able to optimize decision-making regarding the appropriate use of land and water resources and the selection of appropriate agricultural practices (PD pgs 13-14). The project intended to achieve its objective through four key components:

- Component 1: Awareness raising and baselines
- Component 2: Assessment of freshwater contaminants
- Component 3: Developing best practices
- Component 4: Developing networks

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

There were no changes to the project objectives.

4. GEF IEO 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 project was relevant to GEF's Strategic Priority 3 on demonstration of innovative and cost-efficient technologies. It was also related to GEF's Operational Program 10 of International water contaminants and OP 14 on POPs reduction. As the project also aimed to prevent contamination of biologically rich aquatic systems, it would benefit global biodiversity as well. The project was also aligned to priorities of the target countries. As agriculture is widely practiced "addressing the health problems through the reduction of the use of chemical products in agriculture the project is well-placed to defend these vulnerable actors, small farmers, in the six beneficiary countries" (TE pg 16).

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

The TE gave a Satisfactory rating to the projects achievements of outcomes, however, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating because of partial delivery of outputs under some of the components. The project had four main components: to raise awareness, assess freshwater contaminants, develop best practices and networks. The project was able to generate awareness on negative effects of chemicals but wasn't able to complete its aim to produce national policy studies. The project also set-up labs for freshwater assessment, but there was no evidence whether assessment was successfully done. However, the project built networks amongst producers in the six targeted countries.

Below is a detailed assessment of the four components:

Component 1: Awareness raising and baselines

To raise awareness and build baselines, the project held consultation meetings with representatives from government, communities, and regulatory institutions for chemicals. The meetings helped to better inform the stakeholders and to set-up structures for piloting of the project. With Environment and Development Action (ENDA) the project conducted local awareness-raising sessions and carried out qualitative data analysis of community-level use of pesticides and its impact on their health and environment. The TE states that "this analysis carried out by ENDA was to be combined with quantitative measurements of OSU, but unfortunately the project was unable to synchronize these two

exercises due to a delay in receiving the funding for the second activity” (TE pg 16). The project established baselines on pesticide contaminants in order to influence national studies and policy recommendations, but it wasn’t able to completely achieve its aim. The project also failed to complete national policy studies.

Component 2: Assessment of freshwater contaminants

To assess freshwater contaminants, the project received funding from FAO to conduct toxicology testing and CERES laboratory also received useful equipment to do on-site analysis of pesticide residues. CERES scientists were trained in sample collection and analysis, and on PSD for water toxicity levels. “This training was subsequently carried out by CERES for laboratories in countries such as Mali, Niger, Guinea and Benin” (TE pg 17). CERES continued to scale the trainings by signing “protocols with laboratories at the country level to train in water sampling and testing methodology, including collection and transfer to laboratory without contamination” (TE pg 17). This showed that the project succeeded in transferring skills and building capacity in the scientific assessment and testing of fresh water.

Component 3: Developing best practices

Under this component the project intended to expand Farmer Field School (FFS) curricula and build regional capacity for training, and as per the TE, the results were mixed. The project intended to install demonstration plots in beneficiary communities and on average each field involved 25 producers during two campaigns. Producers and stakeholders involved felt that FFS approach contributed knowledge of best agricultural practices. FFS introduced methods like use of organic manure, quality seeds, and treatment and manufacturing of products based on neem. Data showed that there was increase in yields in demonstration plots (TE pg 18). The FFS was established in six beneficiary countries and they had an “area of 0.25 hectares, half of which was dedicated to cultivation using farmers' existing practices and the other half applying the practical principles of IPPM... At the end of the campaign, in the absence of any extraordinary event, participants had noted an increase in production and a reduction in their production costs through a reduction in the amount of seed and fertilizer cost and other pesticides” (TE pg 18). Although FFS was effective at project sites “adoption in the plots of the producers who did not participate in those FFS was a problem because of high input costs and the apparent lack of conviction producers held.” (TE pg 18).

Component 4: Developing networks

Under this component, field facilitators were trained in IPPM and they were made responsible for FFS in target villages. Producers in the communities had to” ensure the transmission of knowledge to other members of their communities. In Mauritania, Senegal, Mali and Niger where rice cultivation is carried out in community-managed plots, these facilitators had an easier task as they had smaller distances to cover. Similarly, networking between the producers trained, their groups and other environmental groups was relatively easy” (TE pg 19). Women participants in Mali felt they got the opportunity to go beyond their local area to meet other producers and producers learnt from each other during meetings.

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

The TE gave a Satisfactory rating to the efficiency of the project but the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating because of delays and irregular funding disbursement. The project based its national teams in the ministries of agriculture of beneficiary countries to optimize collaboration. The project also worked with agricultural technicians from the government agencies in order to reduce operating costs. However, the project faced difficulties because of “staggering of funding, and the small number of producers and demonstration sites in the project. Funding for the different elements and components was allocated and distributed at differing points throughout the project duration” (TE pg 27). The TE says that this led to the objectives not being linked to tranches of funding available and may have diluted the impact of the project. In terms of timeframe, the project took a long time to evolve as the design phase began in 2005 but the project was only approved in 2009. This resulted in closure of the twin project on Integrated Production and Pest Management that guaranteed essential co-funding for training and management activities in 3 countries (TE pg 7).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The TE gave an overall Unlikely rating to sustainability of the project and stated that “As per the UNEP Evaluation Office guidelines, all the dimensions of sustainability are deemed critical. Therefore, the overall rating for sustainability will be the lowest rating on the separate dimensions”. However, the TER finds that sociopolitical, institutional and environmental risks were minimal and, even though financial resources were lacking, the overall sustainability was Moderately Likely. Below is an assessment of sustainability criteria:

Financial resources: The TE gave an Unlikely rating to financial sustainability of the project because of lack of clear funding plan. During the project the FAO promoted IPPM through mobilization of funds but the target areas of this fund were not the same as project areas. Besides the FAO initiatives, there were no other sources of financing for activities.

Sociopolitical: The TE gave a likely rating to sociopolitical stability and the TER retains the same rating. The TE found that the agricultural policies related to IPPM were in place in Senegal and Niger and authorities have referred to IPPM when developing agriculture related policies. Even in Mali “the project has undoubtedly contributed to establishing greater awareness among public authorities on the potential negative impacts of using pesticides, particularly POPs” (TE pg 24).

Institutional framework and governance: The TE states that as the project was in a pilot-phase, the scaling up of results had not yet begun. The project did set-up regional committee in ECOWAS which would work to improve knowledge generation. Although plans were not institutionalized, national and

regional structures had initiated plans in the agriculture sector. The TE also notes that “with the awareness that has been made by the project, producers are more informed and aware of these negative effects. In the immediate and medium term, it is clear that producers will seek to apply the learned practices” (TE pg 25). Given the absence of formal institutionalization but awareness created, the TER gives a Moderately Likely rating.

Environment: The project’s techniques were being used by majority of producers and some producers were replicating best practices from neighboring fields. There was also greater awareness amongst producers about negative effects of agrochemicals on crops, health and environment. However, some producers used synthetic products when the natural product did not work and thus, environmental gains have not yet been fully achieved.

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?

Although the planned co-financing amount was \$4,827,510, the actual co-financing amount was not reported.

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?

The project faced some initial delays because of slow evolution of the project. Although project design happened in 2005, it did not get approval until 2009. This resulted in closure of a sister project. The project also had delay in receiving funds and feedback from UNEP (TE pg 38).

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 project experienced strong ownership from the country governments and beneficiaries. The TE states that “structures responsible for agriculture were largely involved in the implementation of the project, with the exception of Benin” (TE pg 31). The structures facilitated in enrolling technicians in farmer field school activities and at ministerial level, the project set-up national steering committees. The committees brought their functionaries and stakeholders involved in the regulation and use of chemical products in agriculture (TE pg 31). “In Niger, Mali and Senegal, the authorities went further by seeking to adopt the IPPM as a curriculum in the training of farmers; the same applied in Mauritania. In Guinea, the project experienced slightly less success due to political instability in the country during the implementation period” (TE pg 31).

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: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to M&E design at entry. The project's M&E system planned for a monitoring report, financing and co-financing reports, a mid-term and terminal evaluation. It had a logical framework designed for funding allotment, but it was not revised when needed and thus, "ultimately affected the quality of project implementation with respect to the sequence implicit in the theory of change" (TE pg 33). The framework also had indicators but did not meet the SMART criteria, and had ambiguous terms. While some indicators seemed like outputs, others read like objective statements. Thus, the TER also gives Moderately Satisfactory rating to M&E design.

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

The M&E implementation was given Moderately Satisfactory rating and the TER gives the same rating. The project regularly collected data on activities but transmitting of verification of data was less often. The TE reports that "since the data was not transmitted in the same format it is assumed that the consolidation was minimal and basic. It essentially concerned the number of Farmer Field Schools established and the number of producers participating in the activities" (TE pg 33). As per the TE, this does not give objective information on project outputs and services delivered in a quantitative manner. Although each country provided progress reports, there was no clear mechanism and uniformity for reporting. Additionally, the shortage of funds prevented the final evaluation "to include water testing which would have allowed the project to say if there were a reduction in water toxicity compared to the toxicity level at the beginning of the project" (TE pg 33).

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 Unsatisfactory
--	-----------------------------------

UNEP was the implementing agency and it provided technical support to FAO for executing the project. UNEP was responsible for project design and M&E system, which the TER finds had flaws. The original design of the project was too ambitious for the time and budget, and the M&E indicators were too ambiguous. While there were inadequate resources to risk communication, the TE also notes that there were delays in getting feedback from UNEP. Considering these shortcomings, the TER gives a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to project implementation by UNEP.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---	---------------------------------

FAO was the executing agency and it led the project through a regional management unit in Senegal. This unit coordinated the work in all the participating countries at the national levels, and on the ground, it had representatives in the ministries of agriculture. This resulted in better management between project management and the government. The project also had national and regional referral committees which met twice a year to track progress and offer advice. However, the project faced funding disbursement issues because of FAO procedures being cumbersome and inadequate. Also the FAO lacked experience in risk communication which prevented information to be transmitted to communities in need. Thus, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to quality of project execution.

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 in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. 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.

The TE does not assess any environmental impact from the project.

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.

No socioeconomic changes were reported.

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: The project trained facilitators and farmers on IPPM, water sampling and testing methodology. The producers commented that they had learnt from the project’s initiatives and were utilizing the knowledge in their work.

b) Governance: The project set-up national and regional technical steering committees to manage chemical products in agriculture.

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 impacts were reported.

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.

The project’s objectives on IPPM were adopted by the governments of Senegal, Mali, Niger and Mauritania in their national training curriculum for farmers.

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 TE provides key lessons from the project (TE pgs 39-40):

1) Sustained awareness-raising increases stakeholders' interest in pilot projects: the project was successful in awareness generation on the negative effects of POPs and other harmful agrochemicals in agricultural production systems. In some countries such as Senegal and Mali, the practice of IPPM was being promoted in national agricultural extension curriculum.

2) The lack of risk communication experience and funding hinders the achievement of planned objectives: Risk communication is important for beneficiaries and FAO should have "invested more into finding methods for communicating the information in an appropriate form to communities" (TE pg 40).

3) Mistake for the project to follow an approach that promotes the use of neem for any sort of disease and pest in farmers' plots: As the use of neem was not good for weeds and pests in plots, the farmers lost confidence in the recommended practice. "The project was trying to be completely anti-pesticides when this may not have been appropriate in some circumstances, so FAO should be encouraged to create a better link between the lab and the FFS as a means of making projects like this one more effective" (TE pg 40).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE gave following recommendations (TE pgs 40-41):

1) To provide budget for risk communication component in future projects and also build certain flexibility to accommodate challenges;

2) To identify the best available products that farmers could use and define the optimal dosage and mode of utilization, FAO should partner with laboratories;

3) To ensure baseline information is appropriate and targets are well-defined for proper M&E implementation. A comprehensive M&E system should be set-up from the beginning of the project; and

4) To ensure gender needs assessment is completed and incorporated into the design of the project. "For future projects of a similar nature, UNEP and FAO must clearly articulate a gender strategy with milestones and timelines that are integrated into the larger project strategy from the outset".

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 IEO 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 detailed information of relevant outcomes and achievements, but it was seriously lacking in the impacts created by the project.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report was adequately consistent with the ratings, however, the ratings for sustainability were slightly inflated especially considering the lack of evidence presented.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The sustainability section was evaluated in detail but the TE did not provide an exit strategy	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned were inadequate and lacked detailed evidence.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE did not report actual co-financing information	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report assessed the M&E system well and provided appropriate ratings	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No other sources were used to prepare the TER.