

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:	1851		Review date:	
IA/EA Project ID:		GEF financing:	<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Protection of the North West Sahara Aquifer System (NWSAS) and related humid zones and ecosystems	IA/EA own:	0.60	NA
Country:	Regional (Africa)	Government:	0.12	NA
		Other*:	0.70	NA
		Total Cofinancing	0.82	NA
Operational Program:	OP 9 (Integrated land and water management)	Total Project Cost:	1.42	NA
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	Observatoire du Sahel et du Sahara	Work Program date		Dec 2002
		CEO Endorsement		Dec 2002
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		May 2003
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
		July 2005	June 2006	
Prepared by: Neeraj Negi	Reviewed by: Lee Risby	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 27 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 38 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 11 months
Author of TE: Serge Puyoô		TE completion date: Dec 2006	TE submission date to GEF OME: Aug 2007	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 9 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

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	MS	S	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	ML	ML	ML
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	MS	MS	UA
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	MS	MS

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

No. It does not present information in a coherent and logical way. Further, the section on M&E is not well fleshed out and information on actual project expenses has not been provided.

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

No such issue has been mentioned.

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 Appraisal Document (PAD) submitted for the CEO endorsement, the overall objective of the project is to “improve management of the NWSAS aquifer system shared by Algeria, Libya and Tunisia through protection of water quality and of the recharge areas and humid zones and ecosystems related to the aquifer.”

Although other versions of this objective have been listed in the PIR 2006 and the terminal evaluation report, it seems that there has been no change in substantive elements of the objectives.

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

The development objectives of the project are “the updating of the evaluation for the NWSAS water resources in order to define sustainable exploitation modalities” and “the implementation of a consultation mechanism at the basin level for the three participating countries with a view to ensuring a homogenous management of these common water resources.”

The terminal evaluation quotes these as the development objectives of the project, implying there has been no change in them.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

The terminal evaluations lists following outcomes:

Hydraulic component:

- The Djefara model has been constructed and calibrated.
- The Biskra model (North of the Chotts zone) has been completed and validated.
- Conceptual model of the Bassin Occidental (Western Basin) has been constructed, calibrated and used for prediction.
- the studies related to understanding the exchanges between the Chotts/ Sebkhass and the underlying aquifers have been initiated (but not completed);
- The updating of the SASS model in the border region of Ghadames has allowed the three participating countries to agree on the way to consider water extractions and their transboundary impact.
- The study of the piezometric network has been completed and validated.

Socio-economic component:

- The water demand, as well as the projection, and the efficiency of the irrigation modes has been evaluated;
- The water costs have been addressed, but the detailed and comparative analysis has not been completed.

Environmental component:

- Cartography of salty waters and of wetlands based on the interpretation of satellite data has been made,
- Reports analysing the causes and distribution of salty-soil zones have been drafted,
- Wetlands have been inventoried in an exhaustive way in the three countries,
- Recharge of the SASS aquifers has been taken up as the subject of an academic doctoral dissertation,
- the analysis of the phenomena of water level rises in the surface aquifers has not been conducted,

- a synthesis of the environmental impacts connected with the exploitation of the SASS has been done and an Action Plan has been proposed, together with monitoring indicators.

“Information System” component:

- the GIS-connected SAGESSE data base has been complemented and enhanced,
- dedicated data bases have been established in the three study zones of the Djefara, Biskra and bassin occidental (Western Basin),
- a geographic server, allowing cartographies of aggregate data has been developed (GEO-SASS),
- the link Data Base – Mathematical Model of the aquifer is operational,
- the link modes between the SAGESSE Data Base and new local Data Bases have not been clearly established as yet,
- training sessions have been organised for data base webmasters (administrators).

Barring a few, most of the listed outcomes are primarily outputs of the project.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

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

A Relevance	Rating: S
The project aims to contribute to improved management of the NWSAS aquifer system shared by Algeria, Libya and Tunisia through better management of recharge areas and humid zones and ecosystems related to the aquifer. The outcomes listed in the terminal evaluation, that will contribute to achievement of the project objectives are consistent with the priorities of OP 9.	
B Effectiveness	Rating: MS
According to the terminal evaluation the projects performance was 'highly satisfactory' in terms of outcomes of its environmental component; 'satisfactory' in development of regional models and promoting consultative mechanisms; 'moderately satisfactory' in terms of the dedicated studies and SASS monitoring, and further development of the information system; and, 'moderately unsatisfactory' in achieving the expected outcomes of the socio economic component. Overall the terminal evaluation has given a rating of moderately satisfactory to the project.	
The Evaluation Office Unit (EOU) of UNEP however gives the project a 'satisfactory' rating on effectiveness in achievement of expected outcomes. The explain it by reasoning that it puts more weight on the success in achieving a political agreement at ministerial level with regard to the management of the share aquifer resources. However, EOU (UNEP) does not explain the rationale for this component being given a higher weight. According to PIRs for 2004 and 2005, in the meeting of the first steering committee it was decided that hydrological modeling will be the main priority of the project management even though performance on achieving a political agreement at that point was rated to be below the satisfactory level – this contrasts with the greater weight being given to this component by the EOU at the completion of the project.	
C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: MS
The project was completed with a delay of 11 months. According to the terminal evaluation the project conducted its activities pertaining to dissemination of information and development of the information system satisfactorily. However, other activities such as the development of the consultation mechanism, implementation of the socio-economic component, development of regional models and conducting dedicated studies and SASS monitoring faced minor difficulties.	

4.1.2 Impacts

According to the terminal evaluation, the participating countries succeeded in establishing a permanent consultative mechanism.

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: ML
According to the terminal evaluation, the participating countries have agreed to provide financial support to the consultative structure. The extent of this support is, however, not known.	
B Socio political	Rating: ML
Information provided in the terminal evaluation indicates that there is sufficient socio-political support for consultation on management and conservation of the aquifer. However, it is not known whether they will be	

willing to take hard decisions based on the information generated by the project.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
According to the terminal evaluation, the establishment of a permanent structure for consultation by the participating countries on management and sharing of the aquifer reduces institutional and governance risks to the sustainability of benefits from project outcomes.	
D Environmental	Rating: L
No such risks are anticipated.	

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good
The project created information relevant for sustainable management of the trans boundary aquifer. It was also able to facilitate the participating countries to come on an agreement to set up a permanent framework to allow continued consultation among them on its management.
b. Demonstration
c. Replication
d. Scaling up

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): MU
Although the M&E design provides the institutional structure to facilitate monitoring, overall the M&E plan is inadequate. The section on M&E lists some broad activities that will be taken up. However, indicators to measure progress of the program have not been specified and timeframes for major M&E activities have not been described.	
B. M&E plan Implementation	Rating (six point scale): UA
According to the terminal evaluation, the M&E arrangements in the project were similar to other projects. It notes that there were "shortcomings" in follow up on the specified indicators. It notes that timely funding was not provided for M&E activities.	
C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document?	
No. The budget does not include a separate line item for M&E activities.	
C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation?	
No. According to the terminal evaluation the funding for M&E activities was sporadic.	
C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?	
No. Lack of adequate follow up on specified indicators and sporadic funding for M&E activities are not good practiced.	

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?
According to the Terminal Evaluation following lessons could be learnt from the project: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The socio-economic and environmental syntheses, the related workshops, and the setting up of National Steering Committees, made it possible to broaden the scope of the project stakeholders by involving the ministries (namely those of Agriculture and the Environment) which were not part of the initial decision-making process of the project. The roles of each party, the reporting and modes for circulation of information may be rationalised and formalised towards a possible "Mécanisme de Concertation" (Mechanism for Concerted Action) whose purpose and roles have already been identified in outline.
List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation
The terminal evaluation report lists following recommendations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The incomplete tasks expected under Phase 2 should be completed. This includes: a study on the connections between the Chotts and Sebkhass and the underlying aquifers; study on water level rises; making the SASS piezometric network and the data exchange operational;

<p>implementation of the construction of a quality network; and, development of analysis tools for, in particular, the socio-economic and environmental data in connection with the Information System.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Strengthen the data bases and the information updating, consultation and management mechanism, especially the procedures for integrating SASS monitoring data. • Provide for potential evolution of the monitoring networks, including automatization of measurements and telemetry-based transfer. • Operate the Information System and conduct real-size testing of the administration of the system. • Refine the collection of socio-economic data, as well as the consideration of the water uses, which should lead to a concerted programme of conservation of water resource. • Strengthen the SASS model by integrating the corrections and adjustments induced by the construction of the 3 'local' models. • Envision possible sub-models which meet exploitation and impact analysis objectives on various scales. • Promote Research – Development activities based on partnership with research institutes and universities. • Refine the method and planning of the implementation of the water resources integrated management, GIRE (IWRM), involving development operators, and this based perhaps on implementing integrated management show-cases and defining training and education actions. • Identify and implement extension and communication actions in order to disseminate the results and decisions related to shared management. • Formalise the project management procedures at the level of the 'Mechanism for Concerted Action'.
--

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.
None

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?</p> <p>The report contains an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objective. However, the information is not presented in a reader friendly manner. The focus has been more on assessing the achievement of outputs rather than outcomes and impacts.</p>	MS
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</p> <p>The report was consistent, evidence was fairly complete. The ratings were usually substantiated. There were exceptions, however. For example, a detailed discussion on the basis for the ratings provided for M&E systems is absent.</p>	MS
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>The report provides adequate assessment on project sustainability and exit strategy.</p>	MS
<p>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>The report has listed some lessons. However, it has not been able to inform the reader how these lessons are relevant to the GEF portfolio.</p>	MU
<p>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p> <p>The report has not provided this information.</p>	HU
<p>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?</p>	MU

The report does present this assessment. However, the assessment is cursory. The ratings on M&E have not been supported with sufficient reporting on how the M&E systems actually performed.	
--	--

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

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?
UA
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?
Causal linkages have not been addressed in the terminal evaluation report.

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.	Yes:	No:
	X	
Explain: Some of the issues are not well covered in the report. A technical assessment could be done of the issues pertaining to M&E.		

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

PIR 2006, PAD.
