

GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	March 2011
GEF Project ID:	2151 MSP		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P071100 (WB)	GEF financing:	880,000	880,000
Project Name:	Novel Forms of Livestock and Wildlife Integration Adjacent to Protected Areas in Africa – Tanzania	IA/EA own:	0.0	0.0
Country:	Tanzania	Government:	310,000	310,000
		Other*:	1,149,000	1,149,000
		Total Cofinancing	1,459,000	1,459,000
Operational Program:	OP#1 Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems	Total Project Cost:	2,339,000	2,339,000
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	FAO	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		August 2005
		Closing Date	Proposed: Not provided	Actual: June 2009
TER Prepared by: Oreste Maia-Andrade	TER peer reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): Not provided	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 46 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): Unable to calculate
Author of TE: Christophe Crepin		TE completion date: October 2010	TE submission date to GEF EO: March 2011	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 5 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	S	S	N/A	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	N/A	ML
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	U/A	U/A	N/A	S
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	HS
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU

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

No:

- Although outcomes, processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability, as well as quality of execution were well explained in the ICM, major gaps on the clarification of financial sustainability, M&E implementation and on quality of implementation have made it difficult to fully

understand project's results and completely assess project's aspects.
<p>2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?</p> <p>Reallocation of Funds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the ICM, a “minimal reallocation of funds among original disbursement categories was undertaken as specified: a) an increase of US\$ 2,000 from category 1 (goods) (2.2% of initial amount); b) a reduction of US\$ 42,000 from category 2 (consultant services) (7.6% of initial amount); c) an increase of US\$ 40,000 for category 3 (training, workshops and conference) (25 % of initial amount).” • To the ICM, “the reallocation from category 2 to categories 1 and 3 was undertaken because the project did not foresee any major future expenses against this category”.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives			
a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?			
<p>According to the ICM, “the goal was to promote conservation of globally significant biodiversity, with improved ecological integrity, conflict resolution, food security and poverty alleviation. The project objective was to contribute to a significant reduction in conflict over access to resources through the integration of pastoralism, cropping and wildlife conservation through effective policy and institutional change.”</p> <p>No changes were noted in the ICM.</p>			
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)?)			
<p>The Project design included three main components:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Development, adoption and effective implementation of land use plans: “Aim was to develop and implement participatory land use planning in six selected villages to improve sustainable management of land resources for livestock, wildlife and other land use purposes and to facilitate the establishment of wildlife management areas with full engagement of local communities”. 2) Design and develop benefit-sharing mechanisms through capturing direct and indirect wildlife values: Aim was to design and implement benefit sharing mechanisms from wildlife such as conservation business ventures with the aim of improving returns from wildlife to communities and to contribute to wildlife conservation. 3) Development of decision support tools to strengthen rational resource-access and management: Aim was to develop a decision support tool (DST) by building on input from baseline assessment conducted during project implementation period. Purpose of the DST was to help communities and policy-makers at local and national levels make informed choices regarding land use, business ventures, and public policy in pastoral areas, particularly in the Maasi Steppe and other semi-arid parts of East Africa. <p>Regarding changes, according to the ICM, “no significant changes were made to design, scope and scale.” However, “adjustments” were noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As explained by the ICM, “all project activities as initially identified and slightly adjusted as per mid-term review have been successfully implemented and completed. The following slight adjustments were made to the project activities during the midterm review: Initially, the project aimed to support the establishment of two Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs), but during project implementation the two WMAs were merged into one larger WMA and the target was revised to one WMA accordingly. Initially, the project aimed to support the creation of 3 Conservation Business Ventures (CBVs), but the target was revised to 1 CBV due to lack of viable business groups. All modeling and analytical work were consolidated into one comprehensive tool kit (i.e. Decision Support Tool) to enhance dissemination and knowledge activities. All of the above changes were endorsed by the project steering committee (PSC) and the World Bank.” 			
Overall Environmental	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)

Objectives				
N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)
X	N/A	X	N/A	N/A

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)

a. Relevance	Rating: 5
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ICM affirms that the project was “in line with the global objectives and priorities to promote conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity in environmentally vulnerable areas such as arid and semi-arid areas characterized by high biodiversity of global significance; in line with the African Union’s Pastoral Policy Framework that among other objectives aims at defining practical approaches for improving the ability of pastoral societies to manage extreme environmental variability, reducing the vulnerability of pastoral people to climatic shock, and to conflict; consistent with Tanzania’s National Strategy for Growth and Poverty Reduction (NSGRP)/MKUKUTA; consistent with the Bank’s Joint Assistance Strategy for Tanzania (JAS).” Considering the valuable importance of the project in addressing the biodiversity issues, pastoral policies, as well as its significance to minimizing the human impact of climate change, the projects outcomes’ relevance is rated as satisfactory. 	
b. Effectiveness	Rating: 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ICM affirms that “the project objective of ‘a significant reduction in conflict over access to resources through the integration of pastoralism, cropping and wildlife conservation through effective policy and institutional change’ is measured against a composite indicator. This composite indicator combines four key institutional and policy changes – all of which have been achieved: six villages land use planning groups have been established and are operating; two district land use planning for a have been established and are active; two community groups support the development of WMAs (two WMA eventually merged into one larger WMA); community group benefitting from the development of Community Based Ventures (CBVs).” Considering that all components were satisfactorily fulfilled, effectiveness is then rated as satisfactory. 	
c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)	Rating: 5
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ICM affirms that “the project can demonstrate efficiency through attainment of all expected results considering the objectives previously set. All trainings were delivered, all tools developed, and all land use planning-related activities carried out. The partners selected for project implementation all have a competitive advantage in their area of expertise and were thus able to deliver effectively. For example, FAO could draw on knowledge and experiences elsewhere around the world for development of the Decision Support Tool for ‘Sustaining Communities, Livestock and Wildlife – A Guide to Participatory Land Use Planning’, while ILRI could provide the necessary analytical input needed to make the tool highly relevant for the Tanzanian savanna ecosystem. A WF could build on a long history of community outreach and presence on the ground to build the trust necessary to effectively engage communities in land use planning and new approaches to livestock and wildlife integration.” Considering that all cofinancing reported in the ICM has been “met or exceeded”, and that all components were satisfactorily fulfilled, the project is satisfactorily cost-efficient. 	

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.

a. Financial resources	Rating: U/A
<p>Unable to Assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The ICM does not provide specific information about financial sustainability. 	
b. Socio political	Rating: 3
<p>Moderately Likely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the ICM, project outcomes are likely to be sustained after completion because “the participatory approach adopted by the project and the continuous involvement of the project beneficiaries and other stakeholders, i.e. through the establishment of multi-stakeholder fora at local and district level, further support ownership of project achievements.” Therefore, considering that the project’s participatory approach represents an important, but also unclear and maybe limited socio-political involvement of the Tanzanians, sustainability with this regards is considered moderately likely. 	
c. Institutional framework and governance	Rating: 4
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the ICM, project outcomes are likely to be sustained after completion due to “capacity building and institutional development for participatory land use planning, establishment of land registries, and development and dissemination of the Decision Support Tool. Considering that the land registries represent a major institutional achievement of the project, sustainability with that regard is considered satisfactory. 	
d. Environmental	Rating: 3
<p>Moderately Unlikely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to the ICM, although project outcomes are likely to be sustained after completion, there is an overall downward trend of wildlife at larger ecosystem level, which threatens “one of Tanzania’s important resources and basis for the economically important tourism industry [...] Key factor for the dwindling wildlife is uncontrolled and conversion and agricultural expansion into important wildlife corridors as well as into dispersal areas for wildlife grazing and calving outside protected areas. Yet, agricultural expansion into these semi-arid areas traditionally occupied only by wildlife and pastoralists is highly exposed to climate variability risks and mostly not sustainable given the constraints of soil fertility in these semi-arid lands. Consequently, a larger effort to scale up sustainable land management activities and results to the landscape level is necessary to achieve biodiversity and other global environmental goals at the ecosystem level” Despite the efforts carried out within the project, the overall downward trend of eco-systemic wildlife and the agricultural expansion do pose a significant threat to the project’s environmental sustainability, which is rated as moderately unlikely. 	

4.3 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

<p>a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? 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?</p>
<p>All reported in the ICM about cofinancing is that the amount envisaged at project appraisal has been met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> FAO (US\$ 71,000) for technical input and knowledge transfer; AWF (US\$ 150,000) for proving logistical support, transportation, facilities, and additional staff time; ILRI (US\$ 110,000) for technical and analytical support and input across all three project components; Masaai Advancement Association (MAA) (US\$ 78,000) for complementary activities related to community capacity building and empowerment; Wildlife Division (US\$ 110,000) for the processes related to WMA designation; Livestock Division (US\$ 60,000) for vaccination campaign to control Rift Valley Fever; Simanjiro and Monduli District Council (US\$ 80,000) for staff supporting land use planning activities maintaining land registries and contributing to PCC and PSC meetings;

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Target villages (US\$ 60,000) for operating land use committees and contributing to the building of the land registry office; • Substantial associated financing was also provided by LEAD (US\$ 130,000) for complementary ecosystem studies: transversal study and drought management toolbox and by FFEM (US\$ 610,000 for the sister project in Chad.
<p>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?</p>
<p>One year and half of delay:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the ICM, "original project implantation period stipulated in the project document was three years starting 2004 to 2007. With the initial delays at the onset of the project due to political reasons (national elections), natural calamity (a prolonged drought in 2005), and other issues related to official bureaucracy, effective implementation of activities did not commence until December 2005. Consequently, a one-year extension was granted for the period December 31, 2007 to December 31, 2008 in order to bring the project up to the three years initially granted. A second 6-month extension until June 30, 2009 was granted to permit the completion of an Environmental Impact Assessment, which was necessary prior to a potential additional investment, that had been identified later during project implementation as part of village land use planning activities."
<p>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.</p>
<p>Government support was considered adequate:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To the ICM, "there was adequate support, contribution and participation from the Government of Tanzania – represented mainly through the Project Steering Committee – during implementation. Additional support was provided from district staff for on-the-ground activities."

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

<p>a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): 5</p>
<p>Satisfactory:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • According to the PAD submitted for CEO Endorsement, "FAO, with support from the Steering Committee of the LEAD Initiative and in collaboration with the national partners, will conduct the monitoring and evaluation of the project. Three activities will be implemented: 1) A bi-annual project supervision and preparation of an annual project status report. 2) A mid-term review to assess the progress toward meeting development objectives. 3) A project completion report to access the performance of the project." • As explained in the PAD, "FAO will (a) clear the draft TOR for the monitoring and evaluation plan, including the evaluation team members, and (b) review and comment on the evaluation reports (the draft reports will be submitted to the Bank and FAO and GEF simultaneously). These monitoring and evaluation activities will be carried out in close collaboration with the World Bank and GEF. In particular, the evaluation and monitoring log-frame has been developed in alignment with the GEF and World Bank Methodology and with the Regional Management group requirements." • Considering that the M&E design was appropriate and well outlined in the PAD, its rating is satisfactory.
<p>b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): U/A</p>
<p>Unable to Assess:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The ICM does not provide specific information about M&E implementation.

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

<p>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): 6</p>
<p>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): U/A</p>
<p>Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution.</p>
<p>Unable to Assess:</p>

- The ICM does not provide specific information about quality of implementation.

c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies¹ (rating on a 6 point scale): 6

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.

Highly Satisfactory:

- According to the ICM, “FAO has been the executing agency of this project on behalf of the World Bank (under the GEF’s interim arrangements for other Implementation Agencies with no direct access to GEF). The main roles of FAO comprised of provision of technical input through FAO’s Livestock, Environment and Development (LEAD) Initiative; the oversight of procurement, financial management and M&E; and overall coordination and supervision of local implementation agencies. FAO has maintained a highly qualified administrative and technical team that has been actively involved in the project right from design to completion. There has been close oversight and continuous guidance provided throughout the project.”
- The ICM explains that “the recipient of the grant was FAO, with the International Livestock Research Institute (ILRI) and the African Wildlife Foundation (AWF) serving as sub-recipients. The role of FAO was to provide technical support utilizing in-house expertise and knowledge generated from the LEAD Initiative in the development and implementation of the project as well as administrative and operational support and assistance to monitoring and evaluation of the project. AWF was responsible for the on-the-ground co-ordination and implementation of project activities, under the supervision of the FAO. The ILRI was responsible for providing scientific and analytic support to the design of various activities and tools.”
- Considering that during the course of implementation, FAO went “beyond its affirmed roles on many occasions”, as remarked by the ICM, “a feature that has ultimately resulted in a successful completion of the project”, execution is rated as highly satisfactory.

5. PROGRESS TOWARDS IMPACT

a. What is the outlined outcomes-to-impact pathway?

Briefly describe the logical sequence of means-to-end linkages underlying a project (Outcome to impact pathways are the means-ends relationships between project outcomes and the intended impacts – i.e. the logical results chain of activity, output, outcome and impact)

Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Impacts / GEB
<p>To reduce conflict over access to resources through the integration of pastoralism, cropping and wildlife conservation</p> <p>To stimulate effective policy and institutional change through the promotion of land use planning groups, land use planning districts, and community groups that support the development of Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) and Community Based Ventures (CBVs).”</p> <p>To promote capacity building and institutional development for participatory land use planning</p>	<p>Adoption of a participatory approach</p> <p>Continuous involvement of the project beneficiaries and other stakeholders</p> <p>Establishment of multi-stakeholder fora at local and district levels</p> <p>Establishment of land registries</p> <p>Development and dissemination of the Decision Support Tool to help East African communities to strengthen natural-resource management</p>	<p>Enhanced, peaceful conflict resolution over access to resources through the integration of pastoralism, cropping and wildlife conservation</p> <p>Effective policy and institutional change through participatory land use planning and the establishment of land registries within WMAs and CBVs</p>	<p>Conservation of an area of globally significant biodiversity, improved eco-systemic integrity</p>

b. What are the actual (*intended or unintended*) impacts of the project?

¹ 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.

Based on the assessment of outcomes [4.1.1] explain to what extent the project contributed to or detracted from the path to project impacts and to *impact drivers* (Impact drivers are the *significant factors* that, if present, are expected to contribute to the ultimate realization of project impacts and that are within the ability of the project to influence

The impact drivers and consequent impacts were:

- Establishment of awareness fora → knowledge exchange; women empowerment (unexpected)
- Capacity building initiatives → innovative products
- Partnerships and new forms of cooperation → strengthened institutions; outside-project demands for cooperation (unexpected)

c. Drawing on the assessment of the likelihood of outcome sustainability [4.2], what are the apparent risks to achieved impacts being sustained and likely impacts being achieved?

- **Unclear financial sustainability:** The ICM does not provide information about financial sustainability, which might indicate a moderate unsustainability regarding that criterion.
- **Downward trend of eco-systemic wildlife:** Although project outcomes are likely to be sustained after completion, there is an overall downward trend of wildlife at larger ecosystem level, which threatens “one of Tanzania’s important resources and basis for the economically important tourism industry.
- **Agricultural expansion:** Key factor for the dwindling wildlife is uncontrolled and conversion and agricultural expansion into important wildlife corridors as well as into dispersal areas for wildlife grazing and calving outside protected areas. Yet, agricultural expansion into these semi-arid areas traditionally occupied only by wildlife and pastoralists is highly exposed to climate variability risks and mostly not sustainable given the constraints of soil fertility in these semi-arid lands. Consequently, a larger effort to scale up sustainable land management activities and results to the landscape level is necessary to achieve biodiversity and other global environmental goals at the ecosystem level.”

d. Evidence of Impact

Question	Yes	No	UA
i. Did the evaluation report on <i>stress reduction</i> ² at the <u>local level</u> (i.e. at the demonstration-pilot level, etc)?		X	
ii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope ³ of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
iii. Did the evaluation report stress reduction at the broader <u>systemic level</u> ?		X	
iv. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such reductions given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
v. Did the evaluation report change in the <i>environmental status</i> at the local level (i.e. at the demonstration - pilot level, etc)		X	
vi. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
vii. Did the evaluation report change in the environmental status at the broader systemic level?		X	
viii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of such change given the range of concerns targeted by the project.			
ix. Did the evaluation report change in the socioeconomic status at the local level?	X		
x. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project. Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land registries were established to promote legal/institutional sustainability. 			
xi. Did the evaluation report change in the socio-economic status at the systemic level?	X		
xii. If yes, describe the evidence that was provided whenever possible quoting quantitative evidence. Also discuss the scope of change given the range of concerns targeted by the project. Yes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adoption of a participatory approach, continuous involvement of the project beneficiaries and other 			

² Stress = Pressure on the environment caused by human activities; Reduction=decrease of this pressure

³ Scope refers to the broadness of results against original objectives,

stakeholders, establishment of multi-stakeholder fora at local and district levels, development and dissemination of the decision support tool.			
xiii. Did the evaluation provide evidence of any negative impacts (on drivers toward the projects intended impact, environmental status, socioeconomic status)? Describe the impacts that were documented and how severe were these impacts?			
e. Monitoring of impacts			
i. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the local level after project completion?	X		
ii. Are arrangements/institutions in place to monitor stress reduction/improvement in the environment and/or socio-economic conditions at the systemic level after project completion?		X	

6. 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

Lessons learned in the ICM are synthesized as follows:

- FAO-LEAD played an important role in connecting the project to other regional activities and enabling cross fertilization;
- The multi-layered grant recipient structure has advantages and disadvantages: it has added an additional layer to the project management and accountability structure, which in some cases created extra burden on budget and administration. However, this was largely compensated by the technical input provided by FAO, which was significantly higher than originally included in the project budget.
- Wildlife Management Areas (WMAs) continue to present the most relevant approach to sustain wildlife outside protected areas and improve community livelihoods.
- While WMAs can serve as an important evolving mechanism to allow local communities to plan and manage their land and associated natural resources, benefit from wildlife through the establishment of wildlife-based business ventures, as well as solve conflicts over natural resources, a fully conducive policy, legal and regulatory framework is not yet in place.
- Importance to place a priority on gradually building community trust to overcome distrust and misperceptions attached to government-led efforts towards community empowerment.
- Raising the visibility of non-economic benefits during early stages of WMA establishment is important to manage expectations of communities and maintain momentum.
- Efforts to form and strengthen a coalition of stakeholders in support of integrated land use planning have been essential to promote a joint agenda.
- If environmental safeguard mitigation measures are not applied sensibly, they can derail important investment activities that are crucial for community development impacts of the project.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The main recommendations provided by the ICM were to stakeholders:

- Simanjiro and Monduli District, both having received significant training and capacity building are in an ideal position to scale up participatory land use planning efforts across a larger number of villages, in particular that various tools, such as the Swahili version of the DST, are now available. Continued support from the larger forum of stakeholders, including NGOs, line ministries, sectorial agencies, research institutions, and private sector will be important to maintain the momentum.

7. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

7.1 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.

Additional documents used were policy brief and community guidebook, which do not consider rates or findings, but provide support to lessons learned, recommendations and important considerations on impacts, achievements and replication.

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.

7.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p> <p>Outcomes and impacts are strongly supported by additional documents (policy brief and community guidebook).</p>	5
<p>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?</p> <p>Major gaps are lack of analysis on financial sustainability, M&E implementation and on Implementing Agency.</p>	3
<p>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>Although other sustainability criteria as satisfactorily assessed, there is no assessment of financial sustainability.</p>	4
<p>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>Lessons learned and recommendations are strongly supported by additional documents (policy brief and community guidebook).</p>	6
<p>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p>	5
<p>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?</p> <p>There is no clear evaluation of M&E plan implementation.</p>	3

8. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

Additional documents – policy brief, community guidebook.