

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID:		2167	Review date:	
			<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	GF/1030-03-02	<b>GEF financing:</b>	0.722	0.722
Project Name:	Global support to facilitate the early development and implementation of land degradation programs and projects under the GEF Operational Programme n° 15.	IA/EA own:	0.10	0.10
Country:	Global (countries eligible for GEF funding)	Government:	0.150	0.150
		Other*:		
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	0.250	0.250
Operational Program:	Operational Programme n° 15 on sustainable Land Management.	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	0.972	0.972
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	GEF Secretariat, UNDP, the World Bank (WB), UNCCD, the Global Mechanism (GM), IFAD, FAO, IUCN, GTZ, Government of Norway	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		12/2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: 04/2006	Actual: 9/2007
Prepared by: Florentina Mulaj	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 28	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 45	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 17
Author of TE:	Klaus Kellner	TE completion date: 10/2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: 10/2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 12 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	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>	<b>MS</b>
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	<b>Low Risk</b>	<b>ML</b>	<b>ML</b>	<b>MU</b>
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>MS</b>
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>NA</b>	<b>S</b>
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	<b>N/A</b>	<b>N/A</b>	<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>

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

Yes, the TE for this project could be considered a good practice with the only exception that it does not provide sufficient connection between outcomes and potential of the outcomes to achieve GEBs. However, considering the nature of this project (focusing on awareness raising and capacity building), and the fact that there are no concrete and measurable environmental impacts, the TE could be considered a good practice even though its assessment stops at the outcome level.

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

No, there are evaluation findings that require follow-up.

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the project brief, the overall objective of the project is to “facilitate early development and implementation of GEF programs and projects on sustainable land management through global information and training of the relevant decision-makers in addressing land degradation issues, and developing and implementing activities eligible for GEF funding under OP 15.”

There is no indication in any of the material reviewed of changes in the objectives during the implementation.

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

According to the project brief, last PIR, and the TE, the specific and development objectives of the project were:

1. **Knowledge, awareness rising and capacity building:** Raise awareness about the newly designated focal area of land degradation, and OP 15, and facilitate the access of eligible countries to GEF resources by building their capacities to attain sustainable land management at the local, national, sub-regional and regional levels, that generates global environment and sustainable development benefits.
2. **Networking:** Strengthen intra and inter sub-regional exchange of experiences, best practices, on-going initiatives and activities related to sustainable land management.
3. **Interagency collaboration:** Strengthen interagency collaboration in the land degradation focal area between UNEP, the GEF Secretariat, UNDP the World Bank and GEF Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities including IFAD, FAO and the Regional Development Banks.
4. **Operational Guide on OP15:** Prepare an operational guide on OP15 to facilitate project development.

Based on the information provided in the TE, there was no change in the development objectives of the project.

**(Describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)	
<b>c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)</b>				
Original objectives not sufficiently articulated	Exogenous conditions changed, causing a change in objectives	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)

#### 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 (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S**

**A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:**

**(i) The national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?**

The project is relevant to national sustainable agenda and development needs and challenges. As stated in the project brief, the purpose of the project is to enable developing countries to understand key concepts highlighted in the land degradation focal area strategy and OP15, as well as implement the UNCCD in a more effective way and further integrate priorities identified in Sub-regional Action programmes (SRAPs) and Regional Action Programmes (RAPs) into their national development plans.

The participants were to be provided with information, technical tools and methodologies that will strengthen their capacities in developing and implementing activities on sustainable land management addressing the needs and priorities of their respective countries, which will assist them in implementing the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD).

**(ii) The national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?**

The objective of the project is consistent and relevant with country priorities that emerged from the first session of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention (CRIC) held in November 2002 in Rome, Italy.

**(iii) The achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?**

Project's purpose is to assist developing countries to accelerate the development of GEF eligible projects and prepare and convene a series of eight sub-regional workshops aimed at informing the national implementation of GEF eligible activities to address land degradation under the new GEF Operational Programme n.15 on Sustainable Land Management.

**(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)**

The project aims at assisting developing countries with the implementation of the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD).

**A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership<sup>1</sup>**

To some degree. The project intended to strengthen interagency collaboration in the land degradation focal area, and this was achieved during or shortly after the sub-regional workshop. However, as pointed out by the TE, due to the changes in the GEF strategy in general, this collaboration faded over time.

**b. Effectiveness**

**Rating: MS**

The main objectives of the project: "to raise awareness and build capacity of country members to enable them to understand key concepts of SLM, highlighted in the land degradation focal area strategy of the GEF OP15, as well as implement the UNCCD in a more effective way" – were partly achieved.

Awareness was raised and more than 400 people of 130 countries, mostly representing the UNCCD and GEF focal points, were capacitated. New contacts and alliances between the stakeholders and partners were established.

However, due to changes in GEF approach during June 2006, the long term impact of the project was not so good. First of all, the knowledge gathered led to minimal replication and scaling-up of SLM and LD projects within the GEF framework. Second, based on the quick evolution of GEF, it was decided not to proceed with the establishment of the internet website (that was originally planned). Furthermore, changes in personnel at the national focal points after the workshops to disseminate the skills obtained and ensure long-term sustainability at country level over the long-term

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

was less positive.
<b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) <span style="float: right;">Rating: MU</span></b>
According to the TE, new partnerships were established between countries and agencies. Some project proposals were developed after the sub-regional workshops. However, the information and documentation gathered at the sub-regional workshops, such as the OP15 Guide and training handbook, only led to limited activities at national level. Only a few workshops participants passed on the information gained from the workshops to other members in their countries. The impact of the project to encourage implementation of priorities emanating from SRAPs was minimal. Furthermore, no follow-up procedure was in place to evaluate the impact of this project after the sub-regional workshops.
<b>d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.</b>
The project document and the TE do not make any indication to “trade offs” between environment and development priorities.

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

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of risks to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

<b>a. Financial resources <span style="float: right;">Rating: 3</span></b>
The main financial risks are the lack of co-funding contributions by the partners at national level. The co-funding contribution seems to be a major problem in especially the developing countries. The TE notes that if the time between project submission, approval and implementation takes too long, funding agencies also tend to lose interest, as they see no progress over the short term. Many projects are also only funded over the short term, whereas the impacts and benefits of LD and SLM type of projects are often only seen over the long term. SLM projects therefore need long-term commitment, both from policy and funding agencies.
<b>b. Socio-economic / political <span style="float: right;">Rating: 2</span></b>
Many of the communities at local and grassroots level do not adopt the outputs that have been formulated for the projects. Many projects are also too much environmentally driven with less focus on the livelihood issues of the people on the ground. The local communities that are involved in the projects often do not experience the benefits of LD and SLM projects in their regions, such as improved livelihoods or the alleviation of poverty. To ensure the sustainability of SLM and LD projects, the needs of the communities at grass-roots level should therefore be better incorporated in project development.  In addition, political instability of some countries of, e.g., the United Republic of Tanzania, which include Congo, Rwanda and Burundi, causes an influx of refugees which also have a negative impact on the sustainability of SLM projects.
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance <span style="float: right;">Rating: 3</span></b>
The TE notes that “appropriate policy and regulatory frameworks need to be in place to sustain and foster SLM in agriculture, forestry and across sectors. In many countries the UNCCD and GEF focal points are even in different Ministries at national level, e.g. the one is in the Ministry of Agriculture, whereas the other focal point is in the

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

Ministry of Environment. Due to many other commitments and a heavy work load by the employees, less LD and SLM projects under the OP15 that involve contributions by all partners were developed. Taking the responsibility to assist and implement a project is also lacking, as too many persons from different institutions are involved, leading to a lack in synergy and coordination, and due to conflicting sectoral policies and regulations.”	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>
There are no or very little environmental and ecological risks involved in this project that could undermine the follow-up work, continuation and long-term sustainability of this project. Environmental and ecological risks will only become important when SLM and LD projects have been implemented (e.g., climate change, overpopulation, etc).	
<b>e. Technological</b>	<b>Rating: 4</b>
No technology related risks mentioned.	

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

<b>a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders</b>
<p>The project facilitated UNCCD and GEF focal points as well as other country representatives came together to participate in sub-regional workshops to discuss and brainstorm the concepts and implications surrounding the OP15 of GEF.</p> <p>The project also enabled country representatives to meet the relevant IAs and EAs that are responsible for SLM implementation, learn about the development of project proposals in this focal area and collect further information on what type of co-funding could be resourced directly from, or in partnership with, the different agencies. A certain “team work” between agencies was created and the work for SLM activities was now better “streamlined”.</p> <p>Unfortunately, this catalytic role between all the partners (country, IAs and EAs and funding agencies) was not sustained due to the changes that occurred in GEF shortly after the sub-regional workshops, and feedback by GEF to countries that submitted projects under OP15 was slow.</p>
<b>b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors</b>
<p>The project did not contribute to changes in institutional behavior, but it did provide the participants of the workshop with knowledge and skills that was later shared with other stakeholders in respective countries. This has the potential to indirectly contribute to institutional changes. However, there is little evidence that may indicate concrete and measurable institutional changes.</p> <p>In some countries, such as Lebanon, the persons that attended the workshops did, for example, duplicate the documentation and information that were supplied to them and distributed the copies and learning material to other participants in the country. Other workshop participants (e.g. University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago), involved students in research projects about certain LD and SLM topics, whereas the representative from Egypt that was interviewed, had tried to translate the material into the local language.</p>
<b>c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?</b>
<p>There is little evidence to suggest that project contributed to policy changes, but it did facilitate the participating countries in understanding the OP15 of GEF better and did enhance their capacity to better implement the UNCCD.</p> <p>A few project proposals eligible for GEF funding under OP15 were developed, either by the country representatives themselves or by consultants employed by the focal points in National Governments. Some donors even expressed their interest in being associated with such enterprises and contributed either financially, such as the GTZ (see paragraph 133 and Annex E), logistically, or in-kind, to the sub-regional workshops.</p>

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

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

As mentioned in the TE, the participants' enthusiasm ebbed when they found that the GEF approach had changed just after the sub-regional workshops had ended and that very little or no funding was available in this programme for projects. This had a negative influence on what could have otherwise been a good catalytic impact of this project, and led to minimal replication and scaling-up of SLM and LD projects within the GEF framework.

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

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

**a. Co-financing.** To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?

- The TE does not discuss the extent co financing was essential to achievement of GEF objectives.
- There was no difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing.

**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?

The project duration was 29 months initially starting December 2003 to April 2006, which was later revised and extended to be completed at the end of August 2007, making a total duration of 45 months. An extension of the project from April 2006 to August 2007 was granted because of savings made during project implementation. The GEF Secretariat asked the project management to produce some additional documentation, reviews, workshops and "added value" outputs with the saved money in the extended period.

**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.

This project enhanced synergy between UNCCD and GEF Focal Points, contributing to the mainstreaming of SLM and LD projects at a national level. It raised awareness about LD and SLM issues within OP15 on different levels in the partner countries, especially those that attended the sub-regional training workshops. However, the persons that attended the workshops were not all engaged in LD and SLM matters, as they represented different departments and institutions in their countries. In a more positive way, people that were already engaged in LD and SLM projects at national level, the workshops helped in the further understanding and related challenges regarding already established projects and create bigger exposure to stakeholders at country level.

The workshops were targeted at UNCCD and GEF focal points (which was the innovative aspect of the project) to allow focal points coming from different institutions to interact among themselves and to enhance synergies and collaboration at national level. Some departments were inspired to contribute to the development of broader, long-term Environmental Action Plans and mainstreaming of SLM initiatives to be in line with the implementation of UNCCD, UNCBD, UNFCCC and other International agreements and Conventions' Action Plans (NAPs).

Training and awareness about workshop outputs to other persons at country level was minimal. Follow-up workshops at country level by the national focal points are needed.

**4.5 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): MS**

The TE indicates that this project did not have a sound M&E plan, which includes the SMART approach and indicators to monitor results and to track progress towards achieving project objectives. Nevertheless, the TE notes that no problems occurred as a result of lack of a formally planned and presented M&E strategy for this project. Similarly, under the M&E section in the project brief, there is no description of the M&E design, but only a brief description of its implementation process consisting of the following:

- execution of the activities of the project will be monitored through a quarterly progress report to UNEP and a

<p>final report upon completion of the project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- overall progress of the project implementation will be assessed by the Steering Committee through the analysis of achievement of results based on the quantitative and qualitative indicators related to the activities.</li> <li>- reporting will be undertaken by UNEP/DGEF based on the conclusions of the project steering committee. Participants and experts-trainers who attended the workshops will evaluate them and will judge the usefulness, impact and outreach of the contents and issues selected.</li> <li>- An independent external evaluation of the project will occur at completion of the project.</li> </ul>
<p><b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation                      Rating (six point scale): MS</b></p>
<p>The TE concludes that the tracking of results and progress towards project objectives throughout the project implementation period was carried out by consistent reporting. One shortcoming reported in the TE was that “no long-term monitoring and follow-up programme to track the impact of this project after implementation especially at country level was in place.”</p>
<p>b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&amp;E in the budget included in the project document? UA. The project document does not indicate the amount of funding provided for the M&amp;E activities of the project.</p>
<p>b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&amp;E during project implementation? NO.</p> <p>According to the TE, the project budgeted for a terminal evaluation but it did not budget for mid-term review/evaluation and costs associated with collecting and analyzing indicators’ related information.</p>
<p>b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system?</p> <p>The progress of the project was monitored closely by the steering committee and project reports and portfolio reviews were submitted, which included justified ratings, objectively verifiable indicators and the status of the achievements according to the project outputs and objectives.</p> <p>However, the TE notes that there was no long-term monitoring and follow-up programme to keep track with the impact of the programme after completion was in place.</p>
<p>b.3 Can the project M&amp;E system (or an aspect of the project M&amp;E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why.</p> <p>No. It cannot be considered a good practice because of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- A good M&amp;E plan according to the new SMART parameters was not implemented for this MSP.</li> <li>- There was no long-term monitoring and follow-up programme to keep track with the impact of the programme after completion was in place.</li> </ul>

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

<p><b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</b></p>
<p><b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S</b></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>According to the TE assessment, the support and backstopping by UNEP was very good. The TE indicates that “all steering committee members, consultants and workshop participants that were interviewed, or from which response was obtained through the e-mail questionnaire, were full of praise regarding the assistance, support and organizational skills of UNEP-DGEF Task Manager.”</p> <p>Due to the short time period in which all the workshops had to be completed, no proper follow-up actions and continued communication and collaboration actions were however implemented. The contact details of many of the workshop participants are, in many cases, no longer valid.</p> <p>The M&amp;E arrangements in the project design should have been improved..</p>

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

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.

The project documents do not provide sufficient information to assess the performance of the partners involved, namely; UNDP, the WB, UNCCD Secretariat. However, throughout the report, including the last PIR, it is mentioned that the implementation approach was successful and to a great extent effective. Activities carried out by the partners were very valuable and in accordance with the project’s implementation mechanism and framework outlined in the project document. Considering no specific issues were brought up relating the performance of the partners, it could be concluded that their performance was satisfactory.

**5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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

- The period in which the nine sub-regional workshops had to be presented in the initial 29 month period that was planned for this project, was too short. Adaptations between workshops were therefore minimal. Although guidelines from the steering committee and GEF Secretariat had to be considered, there was too much interference with the original project design and implementation acting negatively on the creativity by the project team.
- A positive lesson was that the project management team used a number of experts and consultants to develop documents and help to make workshop more tailor made per region. This did not only increase the “critical mass” of efforts and capacity, but also enhanced the collaboration between country participants and representatives from IAs, EAs and other stakeholders.
- The inputs by the steering committee, especially towards the end of the project faded. The lesson is that the TOR of the steering committee was not absolutely clear.
- Regular meetings were held by the steering committee and good progress reports were delivered timely over the duration of the project, but no clear M&E plan was in place.

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

- The TE recommended that the projects should not be extended for too long and should not be expected to produce additional outputs long after the expected outputs of the project have been accomplished even if considerable savings have been made over the duration of the project.
- It recommended that project managers and other stakeholders have to be constantly made aware, be trained and capacitated at national level regarding changes that may occur in e.g. GEF and other IAs and EAs regarding SLM and LD activities and initiatives.
- It recommended that a better M&E plan, according to the new GEF requirements and SMART approaches, has to be applied in similar projects in future.
- It recommended involvement of steering committee members in follow-up activities of this project if approved by the GEF Secretariat.

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

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

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

<b>6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b>	5

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



The report provides a satisfactory assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, outcomes and the achievement of the objectives. Nevertheless, in some areas it runs short in providing sufficient information and elaboration on the impacts of the attained outcomes. For example, the project brief and also the TE indicate that one of the objectives of the project was to improve the effectiveness of implementing the UNCCD. The TE does not explain how the skills and knowledge gained during the implementation of the project has the potential to contribute towards that objective.	
<p><b>b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?</b></p> <p>The report is generally consistent and the evidence is complete for allow the areas that the TE covers. However, as indicated above there are some areas that the TE doesn't necessarily pay a separate attention. For example, it does not assess the performance of the IAs, but it does assess the performance of the EAs.</p>	4
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b></p> <p>The report assessment of sustainability of the project is satisfactory for all of its components: financial resources, socio-political, institutional framework and governance, and environmental.</p>	5
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b></p> <p>Satisfactory.</p>	5
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b></p> <p>Yes, the project includes actual project costs and co-financing used. However, it does not include the budget for M&amp;E activities.</p>	5
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b></p> <p>The report identifies the shortcomings in the design and implementation and provides valuable recommendations.</p>	5

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

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

**Implementing Agency contact person:**  
Mr. Ahmed Djoghlaif  
Director, UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination  
PO Box 30552  
Nairobi, Kenya  
E-mail : [gefprojects@unep.org](mailto:gefprojects@unep.org)  
Fax : 242-20-62 40 41

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