

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
<b>GEF project ID</b>		2184	
<b>GEF Agency project ID</b>		GFL/2328-2770- 4A79	
<b>GEF Replenishment Phase</b>		GEF-4	
<b>Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)</b>		UNEP	
<b>Project name</b>		Stimulating Community Initiatives in Sustainable Land Management (SCI-SLM)	
<b>Country/Countries</b>		Ghana, Morocco, South Africa, and Uganda	
<b>Region</b>		Middle East and Africa	
<b>Focal area</b>		Land Degradation	
<b>Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives</b>		GEF-4 Land Degradation- SO2: Upscaling of sustainable land management investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods; GEF-5 LD-SP-1: Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management; and LD-SP 3: Investing in new and innovative approaches to SLM	
<b>Executing agencies involved</b>		University of KwaZulu-Natal	
<b>NGOs/CBOs involvement</b>		TARGA-Aide as National Executing Agency	
<b>Private sector involvement</b>		None involved	
<b>CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)</b>		June 4, 2009	
<b>Effectiveness date / project start</b>		September 15, 2009	
<b>Expected date of project completion (at start)</b>		September, 2013	
<b>Actual date of project completion</b>		December 31, 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
<b>Project Preparation Grant</b>	GEF funding	0.025	-
	Co-financing	0.016,500	-
<b>GEF Project Grant</b>			-
<b>Co-financing</b>	IA own	0	-
	Government	0.788	-
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	-
	Private sector	0	-
	NGOs/CSOs	0.160	-

<b>Total GEF funding</b>	0.937,391	-
<b>Total Co-financing</b>	0.964,500	0.582,074
<b>Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)</b>	1.901,891	-
<b>Terminal evaluation/review information</b>		
<b>TE completion date</b>	March 2016	
<b>Author of TE</b>	Justine Braby	
<b>TER completion date</b>	August 3, 2017	
<b>TER prepared by</b>	Spandana Battula	
<b>TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)</b>	Molly Watts	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
<b>Project Outcomes</b>	HS	S	-	MS
<b>Sustainability of Outcomes</b>		L	-	ML
<b>M&amp;E Design</b>		MS	-	MS
<b>M&amp;E Implementation</b>		MS	-	MU
<b>Quality of Implementation</b>		MS	-	MS
<b>Quality of Execution</b>		-	-	MU
<b>Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report</b>		-	-	S

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective was to “refine ways of stimulating the further improvement and spread of community-based sustainable land management initiatives while developing a methodology to upscale and institutionally embed SCI-SLM approaches at local and regional level in four pilot countries in Africa” (Request for CEO Endorsement, p.1).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project aimed to use “community innovation” in sustainable land management “to curb land degradation, desertification, and thus alleviate food security issues and poverty, in dryland areas of Africa” (TE pg 17).

The project had four main components to achieve its objective, and they were:

- 1) Identification and analysis of community initiatives in SLM;
- 2) Stimulation and upscaling of community initiatives;
- 3) Awareness raising amongst policy makers; and
- 4) Development of methodology for upscaling and institutionally embedding SLM initiatives.

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

There were no changes to objectives of the project, but the components were reworded as activities (TE pg 20).

#### 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	----------------------

The project was relevant to GEF’s land degradation focal area and Strategic Objective 2 on “upscaling of sustainable land management investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods” (TE pg 25). It was also aligned to GEF’s land degradation Strategic Priority-1 of supporting sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management, and Strategic Priority-3 of investing in New and Innovative Approaches to SLM (TE pg 25). The project was part of the Strategic Investment Programme for SLM in sub-Saharan Africa and aligned to TerrAfrica. The PD notes that due to the focus of the project on “local initiatives and community driven innovations in sustainable land management, the proposed project is thus in line with the priorities of the UNCCD in Africa” (PD pg 28).

4.2 <b>Effectiveness</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE gave a satisfactory rating to the achievement of the four components which promoted community initiatives and innovations in sustainable land management (SLM). During implementation, the project was able to achieve only five out of ten planned outputs. The TER finds that some of the evidence was not present to support delivery of outputs especially in the case of awareness raising and identification of community initiatives. Thus, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating because of partial delivery of outputs.

#### **Component 1: Identification and analysis of community initiatives in SLM:**

The project planned for three outputs under this component and it was partially successful in achieving its targets. The first output aimed to identify community initiatives in SLM in the four project countries. The project designed a novel methodology “through a step-by-step process, which included the TEES-test and SRI-test, and characterisation, four community initiatives

were selected out of a larger number identified in each country” (TE pg 26). The TE mentions that the project also carefully designed for impact and effectiveness to analyze technical and socioeconomic aspects of the initiatives (TE pg 27). The project collected data on baseline scenarios of innovative community SLM initiatives and made it available as a database. However, not all the information was accessible and the website was not user-friendly (TE pg 28).

### **Component 2: Stimulation and upscaling of community initiatives:**

The project managed to deliver on all the three outputs under this component, intended to broadly disseminate the community initiatives. For the output to further develop the initiatives in organizational structure and technically, the project supported in-country community exchanges. For instance, “the NGO Zasilari Eco Farm Project worked in partnership with the Ghana SCI-SLM team to encourage the improvements in organisational structures in e.g. Moatani” (TE pg 28). Due to these exchange visits the communities were able to learn from each other and there were offshoot benefits such as community organization and rainwater harvesting. The project also successfully upscaled various initiatives, like in Ghana, “nearby communities around Kandiga spread the idea of compost heaping, in Uganda, the tree planting by RECPA motivated young farmers nearby to do their own planting” (TE pg 29). However, because of budgetary and logistical difficulties, exchange visits were not done for all four communities in each country (TE pg 29). Finally, to identify constraints to upscaling initiatives, the project conducted studies to determine/measure developments of upscaling before and after project, and administered characterization forms which included the measurements of the community initiatives (TE pg 30).

### **Component 3: Awareness raising amongst policy makers**

Under this component there were two outputs planned to incorporate pilot practices into national and NGO agencies, and publish policy briefs with suggestions for improvements. As per the TE, the project had strong stakeholder involvement through National Steering Committee (SC), NGO and government partnerships. This led to incorporating SLM practices into national agencies, research bodies and NGOs. For example, community initiatives and social innovation processes were absorbed into NGOs in Ghana, whereas in Uganda the National Agricultural Research Organisation continues to liaise with communities like Bandera 2000 and NACIA. But, due to lack of prioritization of workloads in Morocco, institutional partnerships were difficult to maintain (TE pg 30). In addition, policy makers were incorporated into the structures of the projects such as participation in SC meetings and their participation had positive effect on the outcomes. “In South Africa with the SCI-SLM elements incorporated into the upcoming SLM related GEF project. In Uganda, SCI-SLM was integrated at government level and into their national SLM strategy” (TE pg 31). However, the TE states that there is no evidence of policy briefs being published which was one of the important outputs (TE pg 30).

#### **Components 4: Development of methodology for upscaling and institutionally embedding SLM initiatives**

The project developed a methodology in a policy brief and information on project implementation was systematically collected for the SCI-SLM book. “A writeshop in May 2013 was held in South Africa, after which the project coordinator made several visits to the countries (e.g. Uganda, Ghana) to finalise write ups of the individual chapters” (TE pg 31). The book included methodology for vertical upscaling of SLM initiatives.

<b>4.3 Efficiency</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-----------------------	---------------------------------

The project faced few delays because of GEF’s reorganization, and disbursement of funds from the executing agency. Although the project concept was drawn up in 2002, the reorganization in GEF took until 2009 for the project to finally approved. Additionally, the bureaucracy in South Africa led to delays in funding from the executing agency (TE pgs 46-47). In relation to cost efficiency, the TE notes that there was under-budgeting during design phase because there was shortage of funds during implementation. However, as the project achievements were substantial given the small budgets, it indicates that efforts were made towards being as cost-efficient as possible (TE pg 47). Considering the delays and shortage of funds, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to efficiency of the project.

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: Moderately Likely
---------------------------	---------------------------

The TE gave a Likely rating to sustainability, however, the TER gives a Moderately Likely rating. The TER finds that there are moderate risks in terms of financial resources and institutional framework that could affect the overall sustainability of the project outcomes. An assessment of the sustainability of the project on the basis of financial as well as socio-economic, institutional and governance, and environmental factors is presented below:

**Financial resources:** The TE states that the project mobilized a number of local level financial resources. For instance, “in South Africa, GEF project development is under way which is informed by and uses elements of the SCI-SLM project (and) in Ghana, the NGO ACDP has put forward proposals and secured funding to implement initiatives with embedding of SCI-SLM principles” (TE pg 44). However, due to lack of interest from broader global community, financial resources seem to be a limitation for upscaling SLM initiatives. Thus, the TER gives a Moderately Likely rating to financial risks for sustainability.

**Sociopolitical:** The project had participation from all levels of stakeholders, including local communities, government departments, NGOs and research institutions. The policy makers were also involved in awareness raising about SLM and many of the SLM practices were incorporated

in agencies and NGOs. In Ghana two NGOs took up SLM concept and methodology for their work, and in South Africa, the SCI-SLM concept made it up to Cabinet level, and there was support from various relevant Government departments (TE pg 43). Thus, the sociopolitical sustainability of the project seems high and thus, the TER gives a Likely rating.

**Institutional framework and governance:** The TE notes that the SLM initiative had “catalytic effect towards institutional embedding in all four countries, the level and potential for sustainability (especially as related to Government ownership) varies between the countries” (TE pg 44). While in Morocco TARGA-Aide incorporated SLM at programmatic level but there wasn’t institutional adoption at government level, in Uganda there was strong embedding in institutional settings (TE pgs 44-45). As the institutional update of SLM was not uniform across the four countries, the TER gives a Moderately Likely rating.

**Environmental:** The project raised environmental awareness and exposed maladaptive practices. “The more of this type of sustained action is taking place at community level, the greater the environmental sustainability, and also the greater the general resilience to climate change” (TE pg 45). The TER gives the same Likely rating as the TE for environmental sustainability.

## **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?

The actual co-financing was \$582,074, less than expected co-financing of \$1,182,181. However, the TE indicates that co-financing information was not regularly reported. There is no information as to whether this impacted the project outcomes.

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 delay during its design phase because of reorganization of the GEF in 2006 and was only approved in 2009. It also had some delays in disbursement of funding from CEAD, the executing agency, due to institutional red tapes.

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 TE notes that there was high ownership of the project from government and communities. In Uganda, the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries was implementing the SLM

project and there was mobilization of government funds. In South Africa, SLM initiatives were being supported by the government through participation in Steering Committee meetings. However, in Morocco and Ghana, there was less support to the project from the relevant government agencies (TE pg 51).

**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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to M&E design at entry as it had few flaws with an overall good M&E framework. The project planned for baseline data collection, project results framework with SMART indicators, mid-term, and final evaluation (PD pg 45). The project included an inception workshop to fine-tune indicators, and also provided to set-up a steering committee to review periodic reports. However, as per the TE, “roles and responsibilities for who should be collecting monitoring results per se was not clearly described although data was collected throughout the process for the book writing, and the UNEP Task Manager was responsible for keeping the project on track” (TE pg 53). The TE also notes that for output 2.1, the indicators did not meet the SMART criteria.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The TE rated M&E implementation for the project as Moderately Satisfactory. Although the project had a mid-term evaluation and regular project implementation reports, the TE notes that “beyond ticking boxes on logframe lists, the M&E implementation was not strong (TE pg 54). Also, the project did not sufficiently follow-up monitoring at community level and at policy level the project did not have enough impact indicators to display outcome of policy awareness. The TE does not report whether information from M&E reports were utilized for project improvements.



## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--	---------------------------------

The TE gave a Satisfactory rating to the quality of project implementation but the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating due to downsides in technical coordination and management. UNEP was the implementing agency and the TE mentions that it provided good supervision, guidance and technical backstopping (TE pg 53). UNEP also disbursed funds for implementation without any delays and it collaborated adequately with stakeholders and beneficiaries (TE pgs 47 & 50). However, the TE states that “technical coordination and management was not as effective as was hoped for the project, especially in terms of actual missions to the countries. Many project proponents mentioned that they had expected more in-country visits by the Project Coordinator” (TE pg 53).

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
---	-----------------------------------

The overall project executing agency was Center for Environment, Agriculture and Development (CEAD), at the University of KwaZulu-Natal in coordination with Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) in Uganda, University of Development Studies (UDS) in Ghana, and TARGA-Aide in Morocco. The TE reports that there were funding disbursement delays from CEAD because of bureaucracy and red tape factors. There was also absence of physical presence in terms of management and coordination from the executing agency, which resulted in the Technical Advisory Group team to take up project management tasks. The TE mentions there is a possibility that “CEAD was overcommitted to a number of things and thus was not always able to make country visits” (TE pg 48).

## 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 mentions a few environmental changes occurring such as, “in Ghana, compost heaping found to improve production of crops; in Morocco, land rehabilitation through terracing was very visibly providing results in terms of production” (TE pg 45).

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.

The TE reports that in South Africa and Uganda there were some income generating changes. In Uganda, the method of conservation agriculture and fruit trees increased production and income generation. In South Africa, communities were able to create income through forest management and saving system which were being utilized for innovations (TE pgs 44-45).

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 provided initiatives such as “exchange visits between communities (peer exchanges) helped them greatly to learn new ideas from peers who face the same challenges; international exchange visits gave them confidence and empowerment through recognition and exposure; international visits by TAG members gave them knowledge on

improving their innovations; and more” (TE pg 46). The project also developed brochures, National policy briefs, and used other communication channels for community outreach efforts (TE pg 50).

b) Governance: No governance related changes were reported.

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 changes 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 provided awareness and communication platforms such as exchange visits between communities and international visits for knowledge sharing (TE pgs 45-46)

## **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 key lessons were (TE pgs 59-60):

1) Community as centre of learning and entry point: The project used community as centre for learning and sharing which was successful in creating replicable environments.

2) Social innovation is an untapped treasure in upscaling and replication: “The understanding of true social innovation was one of the key strengths of the SCI-SLM process and has opened the door to understanding that no technical innovation will spread without an element of social innovation” (TE pg 59).

3) Platforms for sharing and exchange at local level is a powerful experience: The community exchange visits contributed strongly to the South-South learning and a strong platform for peer learning than externals coming in to teach.

4) Strong foundations of previous practice builds a good project: The project used previous experience and practice of researchers testing innovation in the field, and engaged stakeholders to be directly involved in project design.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The recommendations given in the TE were (TE pgs 60-61):

1) Absorption of lessons learnt into future project development and implementation: The TE recommended that the lessons learnt from the project should be considered throughout the GEF Land Degradation Focal Area portfolio through a check-list for new SLM projects at design phase.

2) Methodology, especially the social innovation angle and the characterisation, are low hanging fruit for future and current projects: SLM projects should have methodology for horizontal spread and there should be targeted awareness raising to coordinators in African countries for uptake of the methodology.

3) Strategic book dissemination: The TE notes that the project should develop a dissemination strategy so that it can have as wide a readership as possible within the natural resource community.

4) Global uptake: The TE recommends that the book should be showcased in all types of events like the GEF conferences, side events, Africa level conferences like Clim-Dev etc and information briefs should be shared on platforms such as Africa Adaptation Knowledge Network, and Africa-Adapt.

5) Next steps in terms of SCI-SLM: The TE recommends that projects on SLM should have a component for practical implementation of the science/local knowledge interface. Technical science should be infused into community initiative implementation and experimentation.

## 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 contained detailed analysis of the outcomes and impacts of the project. It gave a thorough assessment of the project implementation and results achieved with few photographs from the project sites.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE gave examples as evidence to support its evaluation, however, some ratings were inflated based on the evidence given.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report properly assesses the project's sustainability very well but does not provide an exit strategy.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are comprehensive and have substantial evidence.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report included actual costs and co-financing information but does not clearly specify GEF's financing.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report assessed and gave appropriate ratings for M&E design and implementation.	S
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

## 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.