

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2268	
GEF Agency project ID		2935	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		SIP: Integrated Ecosystem Management in Four Representative Landscapes of Senegal, Tranche 2.	
Country/Countries		Senegal	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP12 –Integrated Ecosystem Management	
Executing agencies involved		Ministries of Environment (ME) with the cooperation of Directorate of National Parks (DPN), Directorate of Soil Conservation (DEFCCS); DCERP; and Ministry of Fisheries	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Village Committees and CIVD (Inter Village Committees) – secondary executing agencies	
Private sector involvement		Little Green Capital (Eco Conservation) and Iterrae – through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		7/4/2007	
Effectiveness date / project start		9/4/2007	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		9/30/2011	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2011	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3.64	3.64
Co-financing	IA own	1.25	1.25
	Government	2.43 (includes cash contribution of .35 and in kind contribution of 2.08)	U/A (0.35 cash contribution but in-kind contribution not assessed in TE)
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	2.6	N/A
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	1.5	N/A
Total GEF funding		3.64	3.64
Total Co-financing		7.78	N/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		11.42	N/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 2011	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Dr Maguett Kaire and Dr Mamadou Kouma	
TER completion date		January 2015	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	

TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)

Joshua Schneck

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As indicated in the project document, the Global Environmental Objective of the project is to promote integrated and sustainable management of globally significant terrestrial and coastal ecosystems in Senegal. These ecosystems have abundance of flora and fauna of global significance and are increasingly threatened due to issues such as deforestation, poaching, overgrazing, over-extraction of marine resources and non-timber products, and uncontrolled fires. These threats are driven by poverty and inadequate alternative options for the majority of the rural poor, compounded by their poor skills/knowledge and weak institutions. Collectively, these barriers had hampered the adoption of innovative knowledge based ecosystem management approaches in past. The project was set up to address these barriers, and establish an enabling environment for Integrated Ecosystem Management in four representative landscapes of Senegal.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As stated in the project document, the Development Objective of the project is to promote integrated ecosystem management, land degradation control and sustainable use of natural resources in four representative landscapes of Senegal.

The logframe in the project document lists the following expected outcomes of the project:

Outcome 1: Policy and Legal Framework adapted to Participatory Integrated Ecosystem Management

Set up 25 Community Natural Reserves (CNRs)/ Pastoral Units (PU) covering at least 300,000 ha as legal community based common property, with adopted environmentally sound rules and regulations for sustainable use of natural resources, operate as buffer zone for wildlife seasonal migration, livelihood mobility and ecosystem conservation.

Outcome 2: Sustainable development and Community Based Natural Resources Management implemented in Village Territories.

Community based land use management plans adopted and implemented in 175 selected pilot villages. These plans are to be built on project capitalized (experience from first tranche) and local based environmentally sound practices.

Outcome 3: Conservation and Sustainable Management for CNR/PU is achieved

A set of at least 25 CNR/PU are legally established around the project selected Protected Areas (PA) with adapted and adopted management plans along with a set of rules and regulations for sustainable use of natural resources.

Outcome 4: Sustainable Co-Management for Biodiversity Conservation in protected areas

Each of the four project’s selected PA has an adapted and adopted co-management plan being implemented through the cooperation and concerned actors shared benefits from ecotourism.

Outcome 5: Participatory Ecosystem Monitoring and Evaluation is achieved

Project ecosystem management performances along with poverty alleviation through alternative options around PA are regularly assessed by an operating database fed by community based monitoring and evaluation forums.

Outcome 6: Learning, Evaluation and adaptive management increased

Project Learning, evaluation, and adaptive management is demonstrated to local communities by end of year 7 through good knowledge management skills involving all concerned actors.

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

No

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

According to the TE, the project strategy of integrated ecosystems management, land degradation control and the sustainable use of natural resources is in line with the recent shift in environment and forest related policies in Senegal from sectoral and restrictive approach to a more participatory approach in management of Protected Areas (PAs), involving local population living near these protected areas in a win-win option. The project specifically identified four sites of high global significance that are most representative of the four main ecosystems of the country (PD, 5). The project addresses the long term problems facing the conservation of biodiversity and sustainable land management in these ecosystems through building and empowering local capacities to manage their environmental resources – relevant to Outcome 1 of Country Program Document (CPD) 2007-2011 to address poverty alleviation (PD, 8).

Furthermore, the project’s approaches, objectives and activities contribute to the realization of Senegal’s Millennium Development Goals (MDG) 1 and 7, which focus on poverty reduction and environmental management respectively, and to another regional initiative - TerrAfrica’s Program Goal (2018) of improving natural resource-based livelihoods by reducing land degradation.

Project’s strategy to interlink three geographical units – with the PA as a core protected area, the CNR/PU as the buffer zone around PA, and village territories for production system intensification and diversification using Sustainable Land Management (SLM) practices and approaches – is consistent with the GEF operational program on Sustainable Land Management adopted by GEF Council in May 2003 to strengthen and demonstrate an integrated approach to natural resources management. The project is also consistent with the strategic priorities of GEF-4 framework for Sustainable Land Management (PD 14).

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

The TE has listed achievements under all 6 outcomes and assigned ratings on a scale of 1 to 4 (Bad, fair, satisfactory and very satisfactory) to all the outcomes (4 outcomes have a rating of satisfactory and 2 outcomes have a rating of very satisfactory) individually. Based on the results and achievements of the project presented in the TE and APR (2011), this TER assesses effectiveness of the project to be ‘satisfactory’.

Overall, project led to conservation of biodiversity through the legal establishment of 26 Community Nature Reserves (CNRs)/ Pastoral Units (PUs) to operate as buffer zones around Protected Areas (PAs), with community based development and natural resource management plans in place for sustainable management of natural resources in these sites. These CNRs are now considered as classified areas of local collectivities, with local conventions/charters established for use of natural resources and protection of endemic endangered species. According to the TE and APR (2011), these ecosystems located along the hunting areas have enabled significant increase in plant and animal species. As a result of interventions through the project, 21 out of 31 endemic species of Senegal were identified and protected by the Forestry Code with *in situ* proliferation of some of these species in the selected project sites. According to the TE, the amount of carbon hold (approximately 2.295 million tons of CO2 equivalent between 2004 and 2009) in the CNR through measures such as reforestation and control of bushfires, offers a significant potential to be promoted in carbon market in future.

The project was successful in integrating environmental protection with income generating activities, through savings and credit mutual banks for the target population living in the periphery of protected areas. According to APR (2011), the Village Development Committees (CVD) have benefited from (i) the financing of 1,396 projects through credit revolving, (ii) the distribution of 3,332 improved stoves which contributed significantly to improving energy efficiency and reduction of pressure on woody vegetation, (iii) a sustainable land management through the recovering of salt-affected soils, the fixation of sand dunes, the setting up of village woods, windbreaks and hedges, the use of compost, the reduction of water erosion and streaming. The project has developed a strong synergy with other projects and programs (MFP/GEF, Microfinance Project, multifunctional energy platforms project, KINOME, etc.) as well as with government directorates that will facilitate consolidation of outcomes and replication of the project in other areas.

The gender aspect was also well integrated into project activities that allowed it to develop specific initiatives for women, especially related to processing of the local products, poultry farming and petty

trade. According to APR (2011) the project was recognized by UNDP as one of three leading projects in Africa in mainstreaming gender considerations into natural resources management. As APR (2011) notes, at least 50% of the beneficiaries of the microcredit were women and 60% of the people benefitting from 9 mutual credit and savings banks owned by villagers set up in the project area were also women (APR, 2011 Pg 3).

TE notes that despite its good performance, project lags behind developing tools for monitoring and evaluation of progress under the project. TE recommends establishing Geographical Information System (GIS) for monitoring and evaluation of project activities and emphasizes need to conduct certain specific studies such as effect of mutual banks on family incomes as well as study on improvement of vegetation cover in some of the project sites (Ferlo) before and after the project. Some of the issues mentioned in TE, though not elaborated upon, that can be relevant for the next phase (Tranche 3) of the project include – strengthening cooperation with Department of Water and Forestry related to fight against bush fires and threat from competing land uses such as exploitation of Zircon in Niyaes - one of the project sites, can disrupt processes initiated under the project.

The achievements against five outcomes of the project are further listed below:

Outcome 1: Policy and Legal Framework adapted to Participatory Integrated Ecosystem Management

26 CNRs/PUs covering a surface area of more than 577 000 hectares were created. Local community-based development and natural resources management plans developed for these areas and are in the process of implementation- relevant stakeholders have ratified the consensual common charter around two reserves (the Saloum Delta Biosphere Reserve and the Niokolo Koba Biosphere Reserve) and 26 CNRs/PUs endowed with a local natural resources good management charter.

Outcome 2: Sustainable development and Community Based Natural Resources Management implemented in Village Territories.

Community based land occupation and management plans are in place and in the process of implementation for 175 selected pilot villages including 25CNRs/PUs adjacent to PAs. Restoration efforts on community lands in these village territories included initiatives like development of community nurseries (16) and village nurseries (70); restoration of vast tracts of salted lands (1209 ha), mangroves (2862 ha), degraded wetlands (1169 ha), arable lands (1397ha). In addition, awareness generation through trainings and exchange visits amongst local councilors in all four-project sites, on issues related to sustainable development and biodiversity conservation, will contribute towards achieving the overall goal of this outcome. An operational network of 9 Savings and Credit Funds (REMEDE) for the benefit of the populations of 26 CNRs/PUs was also established.

Outcome 3: Conservation and Sustainable Management for CNR/PU is achieved

In accordance with the target in the project, a total 26 CNRs/PUs were created around PAs and endowed with community based local occupation and management plans. According to TE, these plans have been adopted and are in the process of implementation. Activities undertaken under these component included maintenance of firebreaks (538kms), fixation of sand dune (99.2 kms); restoration of degraded spaces with local species (1667 Ha) and 220 pilot villages equipped for bush fire control. Income generation activities promoted in these villages, in order to ultimately reduce pressure on PAs, include bee keeping micro projects (200), introduction of medicinal plants and integrated community nurseries. Setting up of a funds fed by the contributions of CIVD (FCFA150,000/year), and Rural Councils

(FCFA200,000/year), the grazing tax (FCFA1,000/household chief), the watering tax (FCFA100/cattle head) and other donations intended for the maintenance of a network of firebreaks set up under the project.

Outcome 4: Sustainable Co-Management for Biodiversity Conservation in protected areas

Some of the initiatives taken to protect and conserve biodiversity in protected areas include – sign boards designed (60 boards) and settled in partnership with UNESCO; sign boards rehabilitated in Niokolo-Koba National Park; 3 bird nestling islets and water regulation works have been built in Special Fauna reserve of Guembeul; former poachers involved as ecoguards and in micro projects (guinea fowl breeding, bee keeping without smoke).

Outcome 5: Participatory Ecosystem Monitoring and Evaluation is achieved

According to the TE, various studies that were undertaken to track and monitor project’s ecosystem management performances include- inventory of animal/plant species with evaluation of fauna migration in each of the 4 PAs and 25 CNRs/PUs; a study to monitor level of carbon sequestration in field control sites; a comparative study to monitor changes in the living condition of people and land productivity; impact of bushfire control and use of improved stoves. In addition, digital and physical herbaria were established and entrusted with the concerned departments of Environmental Science Institute (ISE) and Cheikh Anta Diop University^[1] (UCAD) University. Participatory community debates on projects were held at various occasions and exchange visits were regularly organized for disseminating best practices adopted in the field.

A decentralized data bank was developed and fed by ecoguards in each of the administrative districts and effective in 17 inter villages committees. TE doesn’t elaborate upon the efficacy of this system in regular monitoring and evaluation of the project performance in the field.

Outcome 6: Learning, Evaluation and adaptive management increased

TE doesn’t elaborate upon activities undertaken under this component, except that local actors were informed, trained and are aware of their responsibilities and organized in Economic Interest Groups.

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

The TE doesn’t assess a rating for efficiency of the project. Based on the information in TE and APR (2011), this TER assesses project’s efficiency to be ‘satisfactory’. According to APR (2011), the Project Local Units (PLUs) improved their efficiency by building synergies with the partners and other ongoing projects, carefully planning the fieldwork in remote areas, resorting to local knowledge to support implementation of activities, devolving responsibilities to the local communities via Inter-Village Development Committees (CIVD) and using local expertise like ecoguards in the management of PAs. This enabled the project to bring more area under its coverage and also provide biological interconnections to the project sites, an aspect that was missing from the project design. For instance, the project covered 26 CNRs over 577,000 ha under 254 VTs (Village Territories), as compared to the original target of 20 CNRs over 1 million hectares under 175 VTs, without changes in the original budget (APR - 2011, 64). Overall, project was implemented as per schedule with full utilization of the available funds.

TE doesn't assess sustainability of the various outcomes achieved under the project. This TER is unable to assess sustainability based on the information presented in the TE and APR (2011).

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?

According to the TE, funds approved as co-financing from UNDP were received and realized, except that these funds were delayed on an average by 25 days, which didn't hamper project implementation in any significant way. According to TE, cash contribution as co-financing from the Government of Senegal (GOS) was also fully realized (APR 2011, 62). Funds from GOS in the form of cash contribution to meet the tax payments and salaries of the staff involved at various levels and funds from UNDP were crucial for completing activities supported by GEF. TE didn't comment or provide an accounting of co-financing from other donors like JICA, IFAD and FENU, as these agencies also committed contribution as co-financing as per details in the project document (PD, 42).

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?

According to the dates mentioned in TE, project was delayed by three months, which I did not impact the project's outcome and/or sustainability.

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:

TE doesn't elaborate on this aspect. But from the details in the TE and PD, it can be inferred that project had high ownership from the Government of Senegal, as evident from the successful completion of Tranche 1 and now Tranche 2. As mentioned in the project document, all preliminary political and social actions were achieved end of Tranche 1 that set the stage for Tranche 2. Establishment of a favorable policy environment for Integrated Conservation and Development (ICD) and eco-geographical planning at the national level, was one of the notable achievements by the end of Tranche 1 (PD, 13). For instance, at the policy level, herders' were given legal land access for the first time in last 39 years resulting in community ownership of Pastoral Units (PUs), establishing community based rules and regulations enforced at community level. Similarly, legally established Community Natural Reserves (CNR) around selected Protected Areas (PA) provided the backdrop for implementation of full array of sustainable land management and biodiversity conservation activities in selected sites of CNR/PUs during Tranche 2. Hence, this favorable policy and legal environment as well as involvement of community in ecosystem management during Tranche 2, facilitated by the Government of Senegal reflect their high ownership of the project.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE doesn't comment or assess a rating for M&E design at entry. This TER assesses the M&E plan given in the project document to be satisfactory. The plan in the project document provides an overall framework for M&E to be taken at various levels of the project – specific technical studies (monitoring biodiversity status and carbon sequestration) to be carried out by external agencies/consultants; formal annual and mid-term evaluations; participatory monitoring and evaluation carried out regularly at the community level and Project Coordination Unit (PCU) to produce quarterly technical financial and technical reports based on indicators in the logframe. The plan in the project document included a logframe with Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVIs), specific targets, baseline situation and source of verification, forming the basis of monitoring and evaluation. The plan also included indicative monitoring and evaluation work plan, defining various reports/M&E outputs to be generated, time frames with responsibilities assigned and corresponding budget. Learning and knowledge sharing is also an integral part of the M&E plan, with provision to share lessons that might be beneficial for design of the similar projects in future.

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

The TE doesn't assess a rating for M&E implementation. This TER assesses M&E implementation as 'moderately satisfactory' based on the evidence in the TE and APR (2011).

According to the details in the Project Document (PD), monitoring and evaluation of the project was to be conducted at various levels. It involved conducting specific technical studies through involvement of external agencies/consultants; participatory monitoring and evaluation to be carried out at regular intervals and quarterly technical and financial reporting by Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) based on Objectively Verifiable Indicators (OVI) indicated in the logical framework.

As per information in the TE and Annual Report (2011), various specific studies were undertaken to track and monitor project's ecosystem management performances including- inventory of animal/plant species with evaluation of fauna migration in each of the 4 PAs and 25 CNRs/PUs; a study to monitor level of carbon sequestration in field control sites; a comparative study to monitor changes in the living condition of people and land productivity; impact of bushfire control and use of improved stoves. TE and APR (2011) have drawn results from some of these studies as evidence to support some of the outcomes achieved as a result of the project. APR (2011) stated setting up of participatory monitoring and evaluation committees in 256 villages, as significant achievement of the project. Setting up of such committees allowed community level debate on the achievements under the project and need for corrective measure, if any, that facilitated adaptive management of Protected Areas (PAs) covered under the project.

However, project lagged behind developing a monitoring and evaluation plan to systematically track project’s performance based on indicators given in the logframe (TE, 28). A study on the “Elaboration of a Monitoring and Evaluation Plan” created databases to ensure effective analysis of data and prepare reports according to selected indicators (TE, 28). However, according to the TE, tools recommended in this study were never utilized fully by the project. Absence of monitoring, evaluation and control mechanisms was also highlighted by the supervision reports of UNDP, but TE doesn’t elaborate upon the reasons that such a system was not adopted by the project.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Unable to assess
--	---------------------------------

According to the TE, UNDP conducted periodical supervisions of the project and the leadership provided by UNDP Dakar office was found satisfactory. But TE doesn’t elaborate upon this aspect due to which TER is unable to assess and assign a rating to quality of supervision provided by Implementing Agency.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Unable to assess
---	---------------------------------

The TE doesn’t comment or provide details to assess the quality of project execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate below that this is indeed the case. 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.

Some of the significant environmental changes as reported in the Terminal Evaluation are as below:

- As a result of interventions through the project, 21 out of the 31 endemic species of Senegal have been identified and protected by the Forestry Code. Some of those species are undergoing multiplication in situ and are part of the global heritage and elements of the biological diversity (TE, 6).

- Application of a model developed under the project and in consultation with institutions (Kinome, EcoSecurities and the University of Ziguinchor, Senegal) showed that the project has had a significant impact on the global environment, with a reduction of 2,295,000 tCO₂e (tons of Carbon Dioxide equivalent) between 2004 and 2009, due to regeneration efforts taken under the project in eight NCRs covering a total surface of 235,580 ha. This is a significant achievement considering that deforestation in the tropical zone represents between 15 and 20% of the global emission of greenhouse gases (APR, 2011, Pg 63).
- Community based management has enabled regeneration of about 14,000 ha of Mangroves on the island of Saint-Louis in Senegal (APR, 2011, Pg 65).
- Application of local techniques (Balanca technique) has enabled the recovery of 360 ha of new rice fields in the project location of Missirah (APR, 2011, Pg 65).
- The project initiative of setting up a consultation framework involving various stakeholders has led to the zoning of biosphere reserves in Saloum delta and Niokolo-Koba on a consensus basis and to the process of classifying the fauna reserves in Ferlo as a biosphere reserve (APR, 2011, Pg 65).

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.

Information on impact of project interventions on well-being of the community members is not available.

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

Relevant information is not available in any of the reports.

b) Governance

The TE and APR (2011) do not elaborate upon this aspect. This aspect is perhaps relevant and can be assessed once the third phase of the project corresponding to Tranche 3 is also completed.

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.

None.

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.

According to the TE, the project has developed a strong synergy with other projects and programs (MFP/GEF, Microfinance Project; multifunctional energy platforms project, the Agricultural Development Program –PRODAM; NGOs such as Agence Nationale de Conseil Agricole et Rural (ANCAR), PASEF etc.) as well as with government directorates. TE notes that these partnerships will facilitate consolidation of outcomes and replication of the project at other locations. Removal of institutional and legal barriers during Tranche 1 favors dissemination of project model throughout the country, as testified by the setting up of the CNR of Boundou covering 120,000 ha of land (out of project sites). Fair access to land for stockbreeders is a significant achievement to the credit of project, as it represents an encouraging sign towards project replication possibilities. According to the TE, CNR creation by Trees and Life (NGO), as well as the setting up of the area of Ndindifelo falls- a park in the southeast of Senegal, as CNR by the NGO Wula Nafa are inspired by the success of this project.

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.

No lessons and good practices that could have application for other projects are mentioned in the TE.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

TE provides the following recommendations that could be relevant for the next phase – Tranche 3 of the project:

For the Government of Senegal

- Address the institutional Base, recognition of eco guards and replace the staff eligible for retirement.
- Develop rules to harmonize approaches in rural environment since various projects and NGOs are coming together to implement different aspect of projects related to biodiversity conservation and sustainable development.

- Resolve land issues related to the implementation of the Mineral Deposit Limited (MDL) project in the Niayes.

For UNDP / GEF

- Start the third tranche of the project as soon as possible in order to avoid breaks in the field and shorten time of funds availability.

For the project

- Establish the effects of mutual banks on family incomes; [L] [SEP]
- Finalize the diagnosis and business plan of the mutual of Malandou and define a [L] [SEP] formal cooperation frame with it
- Commission a study on improvement of vegetation cover in the Ferlo for the period [L] [SEP] 2003 (before the Project start) and 2011 (completion of Tranche 2); [L] [SEP]
- Request MFP/GEF support in the case of difficulty with mutual; [L] [SEP]
- Emphasize on activities planned in management plans in the last Tranche (3); [L] [SEP]
- Imply more the region permanent structures in view of post-project preparation, since [L] [SEP] appropriation of the project by populations is the best barometer of success; [L] [SEP]
- Involve the W&F Department in the follow-up activities [L] [SEP]
- Establish the geographic information system for monitoring and evaluation of project Activities; [L] [SEP]
- Ensure the upgrade of agents assigned
- Establish an aggressive communication plan during the third tranche by highlighting the achievements
- Increase the number of fruit trees in plantations; [L] [SEP]
- Request ANCAR support with regard to market-gardening strengthening; [L] [SEP]
- Elaborate a specification sheet concerning mangrove reforestation with Avicennia [L] [SEP] Africana. This could be used by other projects [L] [SEP]
- Strengthen nurseryman and ecoguards training on environment protection; [L] [SEP]
- Organize study tour for Inter Village Committee (CIV) and project officials at the Bundu (one of the project sites) [L] [SEP]
- Strengthen the capacities of the UP Office in fuel, in communication skills and literacy [L] [SEP]

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 EO 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 terminal evaluation report lists various activities undertaken during the project against expected outcomes, but it often fails to establish linkages as to how achievement of those activities helped in meeting the objectives of the project.	MU
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The ratings assigned to the extent of achievement of various outcomes are not substantiated with justification. The evidence presented is also often not complete to be able to arrive at any conclusion, especially related to sections on efficiency and monitoring and evaluation.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE doesn't assess the sustainability of the project, it could be due to the fact that this was the second phase of the overall project, and aspects related to sustainability and exit strategy might be more relevant when the third phase of the project is also over.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	TE doesn't list any lessons and some t of the recommendations is without reference and elaboration in the main text of the report.	MU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	It doesn't provide information on the extent of co financing realized through the Government contribution and other multi/bi laterals.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	TE doesn't adequately assess the M&E system of the project. For instance, it doesn't elaborate whether Project Coordinating Unit (PCU) was monitoring the technical aspects of the project as mentioned in the design of the project, also the reasons that monitoring and evaluation tools developed through a study couldn't be adopted and implemented by the project.	MU
Overall TE Rating -		MU

Overall TE rating = $(0.3 \times (3+2) + 0.1 \times (2+3+2+3)) = 1.5 + 1 = 2.5$

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