

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 2469		Review date:		11/06/2006
		at endorsement (Million US\$)		at completion (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	PO88475 PMIS1640	<b>GEF financing:</b>	0.90	0.90
Project Name:	Supporting Capacity Building for the Elaboration of National Reports and Country Profiles by African Parties to the UNCCD	IA/EA own:	-	-
Country:	45 African countries	Government:	0.20	0.20
		Other*:	0.70	0.70
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	<b>0.90</b>	<b>0.90</b>
Operational Program:	STRM (OP15)	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	<b>1.80</b>	<b>1.80</b>
IA	World Bank	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	Work Program date		-
		CEO Endorsement		06/08/2004
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		09/30/2004
		Closing Date	Proposed:	Actual:
		<b>06/30/2005</b>	<b>06/30/2005</b>	
Prepared by: Ines Angulo	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: <b>9 months</b>	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: <b>9 months</b>	Difference between original and actual closing: <b>No difference</b>
Author of TE:	-	TE completion date: <b>10/10/2005</b>	TE submission date to GEF OME: <b>06/05/2006</b>	Difference between TE completion and submission date: <b>8 months</b>

\* 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

GEF EO Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEF EO Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	-	-	-	<b>MU</b>

2.2 Project sustainability	N/A	-	-	MU
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	-	-	-	MS
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	-	MU

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

No. The TE provides a very vague assessment of the project implementation and results. It would have been more useful if it distinguished between the targeted countries in terms of their level of awareness, institutional capacity and national coordination of existing mechanisms to address the problem of land degradation.

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

No.

**3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES**

**3.1 Project Objectives**

• **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

Both the TE and project brief mention the same objective:

“The specific objective of this project is to support the African country Parties to enhance their capacities to analyze the current status of land degradation and identify barriers for sustainable land management. This includes the elaboration of national reports so as to assist countries to fulfill their obligations under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). “

Thus, there was no change during implementation.

• **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

The objectives mentioned in the TE and the project brief are:

- Strengthened capacity to implement the UNCCD and awareness raised among national level key stakeholder groups on land degradation.
- The National Coordination Body (NCB) established by country Parties to address the country’s land degradation issues through the implementation of the UNCCD.
- High quality national reports including country profiles prepared<sup>1</sup>.

There were no changes during implementation.

**3.2 Outcomes and Impacts**

• **What were the major project outcomes and impacts, as described in the TE?**

According to the TE, all but one of the countries involved in the project produced the reports and country profiles in time for the global review, and reported that they held national meetings to validate the national reports and to discuss sustainable land management (SLM) priorities. It also assesses that the stakeholder participation in these meetings was very valuable in raising awareness of SLM, and that capacity needs for the process of preparing the national reports were successfully addressed.

**4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT**

**4.1 Outcomes**

**A Relevance**

**Rating: MS**

• **In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

Project outcomes were consistent with OP15 capacity building objectives for mainstreaming sustainable land management. This was to be accomplished through strengthening the capacity of target countries to participate in the implementation of the UNCCD. However, the actual

<sup>1</sup> Although this objective should be correctly classified as a project output.

outcomes listed in the TE are just outputs and, therefore, despite being consistent with the global environment objectives they only provide a very limited convincing indication that real progress is being made in the achievement of these objectives.	
<b>B Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?</b></li> </ul>	
The TE mentions that the project has been successful in achieving its goal of preparing the national reports, reinforcing relevant institutions, and involving a broader range of stakeholders, but at the same time it also assesses that the quality of the reports produced varied considerably in quality and depth of information. In addition, it concludes that the capacity building component cannot be considered completed within the relatively short reporting period, and that capacity building is still clearly required to provide sustained contributions to the UNCCD process. Finally, it finds that the NCB was already formally established in nearly all participating countries.	
<b>C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: UA</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?</b></li> </ul>	
In general the TE does not provide enough information to assess project's efficiency. But it does mention that the project complicated funding arrangements resulted in very high costs in time and resources, especially in proportion to the size of each single grant (around \$14,000) each.	

<b>Impacts</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?</b></li> </ul>
According to the TE, even though this project was too short to really have any concrete impacts, it can be considered an important first step to enhance general awareness, inclusion and knowledge of land degradation related issues in participating countries, enabling them to mainstream land degradation issues into general planning and strategy formulation for different sectoral and line ministries, and to strengthen these countries' role in the international scientific forums and negotiation processes related to land degradation.

**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.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
Even though this project was not designed as an ongoing or sustainable project, the TE mentions that, so far, there is little evidence that many country Parties have committed to financial sustainability of these reporting processes from their own budgetary resources. And it concludes that external resources will be required to help coordinating institutions to function in the future.	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
The TE makes no mention of socio political risks, as a matter of fact; it concludes that the project decreased the socio-political risk by broadening the range of stakeholders involved in the discussion on sustainable land management and to some extent also in the process of preparing their national reports to the UNCCD.	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
According to the TE, the project strengthened the national coordinating bodies that played a key role in the preparation of the national report at country level. It also states that the reports varied considerably in quality and in depth of information, stressing the need for further efforts in and support to continuous capacity building.	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Not applicable	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: N/A</b>
Overall Rating on Sustainability as calculated by the old methodology: <b>ML</b>	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>1. Production of a public good</b> The TE states that 43 National Reports were prepared and delivered to the UNCCD.
<b>2. Demonstration</b> Not applicable
<b>3. Replication</b> Not applicable
<b>4. Scaling up</b> Not applicable

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

<b>A. In retrospect, was the M&amp;E plan at entry practicable and sufficient? (Sufficient and practical indicators were identified, timely baseline, targets were created, effective use of data collection, analysis systems including studies and reports, and practical organization and logistics in terms of what, who, when for the M&amp;E activities)</b>	<b>Rating: UA</b>
Because this project was a STRM to help African countries participate in the UNCCD, the Project Document does not include any description of baselines, or a plan for data collection. It only identifies outcome indicators such as minutes of meetings and workshops proceedings. According to the TE, the Grant agreements signed by the countries specified M&E requirements such as costs and outputs, but it fails to describe them, and to assess if they were practical and sufficient.	
<b>B. Did the project M&amp;E system operate throughout the project? How was M&amp;E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress towards projects objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&amp;E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
The TE states that overall M&E fell largely to the UNCCD secretariat, which played a major role in communicating with countries and sub-regional organizations, and making frequent follow-ups. Much depended also on the Secretariat to provide overall management coordination as well as to elaborate various documents and accomplish the reporting tasks. The TE does not provide any examples of use of M&E activities for tracking progress towards project objectives.	
<b>C. Was M&amp;E sufficiently budgeted and was it properly funded during implementation?</b>	<b>Rating: UA</b>
The TE mentions that no funds were specifically set aside for M&E as a distinct or separate activity, but that financial resources were allocated for data collection and the evaluation through various project activities, including management and supervision activities as part of project implementation.	
<b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b> The TE does not provide enough information to know if the M&E system should be considered a good practice.	

#### 4.5 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

**What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?**

Even though the TE mentions that the project resulted in a number of lessons that will benefit future activities of this kind, it only provides a list of conclusions, while mentioning that lessons were covered in detail in documents ICCD/CRIC3/(2) and ICCD/CRIC3/(5).

**4.6 Quality of the evaluation report** Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to the “Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

**4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings**

In some cases the GEF Evaluation Office may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office. If additional relevant independent information has been collected that affect the ratings of this project, included in this section. This can include information that may affect the assessment and ratings of sustainability, outcomes, project M&E systems, etc.

No additional information was available to the reviewer.

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<p><b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> The assessment of relevant outcomes in the TE is not comprehensive. It gives an overall assessment at a general level, but provides no analysis on achievement of outcomes and objectives at a national level.</p>	<b>MU (3)</b>
<p><b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> Evidence presented in the TE is not complete, there is no information regarding project implementation in each of the participating countries. In addition, it does not include ratings.</p>	<b>MU (3)</b>
<p><b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> Even though the project was not designed as an ongoing sustainable project, the TE does include an assessment of this issue.</p>	<b>S (5)</b>
<p><b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Lessons included in the TE should be categorized as conclusions.</p>	<b>U (2)</b>
<p><b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The TE only provides actual project costs per activity for the GEF funds and not for the co-financing.</p>	<b>U (2)</b>
<p><b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The TE only provides a very general description of the M&amp;E activities. It does not present an assessment of project indicators, and how the M&amp;E system was used to track project achievement of objectives.</p>	<b>U (2)</b>

**4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

**Yes:**

**No: X**

Explain: The project responds to a unique opportunity and was therefore funded under the GEF modality of a “Short Term Response Measure (STRM)”, and it was not designed as an ongoing sustainable project.

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

Project document