

## GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		03/31/2010
GEF Project ID:	2503		<u>at endorsement</u> (Million US\$)	<u>at completion</u> (Million US\$)
IA/EA Project ID:	P090963	<b>GEF financing:</b>	3.0	3.00
Project Name:	International Assessment of Agricultural Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD)	IA/EA own:	3.06	3.30
Country:	Global	Government:	0	0
		Other*:	4.45	4.52
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	7.51	7.82
Operational Program:	OP1, OP2, OP3, OP4, OP6, OP8, OP9, OP12, OP13, OP14 & OP15	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	10.51	10.82
IA	The World Bank	<b>Dates</b>		
Partners involved:	UNEP, UNDP, FAO, World Bank and UNESCO	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		April 2005
		Closing Date	Proposed: September 2007	Actual: June 2009
Prepared by:	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 30	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 52	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 22
Rajesh Koirala	Neeraj Negi	TE completion date:	TE submission date to GEF EO:	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 0 months
Author of TE: Howard Elliott, Eduardo Trigo, Ed Rege, Krishna Alluri, Ayman Abou-Hadid		June 2009	June 2009	

\* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	--	S	--	S
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	ML	--	MS
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	--	MS	--	MS
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	NA	NA	NA	S
2.1e Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	--	S

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

Yes. As the terminal evaluation presents thorough and comprehensive assessment of achievement of project objectives, outcomes and processes, the evaluation report should be considered a good practice.

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

No such instances have been noted in the terminal evaluation.

### 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 appraisal document, the “broad objectives” of the project were to:

- 1) “undertake global and sub-global assessments of the role of knowledge, science and technology (KST) as it pertains to agriculture in reducing hunger and poverty, improving rural livelihoods, and health, increasing incomes and facilitating equitable, environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development”;
- 2) “provide robust information for decision makers on how to ensure that policies, practices and institutional arrangements enable KST to contribute to reducing hunger and poverty, improving rural livelihoods and health, increasing incomes, and facilitating equitable, environmentally, socially and economically sustainable development”; and
- 3) “bring together the range of stakeholders (consumers, governments, NGOs, private sector, producers, scientific community, international agencies) involved in the agricultural sector and rural development to share views, gain common understanding and vision for the future”.

According to the terminal evaluation, there was no change in the broad objectives of the project during implementation.

**b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)**

As stated in the project appraisal document, the “primary goals” of the project were to:

- 1) “assess the effects of agricultural K S&T policy and institutional environments, as well as practices, in the context of sustainable development”;
- 2) “make the resulting state-of-the-art, objective analyses accessible to decision makers at all levels –from small producers to those who create international policy”;
- 3) “identify where critically important information gaps exist in order to allow more effective targeting of resources”;
- 4) “further the capacity of developing country nationals to generate, access and use agricultural science and technology that promote sustainable development”.

According to the terminal evaluation, no change was made in the primary goals of the project during implementation.

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, due to which a change in objectives was needed	Project was restructured because original objectives were over ambitious	Project was restructured because of lack of progress	Any other (specify)	

### 4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

**4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)**

a. Relevance	Rating: S
<p>According to the project appraisal document, outcomes of the project are relevant to 11 Operational Programs of the GEF, which are OP1, Arid and Semi-arid Zone Ecosystems; OP2, Coastal, Marine, and Freshwater Ecosystems; OP3, Forest Ecosystems; OP4, Mountain Ecosystems; OP6, Promoting the Adoption of Renewable Energy by Removing Barriers and Reducing Implementation Costs; OP8, Water body based; OP 9, Integrated Land and Water Multiple Focal Area for International Waters; OP12, Integrated Ecosystem Management; OP13, Conservation and Sustainable Use of Biological Diversity Important to Agriculture; OP14, Persistent Organic Pollutants; and OP15, Sustainable Land Management and Adaptation to Climate Change.</p> <p>Based on survey of the participants involved in this project, the terminal evaluation also concludes that all objectives and outcomes of the project were relevant to national, regional and global context.</p>	

<b>b. Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: S</b>
<p>International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development (IAASTD) evaluated the relevance, quality and effectiveness of Agricultural Knowledge, Science, and Technology (AKST) in relation to meeting development goals of reducing hunger and poverty, improving nutrition, health and rural livelihoods, facilitating social and environmental sustainability. As envisioned in the project appraisal document, IAASTD performed a Global Assessment and five Regional Assessments for Central and West Asia and North Africa (CWANA), East and South Asia and the Pacific (ESAP), Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), North America and Europe (NAE), and Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA). The terminal evaluation notes that explicit capacity building activities were not conducted, although some dissemination and outreach activities were carried out. Further discussion on effectiveness for each project outcome is presented below:</p>	
<p>Conceptual Framework and Annotated Outlines for Global and Sub-Global Reports: The Conceptual Framework includes broad scope to cover all AKST, policy and institutions, role of social sciences and the study of science in society. The assessment is considered as "evidence-based" rather than "scientific". According to the terminal evaluation, the broadening of the scope of IAASTD opened an important debate that was needed and changed the dynamics of the IAASTD. However, it was not uniformly assimilated throughout all the chapters of the reports.</p>	
<p>Global Assessment: The synthesis reports on Global Assessment covers all the themes as envisioned in the project document except the chapters on capacity building and biotechnology. Chapters covered in the report include Challenges and Options, Bioenergy, Climate Change, Human Health, Natural Resources Management, Trade and Markets, Traditional and Local Knowledge and Community based innovation, and Women in Agriculture. One weakness was that the Global Assessment was not built up from the Regional Assessments, but instead both global and regional assessments were carried out in parallel. Because of diverse authors and reviewers, the terminal evaluation states that the Global Report contains materials of "uneven quality" across chapters and within chapters. For wide distribution, 10,000 copies of the Report were printed. Executive Summary of the report was made available in six languages – English, Arabic, French, Spanish, Chinese and Russian – and 200 – 500 copies were distributed.</p>	
<p>Five Sub-Global Reports: According to the terminal evaluation, each of the five regions – Central and West Asia and North Africa (CWANA), East and South Asia and the Pacific (ESAP), Latin America and the Caribbean (LAC), North America and Europe (NAE), and Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) – worked in parallel, without having interaction across the regions. The TE reports that authors did not fully understand the difference between an "assessment" and a "review". Some misunderstanding arose as a result of language problems and difficulties in communication. The terminal evaluation states that involvement of the agricultural sub-regional organizations as authors or stakeholders of IAASTD in SSA and LAC was lacking.</p>	
<p>Outreach and Communication: IAASTD did not produce the Outreach and Communication Strategy document mentioned in the project appraisal document. It supported the participation of 76 Individual authors and review editors at 85 events. Some authors and review editors had been repetitive spokespersons for IAASTD. The IAASTD director attended in high level policy events, including the World Bank's Rural Week. Both co-chairs promoted IAASTD across the board through 27 separate presentations. Four authors presented a side meeting at the preparatory session of UN Commission on Sustainable Development.</p>	
<b>c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
<p>The project mobilized authors and review editors without paying for their time, although experts residing in developing countries were provided financial support for travel. Not providing travel support for authors from OECD countries eliminated many potential contributors, whose institutions required coverage of costs, leading to the exclusion of many "desired" authors. The terminal evaluation notes that "time pressure" on Bureau members restricted to approach good authors recommended by the participating authors. Similarly due to "donor time pressure and funding", the project could not conduct "iterative scenario planning approach" for global and sub-global activities. This led doing global and sub-global assessments in parallel, instead of basing global assessment on sub-global assessments, as originally envisioned in the project document.</p>	

**4.1.2 Impacts: summarize the achieved intended or unintended impacts of the project.**

It is early to evaluate the level of adoption of the "assessment" by individual countries and organizations, and consequent impact on agriculture and other relevant sectors. However bringing divergent stakeholders together to common issues led to their increased knowledge and understanding. According to the survey carried out by the terminal evaluation team, 75%-90% respondents claimed that knowledge gained through IAASTD changed their own understanding of a problem by learning new perspectives and new technical information, and working with new people. The terminal evaluation reports that participants found the knowledge they gained from involvement in IAASTD has been useful for advocacy, lectures or presentations. The IAASTD experience of bringing divergent stakeholders together around common issues served as examples for other institutions. In this regard, the International Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services has been studying and following some of its procedures.

**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</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
The terminal evaluation reports that the IAASTD website would be maintained by UNEP for five years to make the reports electronically available.	
<b>b. Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
As assessed by the terminal evaluation, there are no sociopolitical risks affecting IAASTD's outcomes. The holistic nature of agriculture and the need for strengthening the role of agro-ecology have wide acceptance as part of solution to emerging problems.	
<b>c. Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: MS</b>
According to the terminal evaluation, there is no institutional and governance mechanism for the continuation of the IAASTD secretariat and the Bureau. UNEP had a commitment to maintain the IAASTD website for 5 years after the publication of the documents to make all the published reports electronically downloadable as a public good. There are no other provisions for beyond five years.	
<b>d. Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
There is no environmental risk to the project outcomes.	

#### 4.3 Catalytic role

<b>a.. Production of a public good</b>
According to the terminal evaluation, all the published reports would be electronically available to download as a public good. Also IAASTD would distribute hard copies and CDs of the report to over 500 institutions in 108 countries, most of which could serve as depository libraries. Some reports such as Global Summary for Decision Makers and Executive Summary of Synthesis Report were made available in six major languages. These would serve as “authoritative reference” for scientific writing, advocacy, presentation and lectures. Participating authors and reviewers increased their knowledge and understanding through collaboration with other authors. This enhanced knowledge and understanding has contributed in their institutions. Experience of IAASTD has served as an example for other institutions like International Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services.
<b>b.. Demonstration</b>
No demonstration activities were noted in the terminal evaluation.
<b>c.. Replication</b>
Based on information contained in the terminal evaluation, no replication occurred.
<b>d.. Scaling up</b>
No evidence of scaling up is reported in the terminal evaluation.

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

<b>a. Co-financing.</b> To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to achievement of GEF objectives? Were components supported by cofinancing well integrated into the project? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
US \$ 7.82 M cofinancing was materialized by the time when the terminal evaluation was prepared. The materialized cofinancing is slightly higher than that of expected in the project document (US\$7.51 M). The cofinancing was well integrated in the project and was essential for achievement of the expected project outcomes.
<b>b. Delays.</b> 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?
According to the terminal evaluation, the final publication and translation of the reports was pushed back from April to August 2008. A further discussion on causes and consequences is not presented in the terminal evaluation. Although the terminal evaluation does not provide information, it appears that the project completion was delayed by 22 months.
<b>c. Country Ownership.</b> 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.
According to the terminal evaluation, the panel of participating governments would “make major decisions in plenary meetings with advice from a 60 member multi-stakeholder Bureau”. The Bureau would, however, make decisions on “intersessional matters such as authors, reviewers and financial matters”. For involvement in and coordination with IAASTD, the UK contracted with CABI and other government such as Sweden and Switzerland hired consultants to follow the process in IAASTD on their behalf. France mobilized its research institutes to participate and Canada increased its contribution to the MDTF which allowed the Secretariat to provide travel support to Canadian authors and

review editors. About 50% of the government representatives on the Bureau at the beginning were not the same throughout the process, due to promotions and transfers within departments in their respective governments. The terminal evaluation reports that many people identified this turnover as one of the “weaknesses” of the process that “conspired against the effectiveness” of the Bureau in providing overall guidance. At the end, a total of 57 participating countries endorsed the SDM, but Australia, Canada and the United States, while commending IAASTD contribution and recognizing the significance of AKST, did not approve the SDM, noting that “a more balanced treatment” would require for “a number of assertions, options and observations”.

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

<b>a. M&amp;E design at Entry</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): S</b>
In the project appraisal document, M&E was expected to be done with respect to execution performance (effective and efficient implementation), delivered outputs, project performance, and project impact. Specific indicators and responsible personnel or institutions for each of them were identified. For the 6-monthly administrative and financial reporting to be submitted to the implementing agency, timeline, responsibility, format and content were clearly mentioned in the project document. To ease the M&E, the project document also includes a calendar of activities for the duration of September 2004 – September 2007.	
<b>b. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b>	<b>Rating (six point scale): MS</b>
According to the terminal evaluation, no formal M&E was implemented. IAASTD Secretariat received reports on project activities from the regional coordinators, and subsequently reported administrative and financial status to the Bank and to the Bureau in every six month. The Assessment was paced by the schedule of meetings and deadlines for completion of the Assessment. Financial reporting followed World Bank guidelines and procurement regulations, although that created some extra costs for the project team.	
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? No separate budget was allocated to M&E in the project document.	
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? The terminal evaluation does not present information on use of funding for M&E activities.	
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? There was no feedback provided by the monitoring system to the project team.	
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. No.	

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

<b>a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): S</b>
<b>b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): S</b>
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.
The World Bank implemented the project. Project design was thorough – identification of representative members for the project team, author selection provision, paper review process and others – and logical framework was supplemented by time specific indicators. The multi-stakeholder Bureau was well-conceived in design. The Bureau consisted of 30 government and 30 representatives of Civil Society (NGOs, consumers groups, private sector, inter-governmental and international institutions). For the global assessment component of the IAASTD, sections to be covered and specific questions to be addressed were also identified during the project design phase. However based on the terminal evaluation, conflict resolution mechanisms and codes of conduct were not adequate to “prevent minor disputes from growing into major distractions”. The Bank served as a catalyst through its convening power especially during the consultative phase leading up to the Assessment. The terminal evaluation notes, “From the official accounts in the Preface to the reports, discussions at the Bank brought the private sector and the CSO community together with specific reassurances of a balanced process.” In order to remain the host of an intergovernmental process without giving any appearance of control over the process and direction, the Bank did not play any oversight or arbitration role.
<b>c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies<sup>1</sup> (rating on a 6 point scale) S</b>
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.

<sup>1</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.

Selection of UNEP as an executing agency of IAASTD was appropriate as it was fully consistent with UNEP's sub program on Environmental Assessment and Early Warning. One of the problems encountered during the project execution was turnover of authors and review editors. Two principal reasons were accountable for this: country representatives were changed due to internal promotion and transfer within other departments, and authors and review editors would walk away when there were disagreements on their opinions due to lack of effective conflict resolution mechanism. Similarly the terminal evaluation considers the agreement with Island Press to put an embargo on electronic distribution of the reports as "unfortunate" as it limited their availability during the time of most active outreach and advocacy of the project. No initiatives were taken to address these issues. The terminal evaluation describes IAASTD governance structure as "a hybrid model" of governance from experience with the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) and the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (MEA). It also notes that the project borrowed widely commended principles and procedures from the IPCC. According to the terminal evaluation financial reporting followed World Bank guidelines and procurement regulations, and all the 6-monthly administrative and financial reporting requirements were fulfilled as planned in the project appraisal document.

## 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 terminal evaluation presents following lessons especially for future assessments with multi stakeholder governance:

1. "Clear rules of conduct" need to be developed and participants should be provided "special coaching" on the performance of their functions.
2. To be prepared for potential conflicts, conflict resolution mechanisms suitable both for parties involved and the nature of the conflict.
3. It needs to be understood that managing the tradeoff between salience, credibility and legitimacy always creates tension
4. Because of difference in knowledge, language and cultural practices, everybody may not present his or her ideas, being silenced by "dominating personalities", professional facilitation is recommended.
5. Reducing the gap between approval and availability of the final report promotes wider adoption of the report.

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

The terminal evaluation recommends that a few targeted research projects be carried out to enhance the usefulness of IAASTD to policy makers through: 1) revisit the scenarios through an iterative process of "strategic conversation" by using both quantitative and qualitative information; 2) quantify the size and importance of the recommendation domains for the agroecological options proposed; and 3) assess the scientific, educational and institutional investments required to implement the options.

The terminal evaluation's another recommendation is that benchmark for monitoring progresses of the implementation of IAASTD's work be established. A defined project executed by a consortium of institutions or a self-forming network could be assigned to develop such benchmarks and report through a newsletter on promising initiatives.

## 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.

N/A

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.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p><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> The assessment of relevant outcomes, impacts, and the achievement of the objectives is thorough and comprehensive.</p>	HS
<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> The report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete, and the IA ratings have been substantiated. However one concern regarding the rating is that although financial sustainability is rated as an "MU", the overall sustainability is rated as an "ML". According to the GEF EO standards, the latter would have been an "MU". Similarly the report contains many acronyms, the full form of which is available nowhere in the report.</p>	S
<p><b>c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</b> The terminal evaluation properly assesses project sustainability.</p>	S
<p><b>d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> Lessons learned are supported by the evidence, and are comprehensive.</p>	S
<p><b>e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The terminal evaluation provides the information on the latest project costs and total cofinancing. Per activity project cost is presented for 67% of total project expenditures. Per activity cofinancing is missing.</p>	MS
<p><b>f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&amp;E systems?</b> The report presents a good assessment of the quality of project M&amp;E system.</p>	S

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

The website of International Assessment of Agricultural Knowledge, Science and Technology for Development: [http://www.agassessment.org/index.cfm?Page=About IAASTD&ItemID=2](http://www.agassessment.org/index.cfm?Page=About%20IAASTD&ItemID=2)