Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		2632	
GEF Agency project ID		N/A	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD; UNIDO	
Project name		Participatory Control of Desertification and Poverty Reduction in the Arid and Semi-Arid High Plateau Ecosystems of Eastern Morocco (PCDPR-HPE)	
Country/Countries		Morocco	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Land degradation, with linkages to Biodiversity and Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP15 Sustainable Land Management/SO-2: To generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods through the up-scaling of SLM investments/ Linkages to SO-1: To create an enabling environment that will place SLM in the mainstream of development policy and practice at regional, national and local levels (TE,p.1)	
Executing agencies involved		Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forets et à la Lutte Contre la Désertification (HCEFLCD) ;Ministry of Agriculture and Maritime Fisheries (MAPM)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Secondary executing agency; (the TE mentioned the NGO's role in community mobilization but without specifying the names)	
Private sector involvement		No Involvement	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		09/16/2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		07/01/2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		06/30/2015 (MTE, p.26)	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M) (TE, p.1)	**At Completion (US $M) (TE,p.20)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.35**(GEF Secretariat Review, 09/16/2008)**	0.35
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		5.99	5.96
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	18.89 (different branch of government total, TE, p.i.)	22.32
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		6.34	6.31
Total Co-financing		18.89	22.32
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		24.88+0.35=25.23	28.28+0.35=28.63 (TE,p.6, as of 09/11/2015)
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2016 (estimated)	
Author of TE		N/A	

TER completion date	06/17/2016
TER prepared by	Chenhao Liu
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Molly Watts

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	NR	S
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	NR	L
M&E Design		S	NR	MS
M&E Implementation		S	NR	MS
Quality of Implementation		NR	NR	S
Quality of Execution		NR	NR	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	S

3. Project Objectives

- 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Land degradation affects the livelihoods and food security of about 1.5 million households in Morocco, and is undermining the carrying capacity of the country's ecosystems. The majority of Morocco falls under semi-arid and arid ecosystems. These ecosystems cover different agro-ecological zones with diverse habitats and species heterogeneity, and are therefore of high international importance. (PD, p.1) The Global Environment Objective of the project is "To combat desertification, mitigate the impacts of land degradation, and protect the natural ecosystem integrity and functions of the pastoral ecosystem resources of the arid and semi-arid high plateaus of the Eastern Region (of Morocco)." (PD, p.3)

- 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

Under the Global Environment Objective, the project proposed three specific environment objectives to be achieved (PD, p.3): "

i. Enhancing the institutional capacity of the GOM [Government of Morocco] to develop and implement an enabling policy environment, including resolution of cross-jurisdictional legislation, strengthening the UNCCD-NAP through integration of SLM approaches and mainstreaming SLM practices into the rural development strategy.
ii. Improving the institutional and administrative capacities of local RUAs to take the responsibility and authority to protect the local environmental resources and control of land uses within the areas of their jurisdiction.
iii. Accelerating the adoption of improved technical interventions for control of land degradation and desertification, rehabilitation of degraded areas, and protection of pastoral resources."

Also, the project proposed a "the rural development and poverty reduction objective" to "protect the pastoral resources in the arid and semi-arid high plateaus while improving the livelihoods of the rural poor

in the Eastern Region. This will be achieved by providing support to the GOM to accelerate the Livestock and Pasture Development Project, Phase II, which is being implemented under an IFAD negotiated loan." (PD, p.3)

In addition, the project's implementation and M&E revolve around the following six components of project outcomes as specified by the project Logframe (TE, p.10-12):

i. Mainstreaming SLM principles for rangeland ecosystems
ii. Capacity building for national and local institutions to support integrated SLM
iii. Up-scaling SLM best practices for rangeland ecosystems
iv. Support for local livelihood improvement - Income security and value added production
v. Project monitoring and evaluation
vi. Project management

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

There we no change in the Global Environment Objectives and Development Objectives. The project logframe has been consistently observed for project monitoring with no major change.

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**

In a six-point scale, The TE rated the project's relevance as "Highly Satisfactory". In a binary scale (Unsatisfactory/Satisfactory), this TER will rate the project's outcome relevance as "Satisfactory". The project is consistent with relevant strategic priorities for development at the national and international level.

The project belongs to the GEF's Land Degradation Focal Area. It is consistent with GEF OP15, Sustainable Land Management, and the GEF Land Degradation Focal Area Strategic Objective (SO) 2: To generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods through the up-scaling of SLM investments. The project also has linkages to the GEF Land Degradation Focal Area Strategic Objective SO-1: To create an enabling environment that will place SLM in the mainstream of development policy and

practice at regional, national and local levels. The project has a high relevance in the country-level development context. Land Degradation increasingly threatens the arid and semi-arid ecosystems of Morocco, and put the habitats and the diversity of local species at risk as well as the livelihood of local communities. (PD, p.1) Also, the project's targeted interventions in the agricultural sector pursuing the full potential of carbon sequestration in soils and vegetative cover will help mitigate carbon dioxide and methane emissions. (PD, p.1). The project is also in line with national strategies and development programs such as National Action Plan for Environment (NPAD), UNCCD National Action Program to Combat Desertification (NAPCCD), Rangeland Development strategy, National Forest Plan, Green Morocco Plan, National Human Development Initiative), and with IFAD Country Strategic Opportunities Paper (COSOP), as well as UNIDO Technical Cooperation in Morocco. (TE, p.6)

4.2 **Effectiveness**	**Rating: Satisfactory**

In a six-point scale, the TE rated the project's outcome effectiveness as "Satisfactory", and this TER will adopt the rating under the same rating scale. Based on the evidence presented by the TE, a significantly large portion of project targets were fully achieved, with some targets exceeded, but also with some actual achievements not matching with expect activities. A comparison of the project's achievements against the targets is presented below: (TE, p.21-26)

Project Component 1 is "Mainstreaming SLM (Sustainable Land Management) principles for rangeland ecosystems". Almost all of the expected outcomes under this component have been fully achieved with some exceeding the original expectation. Sub-component 1 was the Harmonization and integration of Sustainable Land Management (SLM)/Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) in the main government programs and support to ATP implementation. Under this sub-component, the project organized 23 sensitizing workshops (against a target of 20) at the central, regional, provincial, and local levels; 39 intersectorial workshops (against a target of 30); iii) 4 workshops (target 5) related to the Tripartite Agreement (ATP) between the three major partners (MAPM, the MI, and the HCEFLCD). Additionally, the design, printing, and distribution of the ATP document and support for implementing the ATP have been put fully in place as expected, consultation on relevant legislative issues was conducted in line with expectation; and 8 workshops (target 8) at the central and regional levels and 7 implementation workshops (target 4) on ATP were organized and conducted. Sub-component 2 was support for decentralized responsibilities and decision-making for planning use and management of common rangelands. Under this sub-component, support to the responsible authorities and cooperatives through technical assistance and a workshop was fully provided as expected; procedures were developed to decentralize the responsibility of rangeland use through a consultation and a workshop participated by relevant authorities and cooperatives, all of which are fully in line with expectation; authorities and cooperatives were sensitized about the guidelines for devolving responsibility for sustainable rangeland use and management through 54 meetings (target 44). 6 planned events (target 6) were organized to mobilize users and cooperatives for sustainable use of rangelands, and institutional capacities were strengthened through the purchase of 6 vehicles (target 5), 2 all-terrain bikes (target 2) and communication as expected.

The project's second component was the "Capacity building for national and local institutions to support integrated SLM /IWRM". The project achieved the expected outcomes under this component. Its Sub-component 1 is addressing development and organization of adapted training packages on SLM/IWRM for the project partners. Under this sub-component, training documents on SLM/IWRM techniques were produced as expected; 24 training sessions (against a target of 27) were conducted for the staff of ministries and regional services; and 31 training sessions (against a target of 21) were organized for the authorities and cooperatives. In line with the project's expected outcome, the Ministry of Education, HCEFLCD, UNIDO and Mohamed I University of Oujda signed a partnership agreement, which established a Bachelor's degree in Geomatics and Sustainable Land Management with the first class of 55 students. In addition, a sensitizing program was planned for the project area primary school students to be implemented by the end of November 2015. Sub-component 2 was strengthening and extending the implementation of drought early warning system developed under PDPEO II project. Under this component, the 15 planned meteorological stations have been purchased and established as expected within the project area, which gives a good coverage of the area for meteorological data; in line with the target of strengthening the monitoring system for vegetation, soil, and livestock (expected activity 2.2.2/2.2.3, TE, p.50). A five-year agreement was established with the National Institute of Agronomic research concerning biophysical and socioeconomic monitoring of the project implementation sites with annual reports issued, and three workshops were organized late 2015 on linkage between catastrophes programs, which partly achieved the expected activity 2.2.4/2.2.5 (TE, p.50) of linking to existing early locust warning and initiate impact assessment and promoting better linkages and integration of the natural resource GIS for SLM.

Project Component 3 is "Up-scaling of Best SLM/IWRM for Rangeland Ecosystems". The expected outcomes under this component were mostly achieved, but not all of the actual achievements match the expected outputs specified by the project logic framework, and some targets were only partially achieved. Subcomponent 1 is the target of developing appropriate SLM plans for pilot sites and mechanisms for up-scaling. Under this subcomponent, the project achieved a large portion of expected outcomes along with extra achievements, however certain expected outputs were not addressed. Specifically, the project completed the delineation, characterization and establishment of 3 project pilot sites and corresponding focal groups through a participatory approach based on 14 workshops and meetings (target 12). Rangeland rest for rehabilitation was 19,300 ha (target 100,000 ha), while rangeland rest for native seed production was 7015 ha, 67% of the targeted10,553 ha. The total area planting fodder shrubs was 21 945 ha (target 15,000 ha). Sand dune stabilization was completed on 150 ha (target 77). The area of water harvesting using line contour was 14,213 ha (target 10,769 ha). 1,017,000 nursery seedlings of native species were produced (not planned in the project design); In line with expected outcome, a plant material center for native rangeland plants (CCTSP) was built in Ain Beni Mathar which was equipped with technical, laboratory and office equipments. Establishment and management of two live rangeland plant collections (pastoretum) in Bouarfa, and Ain Béni Mathar ; 114 Micro –barrages were built (target 105); the area of forest tree planting was 4 446 ha (target 1,400); the implementation of best SLM/IWRM practices within the pilot sites for demonstration purposes was carried out in the form of siga rehabilitation through planting 450 ha of fodder shrubs (target 450). Rangeland rest for native plant seed production on 557 ha (target 600), building of 3 micro dams (target 3), forest tree planting on 450 ha

(target 120). Although a significant portion of the project's actual achievements exceeded the expected outcomes under this subcomponent, they failed to substantially address the expected output "3.1.1.- Tool-kit for rangeland users and communes of recommended procedures for participatory planning and application of SLM best practices" (TE, p.52). Subcomponent 2 is the target of promoting and developing an SLM network of farmers/livestock producers. Under this subcomponent, a SLM/IWRM network was developed through organizing 34 meetings (target 21); 16 workshops (target 6) were organized with the aim of dissemination, diffusion and up-scaling of SLM practices; 4 workshops on Cooperative development plans (PDC) produced under PDPEO II were organized, while three additional meetings are to be organized late 2015 with the concerned Rural communes, in partnership with ODECO and the DPAs of Figuig and Oujda. However, the actual achievements under this subcomponent failed to address the certain expected outputs such as "3.2.2- Procedures and practices for participatory control of land degradation in place", and "3.2.3 SLM best practices adopted and implemented outside the pilot areas" (TE, p.53). Sub-component 3 was developing and implementing an information and knowledge management system. By the end of the proejct, various activities have been implemented to meet this goal: a business plan was produced for establishing an information and training center after extensive consultation; equipment of a room within the CCTSP in Ain Béni Mathar to be used for training/information activities of farmers/livestock producers was rehabilitated; linkages within the MENARID framework was established through the participation of project staff in 7 workshops organized in Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Syria, and Tunisia.

Project Component 4 was "Interventions for local communities' livelihoods improvement". Almost all of the expected outcomes under this component were fully achieved. Subcomponent 1 was to support the identification of income generating activities (AGR). Under this component, technical guidelines were produced for the small and micro enterprises in relation to combating desertification (target 100% achieved); support was provided to local communities for income generating activities through technical assistance and equipment (target 100% achieved); capacity was strengthened for cooperatives and other client groups of Micro Credit Associations (target 33% achieved), those of banking institutions (target 48% achieved), and labeling of local products (target 100% achieved); Subcomponent 2 was the valorization of eco touristic potentialities of the EHP (Eastern High Plateaus). Under this component, a market analysis study was conducted for promoting ecotourism (target 100% achieved); support was provided for ecotourism pilot enterprises through training, equipment, and marketing (target 100% achieved) ; support was provided to the operationalization of the Figuig eco museum dedicated to the J. Grouz Biological and Ecological Interest Site (SIBE) in replacement of the Chekkar SIBE (target 100% achieved). Finally complementarity between coastal tourism in the North to inland ecotourism was promoted through the publication of two guides in partnership with the Regional Delegation of Tourism (target 100% achieved). Subcomponent 3 was the target of establishing support within the improved carbon sequestration, and this target was fully achieved through equipping water points with photovoltaic solar panels as a climatic mitigation action in replacement of agro forestry and tree planting.

The Project Component 5 was the Project's Monitoring and Evaluation. Its target is "Results and lessons learned are monitored, reported and disseminated" (p.59). The target was achieved, but not all of its expected specific activities according to the project logical framework were conducted. According to the

TE, by the end of the project the M&E system was established based on indicators related to project performance and impacts. A data collection and analysis platform was established and located at the DREFLCD-O server; ageo portal dedicated to desertification at the national and regional levels was also developed as a decision-making aid for monitoring desertification; a GIS mapping project activities were being developed; biophysical monitoring was implemented within a 5-year agreement with INRA (CRRAO). Starting in September 2010; a survey was conducted addressing the project socioeconomic impacts; a study on the design of a management plan for the project sites treated with SLM was implemented. But the project's actual achievements didn't address some specific expected activities under this component, such as "5.1.2- Submit the M&E system to the PTC and NPSC for approval" and "5.1.3- Prepare a detailed plan of action for the implementation of the M&E system". (TE, p.59)

The Project Component 5 was Project Management. A Project Management Unit (PMU) was established for implementing, monitoring and reporting on the project. "Despite its small size, the PMU demonstrated, under the supervision of UNIDO, and in close collaboration with HCEFLCD, IFAD and other partners, a high efficacy", and the project execution led by the PMU has been proven a success." (TE, p.25)

Overall, based on the comparison above it would be reasonable to reach the conclusion that achievement of expected project results was at a "satisfactory" level.

4.3 **Efficiency**	**Rating: Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE rated the project's outcome efficiency as "Highly Satisfactory". This TER will rate the project's outcome efficiency as "Moderately Satisfactory". Evidences presented by relevant project documents confirmed that the project's cost-effectiveness was at a reasonable level, but the TE specifically pointed out higher-than-expected project cost in one of the project's features, the building of micro-dams.

Efficiency is rated highly satisfactory by the TE based on the fact that activities have been implemented with a reasonable cost compared to design predictions and comparable to prevailing costs in the area. However, a higher-than-expected actual total cost is the feature of this project. According to the TE, By the 09/11/2015, which is two-month before project completion, the amount effectively committed amounts to $28.283.077, or 113.7% of the initially projected cost (excluding PPG). (TE, p.6) The TE also specifically pointed out that cost of micro dams was higher than predicted by the design due to a larger size of the built structures. (TE, p.6) Also, although there were "cost differences between implementing institutions (GEF, HCEFLCD, and MAPM) for different activities" (TE, p.6), and sometimes the actual unit cost for a single activity conducted by a single implementer may have be lower than that according to project design, the actual unit costs of different implementers for most activities were still higher than that originally designed. (TE, p.21) The TE also reported delays in some cases, such as "short delays in payments" (TE, p.21), and a delay in the development of M&E system (TE, p.42), but no major delays which resulted in project extension were ever reported. However, the MTE indicated June 2015 as the expected completion date, but the project's actual completion date is December 31th 2015, indicating a 6-month extension not confirmed by the TE. In the end, according to available information provided by relevant project documents so far, the project outcomes were not affected by delays.

Overall, considering the satisfactory project outcome, plus a reasonable but higher-than-expected project cost, and some project delays, a rating of "Moderately Satisfactory" for the project's efficiency is justified.

4.4 **Sustainability**	**Rating: Likely**

The TE rated the project's overall sustainability as "Likely" based on its assessment of four sub-categories of sustainability in a 4-point scale: Financial resource sustainability (Likely); Socio-political sustainability (Moderately Likely); Institutional sustainability (Likely); Environmental sustainability (Moderately Likely). This TER will rate the project's sustainability as "Likely" after assessing the four sub-categories of sustainability below. Based on the evidence presented by the TE, the project has successfully secured its sustainability through committed long-term financial support from executing partners, a high-level political support, and the good institutional foundation developed through the project, but its environmental sustainability may likely be affected by draughts.

Financial Resource Sustainability- Likely

The TE rated the project's financial sustainability as "Likely". This TER will adopt the same rating. The project's executing partners and stakeholders have plans for providing follow-up financial support with the aim of sustaining the project impact. For example, "i HCEFLCD (Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forets et à la Lutte Contre la Désertification, the Lead National Executing Agency) through a 10-year plan (2015-2024) allocating substantial resources to GDT activities in the EHP (Eastern High Plateaus, area of project focus); ii MAPM (Ministry of Agriculture and Marine Fishery, another National Executing Agency) through a 3-year plan (2014-2016) within the Morocco Green Plan, in addition to the Rangeland and Transhumance Program being implemented in Southwestern Morocco which will be extended to the EHP, (TE, p.37)

Socio-political Sustainability- Likely

The TE rated the project's socio-political sustainability as "Likely", and this TER will adopt the same rating. The project has generated marked social and economic benefits for the local communities, and is therefore receiving strong support from its partners and beneficiaries and showing a high-level national ownership which can be proven by the "survey on the project socioeconomic impacts", as well as the agreement between the different partners and the Federation of Cooperative Unions. (TE, p.7)

Institutional Sustainability- Likely

The TE rated the project's institutional sustainability as "Likely", and this TER will adopt the same rating. The project strengthened the institutional capacities of relevant stakeholders serving for its global environment and development objective, at the same time the institutions that are newly developed and strengthened through this project, such as the "strengthened beneficiaries' organizations", "formalized partnerships (Federation, INDH, ADS, Women cooperative), "the newly established Observatory for Monitoring of Desertification within the DREFLCD-O", and "the Pastoral Law in the process of being enacted" will provide solid institutional foundation for the project's further scale-up. (TE, p.7)

Environmental Sustainability- Moderately Likely

The TE rated the project's environmental sustainability as "Moderately Likely". This TER will adopt the same rating. The TE confirmed the positive and long-term impact of the SLM practice established through the project, but it also warned the possible threat of drought episodes and their potential impacts on soil/vegetation processes. (TE, p.38)

Overall, this TER's rating of "Moderately Likely" for the project's sustainability is justified.

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 project's initially planned level of co-financing was USD 18,885,166, but the actual level of co-financing was USD 22,327,056, indicating a materialization rate of 118%. The high percentage of co-financing within the project total cost came from the government agencies. (TE, p.20) As the actual GEF project funding was lower than expected and the total project cost was higher than expected (TE, p.20), it can be inferred with strong evidence that the higher-than-expected co-financing has contributed to the higher-than-expected project outcome (at the satisfactory level), although the TE didn't specify this linkage.

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 formally started in July 1st 2009, and finished by December 31th 2015, with a total duration of 6.5 years. The MTE mentioned that the project is expected to complete by June 2015 (MTE, p.26), but the TE didn't formally report any project extensions or delays. The TE did report a few cases of delays such as "short delays in payments" (TE, p.21), and "delay in the development of M&E system" (TE, p.42). However, according to available information presented relevant project documents, none of the delays impacted project outcomes.

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 link

The project is a national project. Apart from generating tangible benefit to the livelihood of local communities, it also garnered extensive support from beneficiaries and stakeholders, which represent a high-level country ownership. This can be evidenced by i. the large number of participants in workshops, meetings and field days; ii. the requests made by the population for more SLM/IWRM activities from 39 cooperatives out of 51 (75%); iii. general decrease in conflicts related to grazing violations by 20% in the Figuig province between 2012 and 2013, and only two oppositions to site selection out of 264 sites. (TE,

p.36). The high-level country ownership not only contributed the project's outcome success, but also became a key factor that ensures the project's sustainability in the socio-political dimension (TE, p.37)

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: Moderately Satisfactory**

In a 6-point scale (1-6), the TE rated the entire M&E system as "5". Also in a 6-point scale (1-6), This TER will rate the M&E design at entry as "Moderately Satisfactory" (4 equivalent). The project had a sound and comprehensive M&E design at entry, but the quality of its indicators can be improved through specifying their targets and the timeline for reaching these targets (although targets of project indicators were mentioned in TE, they were not mentioned in the project logframe). Besides, relevant project documents didn't present a detailed M&E implementation plan.

The project's logic framework presented in the TE has been constantly observed throughout the project period for use in project monitoring with no significant change (TE, p.44-61). Each project component was measured by a number of sub-components, expected outcomes, expected output, expected activities, and a set of specific indicators in general consistent with the SMART principle. For example, "Number and quality of produced SLM training manuals" and "Number of training participants and their qualifications" were identified as indicators for the project component 2 "Capacity building for national and local institutions to support integrated SLM" (TE, p.49). These indicators are specific, measurable, and relevant, but they would have been improved if the project logframe had clearly specified their targets (the targets of some indicators were specified in the TE's evaluation of project outcome effectiveness, but not in the project logframe), and the timeline for achieving their targets. The project logframe was comprehensive and specific by providing the details on means of verification, assumptions and risks of expected outcomes. Setting up a comprehensive M&E system is also a direct project component according to the TE, and the total budget was 1,430,500 (GEF project funding+ Co-financing). But the project document didn't include a detailed implementation plan for the M&E.

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

In a 6-point scale (1-6), the TE rated the entire M&E system as "5". Also in a 6-point scale, this TER will rate the M&E implementation as "Moderately Satisfactory". Evidence presented by relevant project documents is drawing a picture of a strong and successful M&E implementation.

The most significant success of M&E implementation is the consistency of the project logic framework in measuring the project's progress toward achieving expected outputs as compared to other similar GEF projects. Specifically, the 6 major project components and their sub-components, which are strictly followed by each PIRs, have undergone no change from project start to completion. The PIRs have also followed standard IFAD formats by including periodic assessments of the project's outcome achievement, project implementation, and risks. The marked shortcoming of the M&E implementation is some mismatch of the project's actual outcomes and its expected outputs/activities. Specifically, some of the project's actual achievements were not matching specific expected outputs but are still contributing to realizing the expected outcome of the project component they are serving for, which generated difficulties in evaluating the project's actual outcome achievement. For example, the actual outcome achievement under project component 3 reported by the TE failed to address the expected output 3.1.1: Tool-kit for RUAs and communes of recommended procedures for participatory planning and application of SLM best practices, 3.2.2: Procedures and practices for participatory control of land degradation in place, and 3.2.3: SLM best practices adopted and implemented outside the pilot areas. (TE, p.23-24, p.52) This, however, indicates that the originally designed M&E framework has not been 100% observed in the project implementation. In addition, the TE reported the setup of the M&E system was delayed. (TE, p.42)

The MTR was conducted in 2013, and it provided a set of recommendations such as reinforcing project communication and monitoring system. (MTE, p.26-28)

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: Satisfactory**

The project's implementing agencies are IFAD and UNIDO. The TE didn't provide a rating for the project implementation. This TER will rate the quality of project implementation as "Satisfactory". Based on the evidence presented by the TE, IFAD and UNIDO have successfully fulfilled their role as the project's implementing agency.

"The GEF has mandated IFAD and UNIDO to implement the project. IFAD addressed the reporting and M&E. UNIDO was designated as the International Executing Agency (administrative and financial management) and thus supervises day to day operations. "UNIDO, as the International Executing Agency, was instrumental in: i. supervising day-to-day operations; ii. introducing the necessary flexibility for adapting implementation; iii. Introducing new technologies such as the Vallerani System, the use of

Zander in tree planting; iv. Linking environmental preservation to economic development; v. Providing support to the HCEFLCD for upgrading its nursery network." (TE, p.38) The flexibility allowed by the project management, with UNIDO as an International implementing Agency, has contributed to the project's high effectiveness. (TE, p.40)

IFAD, UNIDO and GEF deployed a supervision mission and a MTE (Mid-Term Evaluation) mission, with the UNIDO Representative to Morocco, as Project Manager, and the PMU present in the Field with the mission. UNIDO was particularly active in supporting the missions in the field through the participation of the Resident Representative to Morocco, as Project Manager. These missions provided useful recommendations for the project implementation, including the need for PMU strengthening, replacing planting by equipment of water points as a climate change mitigation action, and activation of the M&E system. (TE, p.38)

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	**Rating: Satisfactory**

The project's executing agencies are the HCEFLCD (Haut Commissariat aux Eaux et Forets et à la Lutte Contre la Désertification), and MAPM (Ministry of Agriculture and Marine Fishery). Both are direct branches of the government of Morocco (TE, p.1). The TE didn't provide ratings for the project execution. Considering the evidence presented by the TE regarding the project's overall execution, this TER will rate the project's overall quality of execution as "Satisfactory". The project's overall execution has been successful based on existing evidence presented by relevant project documents.

The Project Management Unit (PMU), which assumes the supervisory role for the project execution, was established by the HCEFLCD with the close collaboration of UNIDO. The HCEFLCD as the National Project Executing Agency took the necessary actions concerning the project management, i.e., designating the director of the Direction for Combating Desertification and the Nature Conservation (DLCDPN) as the national project director, establishing the Central Cell for the Project Supervision (CCSP), coordinating the national project steering committee, designating the DREFLCD-O (Direction Régional des Eaux et Forêts et de la Lutte Contre la Désertification pour l'Oriental) as the regional structure for implementing the project, and establishing the Desertification Observatory within the Provincial Water and Forest Directorates (DREFLCD). In addition, the Provincial Water and Forest Directorates and local structures of the HCEFLCD, in close collaboration with the PMU and other partners (Provincial Agricultural Directorates for the MAPM and local authorities for the Ministry of the Interior), implemented with professionalism the different project activities concerning GEF and HCEFLCD. (TE, p.39)

"Despite its small size, the PMU demonstrated, under the supervision of UNIDO, and in close collaboration with HCEFLCD, IFAD and other partners a high efficacy in: i addressing coordination among different partners; ii implementing GEF activities; iii working with the beneficiaries' organizations on sensitizing, and training on SLM/IWRM; and iv reporting. The reporting included quarterly and annual reports and work plans as well as project PIR." (TE, p.25)

Although not a key participant of PMU, the MAPM implemented with professionalism the activities planned within the regular program, such as i. SLM activities such as planting of fodder shrubs, water harvesting, rest for seed production, establishment of a regional antenna for the Rangeland Plant Material Center (CPSP) in Ain Beni Mathar, establishment of physical delineation indications for the previous rested pastures to decrease of trespassing risks; ii. establishing water points; iii. continuous back-up of pastoral cooperatives; In addition, the MAPM actively participated in the ATP committees, at the national, regional and local level. Further, the MAPM prepared, in collaboration with the HCEFLCD and the MI, a proposal for the Pastoral Law in order to address some of the barriers encountered by the ATP and up-scaling of rangeland improvements and their sustainable management (TE, p.39)

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 reported following environment change led by the project: (TE, p.34-35)

The project improved the synergy between partners addressing resource management, combating desertification, and mitigation of climatic change, especially through the implementation of Accord Tripartite (ATP). This synergy greatly reduced unauthorized cultivation of rangelands in the project area, as well as trespassing into rested and planted sites. The project improved vegetation cover and biomass as a result of the SLM techniques introduced, and improved plant species regeneration and diversity from SLM techniques. The project improved soil protection and stabilization, and developed the potential for diversification of plant material through use of native species seeds produced in rested areas and processed in the plant material center established in Ain Béni Mathar, and through rehabilitated plant nurseries such as the Bouarfa plant nursery. Finally the project contributed to the mitigation of climate change impacts through rehabilitation of ecosystems by using SLM which can increase plant standing crop by up to 600% and plant cover for soil protection from 5% to more than 30-40%, and through photovoltaic equipment of water points.

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 reported the following socioeconomic changes (TE, p.26, p.32-33)

34% of households surveyed by the project impact study were below the poverty line (3569 MAD/person/year) as compared to 36% in the baseline study; domestic migration was absent in 94% of households whereas it concerned 88% of households in 2011; migration outside Morocco is estimated at 7.1% as compared to 26%. In addition, the survey noted the return of number of children of livestock owners from Europe due to the prevailing economic crisis. Some received a herd from their parents or created a microenterprise benefiting from the ongoing projects and programs such the PLPCDRP, PDPEOII, INDH; the project created opportunities of employment approaching 500 000 person-days; The project activities allowed a reduction in watering cost for animal production (10% as compared to 31% in 2008), and feeding costs. (TE, p.26)

The project generated additional income from work opportunities within project related activities 485.962 person-days (about $4 million distributed in wages) and from better production conditions; the project provided access to additional forage resources within improved sites (rangeland rest, fodder shrub plantation). The biophysical monitoring showed improvements in fodder production of the order of up to 600 Kg DM/ha in alfagrass rest compared to 80 kg DM/ha in open areas, 920 Kg DM/ha by Atriplex plantation as compared to 100 kg DM/ha before planting; the project provided better access to water resources with an average distance to fetch water at 20 km, and the distance between water points decreased from 30-45 km in the 1990s to 10-20 km at the present time; the project provided access to and ownership of technology (Vallerani system, seed collection of native plant species); the project strengthened the human capital of beneficiaries through training (8,796 participants in training, awareness, workshops, meetings, field days, 7 manual on SLM produced) and involvement in planning and implementation of project activities. The project strengthened social capital of beneficiaries (Pastoral Cooperatives, Unions of Cooperatives, establishment of the Federation of Unions, Women cooperative, Youth ecotourism enterprise); and generated medium and long-term work opportunities in guarding rested pasture and water points, harvesting of native plant seed, plant nurseries, income generating activities of handcrafting and ecotourism. Finally the project generated a change in attitude and better appreciation of the importance of SLM as shown by a large number of request for additional implementation of SLM techniques and a positive view of the future of the area. (TE,p.32-33)

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 TE reported the following activities related to the change in capacities: (TE, p.21-26)

23 sensitizing workshops at the central, regional, provincial, and local levels, 39 intersectorial workshops were organized for the Harmonization and integration of Sustainable Land Management (SLM)/Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) in the main government programs. 4 workshops related to the Tripartite Agreement (ATP) between the three major partners (MAPM, the MI, and the HCEFLCD) were organized. Design, printing, and distribution of the ATP document and support for implementing the ATP have been fully in place as expected, and consultation on relevant legislative issues was conducted in line with expectation. Additionally 8 workshops at the central and regional levels and 7 implementation workshops on ATP were organized and conducted.

To support the decentralized responsibilities and decision-making for planning use and management of common rangelands, support to the responsible authorities and cooperatives through technical assistance and a workshop was fully provided as expected. Procedures were developed to transfer the responsibility of rangeland use through a consultation and a workshop, all of which are fully in line with expectation. Authorities and cooperatives were sensitized about the guidelines for devolving responsibility for sustainable rangeland use and management through 54 meetings. 6 planned events (target 6) were organized to mobilize users and cooperatives for a sustainable use of rangelands; institutional capacities were strengthened through the purchase of 6 vehicles, 2 all-terrain bikes and communication as expected.

Training documents on SLM/IWRM techniques were produced as expected. 24 training sessions for the staff of ministries and regional services, and 31 training sessions for the authorities and cooperatives on SLM/IWRM (Integrated Water Resources Management) were conducted. The partnership agreement was signed between the Ministry of Education, HCEFLCD, UNIDO and Mohamed I University of Oujda which established a Bachelor's degree in Geomatics and Sustainable Land Management with the first class of 55 students who fulfilled the Bachelor requirement. Field trips have been organized for the students to the SLM and IWRM project implementation sites.

To strengthen and extend the implementation of the drought early warning system developed under PDPEO II project, 15 planned meteorological stations have been purchased and established as expected within the project area; in line with the target of strengthening the monitoring system for vegetation, soil, and livestock. A five-year agreement was established with the National Institute of Agronomic research concerning biophysical and socioeconomic monitoring of the project implementation sites with annual reports issued; the agreement with ANOC (National association of Sheep and Goats Producers) was implemented; and three workshops were organized late 2015 on linkage between catastrophes programs.

Delineation, characterization and establishment of 3 project pilot sites and corresponding focal groups were completed through a participatory approach based on 14 workshops and meetings; a plant material center for native rangeland plants (CCTSP) was built in Ain Beni Mathar which was equipped with technical, laboratory and office equipment. Two live rangeland plant collections (pastoretum) in Bouarfa, and Ain Béni Mathar were established and are operating well; 2O t of the ZANDER product was purchased for promoting tree plant growth within the Aleppo pine and Tamarix plantations. 114 Micro –barrages were built; the area of forest tree planting was 4 446 ha; the implementation of best SLM/IWRM practices within the pilot sites for demonstration purposes was carried out in the form of siga rehabilitation through

planting 450 ha of fodder shrubs, rangeland rest for native plant seed production on 557 ha, building of 3 micro dams, forest tree planting on 450 ha.

A SLM/IWRM network was developed through organizing 34 meetings. 16 workshops were organized with the aim of dissemination, diffusion and up-scaling of SLM practices. 4 workshops on Cooperative Development plans (PDC) produced under PDPEO II project were organized, while three additional meetings are to be organized late 2015 with the concerned Rural communes, in partnership with ODECO and the DPAs of Figuig and Oujda.

A business plan was produced for establishing an information and training center after extensive consultation. Equipment in a room within the CCTSP in Ain Béni Mathar to be used for training/information activities of farmers/livestock producers was rehabilitated; linkages within the MENARID framework was established through the participation of project staff to 7 workshops organized in Jordan, Lebanon, Morocco, Syria, and Tunisia.

Technical guidelines were produced for the small and micro enterprises in relation to combating desertification; support was provided to local communities for income generating activities through technical assistance and equipments; capacities were strengthened for cooperatives and other client groups of Micro Credit Associations, those of banking institutions, and labeling of local products.

A market analysis study was conducted for promoting ecotourism; support was provided for ecotourism pilot enterprises through training, equipment, and marketing. Support was provided to the operationalization of the Figuig eco museum dedicated to the J. Grouz Biological and Ecological Interest Site (SIBE) in replacement of the Chekkar SIBE; complementarity between coastal tourism in the North to inland ecotourism was promoted through the publication of two guides in partnership with the Regional Delegation of Tourism. To support the carbon sequestration framework, water points were equipped with photovoltaic solar panels as a climatic mitigation action in replacement of agro forestry, tree planting.

As part of the project's M&E system, a data collection and analysis platform was established and located at the DREFLCD-O server; a geo portal dedicated to desertification at the national and regional levels was also developed as a decision-making aid for monitoring desertification. A GIS mapping project activities is being developed; biophysical monitoring was implemented within a 5-year agreement with INRA (CRRAO), starting in September 2010. A survey was conducted addressing the project socioeconomic impacts; a study on the design of a management plan for the project sites treated with SLM was implemented.

b) Governance

The TE reported following change related to governance: (TE, p.21-26)

Procedures were developed to decentralize the responsibility of rangeland use through a consultation and a workshop, participated by relevant authorities and cooperatives, all of which are fully in line with expectation.

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.

Relevant project documents didn't identify any unintended impacts of this project.

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.

There is no immediate scale-up or replication of the project reported by the TE. However, the TE pointed out the project has provided solid institutional foundation and helped build up the capacity of project stakeholders all of which will be facilitating to the project's further scale-up. Good examples are such as the operating of ATP local committees and the constructive collaboration between the MAPM, the MI, and the HCEFLCD, water harvesting through the use of the Vallerani system, and the establishment of an integrated system for promoting the use of native plant material in rehabilitation of degraded rangeland ecosystems. (TE, p.28)

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 TE summarized the following lessons learned (TE, p.7)

"High effectiveness due to: i) The flexibility allowed by the project management, with UNIDO as an International implementing Agency; ii) Commitment and involvement of other partners (HCEFLCD, MAPM, MI) and harmonization of their interventions; iii) Capitalizing on PDPEO II results and products; iv) The participatory ascending approach in the selection of sites and actions; v) The role of training in strengthening the beneficiaries knowledge and ownership; vi) Attribution of implementation of a given activity to the Agency most experienced in that activity;

UNIDO, as the International Executing Agency, was instrumental in: i) Introducing new technologies such as the Vallerani System, the use of Zander in tree planting; ii) Linking environmental preservation to economic development; iii) Providing support to the HCEFLCD for upgrading its nursery network;

The results obtained strengthen the position of the area as a learning environment for up scaling the approach, organization, and the best SLM practices. This was exemplified by the number of beneficiaries participating in workshops and field meetings, as well as the number of visiting farmers/livestock owners

from other areas such as the Sous-Massa Draa Region and the Guelmim Region which are part of the new MAPM Tran regional Program on Rangeland Management and Regulation of Transhumance. In addition, visitors from other countries were reported as well."

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provided the following recommendations (TE, p.41-42)

"Given the considerable surface area of the EHP ecosystems and the extent of desertification processes, it is necessary to deploy (scaling up) successful SLM/IWRM techniques over large areas in order to rehabilitate the ecosystems and extend the environmental and economic benefits to a maximum of beneficiaries, it is recommended that:

- the commitment of the partners be continued, as expressed in their programs in terms of: i) financial resources for investing on SLM and poverty reduction; ii) harmonizing their activities; iii) backing up the beneficiaries' organizations for conflict management, technical advice on SLM and value-adding for their products, and marketing aspects;

- Outsourcing part of implementation to the beneficiaries' organizations within operational contracts. The agreement signed with the Federation of Unions of Cooperatives (annex 10) is a good start which should be pursued and extended in order to fully involve the beneficiaries in implementation, thus giving them on-hand technical knowhow and financial benefits important for the sustainability;

- Promoting the valorization of different products from the area (meat, handcrafting, ecotourism, truffles, medicinal and aromatic plants);

- Strengthening of the native plant material system in order to make it operational over a large scale in the EHP and elsewhere in comparable ecosystems;

- Strengthening field human resources of major partners, in particular those of HCEFLCD and MAPM;

- In future design of projects with co-financing, it is advisable to avoid co-financing the same activity because of constraints in implementation;

- Publication of the Pastoral Law and its operation in order to provide enough incentives to involve rangeland resource users for the needed action on a large scale to reverse the trend of land degradation and desertification."

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 TE compared in detail the project's targeted outcomes and the project's actual outcome achievements. It also assessed the project's impacts with detailed information (one of the best impact analysis I have ever seen plus a thorough assessment of outcome effectiveness)	**Highly Satisfactory**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE report is internally consistent, evidence presented complete and convincing, with its ratings well-substantiated.	**Satisfactory**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE assessed the project's sustainability, however, more detailed information in this area will be preferred. The TE didn't mentioned the project's exit strategy.	**Moderately Satisfactory**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The "Lessons Learned" section was adequate.	**Satisfactory**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE specified the project's total costs and actual level of co-financing, but it didn't present their breakdown by activities.	**Moderately Satisfactory**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE described the implementation of the project's M&E system without rendering an assessment with sufficient evidence.	**Moderately Unsatisfactory**
		Satisfactory

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

In the preparation of this TER, no additional documents were referred to as the source of information apart from PIRs, TE, MTE and PD.