

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

Note: The terminal evaluation for this project was written in French. Quotes from the terminal evaluation have been freely translated by the preparer of this Terminal Evaluation; the translation has not been professionally revised.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3166	
GEF Agency project ID		3707	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Mainstreaming Global Environmental Aspects in the planning and monitoring processes of the National Human Development Initiative (NHDI) in Morocco	
Country/Countries		Morocco	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Multi Focal Area - biodiversity, climate change, and sustainable land management	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Cross-cutting Capacity Building (CB-2) - Mainstreaming Global Environmental Priorities into National Policies and Programs	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Interior (Mol) Agency for Social Development (ASD)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		September 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		November 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		October 2012	
Actual date of project completion		September 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.04	.04
	Co-financing	0	NA
GEF Project Grant		0.46	0.46
Co-financing	IA own	0.1	0.2
	Government	0.1	0.127
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		0.5	0.5
Total Co-financing		0.2	0.327
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		0.7	0.827*
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		July 2015	
Author of TE		Khalid Anouar	

TER completion date	March 21, 2016
TER prepared by	Caroline Laroche
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Molly Watts

* excluding the PPG grant

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

There have been several interventions to support sustainable development and environmental enhancement at all levels in Morocco. The progress that came out of those interventions has so far been limited; most initiatives were scattered, poorly coordinated and did not consolidate political will for a systematic action. This project's overall goal is to integrate Morocco's commitments to global environmental management in the National Human Development Initiative (NHDI), local strategic planning and other decentralization processes. The project has been elaborated taking into account the long-term goal of fulfilling country commitments to the global environmental management in the context of fiscal and governance decentralization process currently underway.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objective is to integrate global environmental objectives of Morocco into the NHDI and local strategic development planning, budgeting and monitoring processes. To do so, the project focuses on the following three outcomes:

1. The institutional framework for the integration of GE management in the NHDI and local strategic development planning and monitoring is developed.
2. The capacities for systematic mainstreaming of the global environmental targets into the local planning are developed.
3. A system of project's adaptive management and lessons learned established.

(TE p.8)

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

No changes in objectives or activities took place during implementation.

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
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory. This TER also rates relevance as satisfactory due to its good alignment with Morocco's national priorities as well as with GEF priorities.

The project is aligned to Morocco's priorities in terms of environmental management. Morocco has ratified the Rio conventions and has adopted strategies to meet its commitments as part of the convention. Starting in 2004, Morocco took part in the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) project, which sought to identify national priorities and requirements in terms of capacity enhancement in the area of global environmental management, notably in what concerns biodiversity, climate change, and desertification. The NCSA identified priorities to better translate commitments made under the Rio Conventions into local action. Those recommendations constitute the basis of this project, which will continue to support Morocco in its demonstrated commitment to the Rio conventions.

The project also conforms to GEF priorities, addressing objectives in three of GEF's focal areas (biodiversity, climate change, and sustainable land management). The project is particularly relevant under the strategic priority related to Cross-cutting Capacity-Building (CB-2) framework related to 'Mainstreaming Global Environmental Priorities into National Policies and Programs' whereby the CB-2 projects would focus on developing capacities for countries to improve their ability to meet their obligations under the three Rio Conventions by integrating global environmental priorities into national policies, plans and programs, particularly macro-economic and poverty-reduction programs/strategies.

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

The TE rates effectiveness as satisfactory. This TER also rates effectiveness as satisfactory due to having made adequate progress under the project's three outcomes, further examined below.

Outcome 1: The institutional framework for the integration of GE management in the NHDl and local strategic development planning and monitoring is developed.

The project had three main achievements under this outcome. First, it successfully introduced methodological approaches and tools for integrating global environmental commitments into the development planning at local level. However, those tools have not yet been fully adopted. Second, it clarified institutional mandates and procedures for environmental mainstreaming at the provincial, regional and national levels. Third, it introduced a set of global environmental indicators to be part of the monitoring system of the National Human Development Initiative (NHDl) at the local, the regional and the national levels. However, those indicators have not yet been fully adopted and implemented by relevant actors (TE pp.38-39). Overall, achievements under this outcome have been moderately satisfactory.

Outcome 2: The capacities for systematic mainstreaming of the global environmental targets into the local planning are developed.

The project focused on two main activities under this outcome. First, the project identified and agreed upon priority global environmental targets to be addressed by all project partners as part of the NHDl. Second, it built the capacity of stakeholders to integrate priority global environmental issues into local development planning. 62 relevant institutions and 200 staff members were trained to better integrate environmental issues into the NHDl, and several NHDl initiatives now integrate environmental issues. The percentage of budgets devoted to environmental management has increased. Overall, achievements under this outcome have been satisfactory and are in line with logframe targets. (TE pp.39-40)

Outcome 3: A system of project's adaptive management and lessons learned established.

Two main outputs were planned under this outcome. First, the project aimed to put in place a better project management infrastructure. Second, it aimed to establish and operationalize better communication and knowledge management mechanisms to serve project objectives. All planned outputs have been fully achieved, and this outcome can be rated as being highly satisfactory. (TE pp.40-41)

The project achieved most of its logframe targets. An overall rating of satisfactory is assigned to project effectiveness.

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

The TE rates efficiency as highly satisfactory due to the good cost effectiveness of the project. This TER rates efficiency as satisfactory but judges that there is not enough evidence provided in the TE to grant a rating of highly satisfactory.

The TE explains that the project demonstrated a very good ability to keep costs in check throughout the project. For example, the project chose to implement pilot activities in three regions, including remote areas where it was rather costly to implement project activities. This choice strengthened project outcomes, but was challenging from a cost perspective. However, the team was able to keep costs low, and the TE reports that “financial execution and management were adequate and rigorous” (TE p.46).

No cost benefit analysis was done, nor have the project costs been compared to those of similar projects. However, given the evidence of good financial management provided in the TE, efficiency is rated as satisfactory.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE rates sustainability as moderately likely due to risks related to future financial resources for project continuation. For the same reason, this TER also rates sustainability as moderately likely due to the uncertainty regarding the future financing of project related activities.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

The Environment Ministry allocated funds to be disbursed in 2015 and 2016 to pursue capacity building activities started as part of this project. No funding has yet been committed for the continuation of other project activities, but it was expected that a strategy would be formulated to ensure a more sustainable project exit. However, as nothing was yet in place at project end, financial sustainability is rated as moderately likely.

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Likely

The tools and guidelines developed as part of the project are already used by several stakeholder institutions. The capacity building activities done as part of the project will contribute to the continuation of the project outcomes. No institutional risks were identified.

Socio-Political Risks – Sustainability Likely

Country ownership for this project was high, with the Moroccan government being highly supportive and willing to update its operating strategy in line with project recommendations. Project achievements are not contingent on political support and will be maintained by the national and local governments following project end.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

There are no identified environmental risks to the continuation of project benefits.

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 co-financing expected from the UNDP and the Government of Morocco was delivered as planned, and contributed to achieving project outcomes.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project had a slow start, and the implementation was slower than usual. Two extension requests were made and granted, postponing project end from October 2012 to September 2015. (TE p.31)

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

According to the TE, the government was "involved from the start in project implementation" and "ensured that regional and local stakeholders were adequately mobilized" (TE p.47). This contributed to stakeholders at all levels feeling a high level of ownership over the tools developed as part of the project, and ensured a higher level of sustainability. The Environment Ministry also mobilized its own teams to work on this project, and it is expected they will remain involved even after project end.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory. This TER rates it as satisfactory due to the presence of all standard components of a strong M&E plan.

The project’s M&E system was overall good, featuring all required components for a standard M&E framework. The Project Document (p.45) shows a clear M&E strategy for the project, including arrangements for frequent monitoring activities, external evaluation and donor reports. The project planned to rely mostly on a capacity assessment scorecard to monitor progress on capacity development. The PD (p.64) also featured a clear logframe specifying targets, indicators, baseline values, targets and sources of verification. “Most of the indicators are specific, realistic, reachable and quantifiable, allowing for an evaluation of the project against the baseline situation” (TE p.24). Overall, we find the M&E plan featured all required components of a strong M&E framework.

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as satisfactory. This TER rates M&E implementation as moderately satisfactory: the project’s M&E framework was implemented as planned, except for the mid-term evaluation which did not take place.

According to the TE, all monitoring reports and activities planned took place, except for the 2012 annual review. Monitoring activities included an inception report, PIRs, annual work plans, annual reviews, audits and execution reports. However, the planned mid-term evaluation did not take place. The TE does not explain why the mid-term evaluation was skipped. Monitoring outputs provided as part of this TER are of good quality. Overall, M&E implementation is rated as moderately satisfactory.

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 implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. The TE rates project rates project implementation as satisfactory, as does this TER. Indeed, the UNDP appears to have actively managed the project and provided useful technical support throughout its implementation.

The TE praises the UNDP for the extent to which it “made available to Morocco its international expertise to implement solutions adapted to integrating global environmental objectives in local development planning. It also played an important role in coordinating and mobilizing local actors and

international partners as part of the project” (TE p.38). In addition, “the UNDP’s involvement and the reactivity of its staff played an important role in ensuring the project’s success” (TE p.38).

The TE also makes minor criticisms to the project design, pointing out that the project document did not specify the intervention scale for this project, nor a timeline for the implementation of planned activities. This could have saved time and speeded up project implementation.

Despite this minor criticism, project implementation is rated as satisfactory.

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

The executing agency for this project was Morocco’s Ministry of Interior (Mol) and the Agency for Social Development (ASD). The TE rates the quality of project execution as satisfactory. This TER also rates quality of project execution as satisfactory due to the flexible and adaptive management displayed by the executing team.

The executing agency displayed good adaptive management throughout the project. The TE reports the Project Implementation Unit “was able to adapt and effectively react to constraints and events by developing appropriate solutions aiming to optimize results and limit project roadblocks” (TE p.31). The Project Implementation Unit was left without guidance in the process of choosing pilot regions for project activities, but successfully managed to develop a selection process and to engage relevant local stakeholders.

The TE reports that the executing agency “was fully committed to the project and felt real ownership over the results” (TE p.38). In addition, “all stakeholders were very satisfied with the work of the national project coordination, who was motivated and engaged in the project” (TE p.38). Overall, project execution appears to have been done very satisfactorily.

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.

No environmental change has taken place as part of this project, nor was it expected to take place in the short time frame of project implementation. However, going forward, development

projects in Morocco will better take into consideration local and global environmental issues, and will help better track Morocco's progress against various environmental objectives. Positive environmental impact from this project is likely to happen in the longer term.

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.

No socio-economic change took place as part of this project.

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

Capacity-building was the core component of this project, which built the capacity of stakeholders to integrate priority global environmental issues into local development planning. 62 relevant institutions and 200 staff members were trained to better integrate environmental issues into the National Human Development Initiative (NHDI), and several NHDI initiatives now integrate environmental issues.

b) Governance

Not relevant.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts were recorded as part 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.

Not relevant.

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 proposes the following key lessons for this project:

- The Project Implementation Unit needs to communicate with local stakeholder groups about project objectives, concepts and activities. Indeed, the project expects important changes in the way local planning activities are conducted, and it is important to work together with local stakeholders from the onset of the project
- It is necessary to set up focal points at the regional level to ensure local stakeholders are well supported.
- The role of OREDDs (Observatoire régional de l'Environnement et de Développement Durable) needs to be communicated to local authorities to facilitate their integration with local institutions.
- Training sessions on methodological tools must include concrete examples to better facilitate learning.
- It was effective to work together with other projects and initiatives to work on the capacity-building components of this project.
- The changing national context must be taken into consideration during the various project phases. Changes to the logframe may at times be warranted.

(TE p.9)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The project recommends a series of actions summarized here. The TE (pp.9-11) contains more information regarding those recommendations.

1. Strengthen advocacy to amend the bill modifying the Charte Communale;
2. Follow up on the generalization strategy;
3. Monitor all awareness raising activities by stakeholders;
4. Set up a collaborative platform for communities to exchange experiences related to the project;
5. Invite communal General Secretaries to Provincial Development Agent training sessions;
6. Prepare standard reporting templates for the monitoring of environmental indicators;
7. Host a presentation workshops on project results;
8. Better disseminate methodological tools and success stories.

(TE pp.9-11)

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 report contains an assessment of all relevant outcomes. Project impacts are assessed, and performance against all logframe indicators is evaluated.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent. All necessary evidence is provided. The justification for some of the ratings could have been better fleshed out.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project assesses sustainability and discusses the project exit strategy. However, the sustainability discussion is rather superficial.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by evidence and appear to be comprehensive.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report presents total project costs and costs per outcome, per costs per activity are not presented. Co-financing figures are included in the report.	MS
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report adequately evaluates M&E, and presents a very thorough assessment of the quality of the project indicators.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

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

No additional sources were used in the preparation of the TER.