

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2013

1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|--|--------------|--|------------------------|
| GEF project ID | | 3230 | |
| GEF Agency project ID | | TA 6357-REG; 38464 | |
| GEF Replenishment Phase | | GEF-3 | |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects) | | Asian Development Bank (ADB) | |
| Project name | | Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management Multicountry Partnership Framework Support Project | |
| Country/Countries | | Regional (Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Turkmenistan, Uzbekistan, Tajikistan) | |
| Region | | Asia | |
| Focal area | | Land Degradation | |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives | | OP 15 | |
| Executing agencies involved | | Ministry of Environmental Protection, Kazakhstan, Ministry of agriculture, Water Resources and Process Industry, Kyrgyzstan; Agency of Land Management, Geodesy and Cartography, Tajikistan; Ministry of Nature Protection, Turkmenistan; Uzhydromet, Uzbekistan; ADB; FAO; ICARDA; IFPRI; GTZ | |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement | | Consultation | |
| Private sector involvement | | None | |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP) | | 17 Oct 2006 | |
| Effectiveness date / project start | | 21 Nov 2006 | |
| Expected date of project completion (at start) | | 31 Dec 2008 | |
| Actual date of project completion | | 30 Jun 2010 | |
| Project Financing | | | |
| | | At Endorsement (US \$M) | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant | GEF funding | | |
| | Co-financing | | |
| GEF Project Grant | | 3.025 | |
| Co-financing | IA/EA own | 1.500 | |
| | Government | 0.500 | |
| | Other* | 0.500 | |
| Total GEF funding | | 3.025 | |
| Total Co-financing | | 2.500 | |
| Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing) | | 5.525 | |

| Terminal evaluation/review information | |
|--|----------------|
| TE completion date | 30 Jun 2011 |
| TE submission date | |
| Author of TE | Mark Kunzer |
| TER completion date | 12/20/13 |
| TER prepared by | Pallavi Nuka |
| TER peer review by (if GEF EO review) | Joshua Schneck |

*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The GEO of the Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management (CACILM) Multi-country Partnership Framework (CMPF) Support Project is the same as that for the CACILM, which is “the restoration, maintenance, and enhancement of the productivity of land in the Central Asian Countries (CACs), leading to improved economic and social well-being of those who depend on these resources, while preserving the environmental functions of these lands (ProDoc, pg. 6).” The Project Document (ProDoc, pg. 2) notes that land degradation in the Central Asian Countries is a problem rooted in human activity, which has led to the “reduced stability and functioning of desert, mountain, wetland, and riparian ecosystems.” According to the ProDoc, this project will promote the adoption of a sustainable land management framework across the CACs which will in turn lead to the global environmental benefits of “restored ecosystems, biodiversity conservation, improved quality of transboundary rivers, and minimized contribution to climate change.”

CACILM = Central Asian Countries Initiative for Land Management

CMPF = CACILM Multi-country Partnership Framework

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Developmental Objective of the CMPF Support Project was “successful implementation of national programs in the Central Asian Countries (CACs) to ensure a comprehensive and integrated approach to sustainable land management.

Expected outcomes of the project were:

1. Improved capacity of the institutions in Central Asia to adopt integrated land use planning and management.
2. Long-term sustained harmonized commitments of financial and human resources through mainstreaming of SLM in donor programs for Central Asia.

Project outputs were specified as:

- (i) a sustainable land management information system designed, developed, and operated;
- (ii) a knowledge management plan developed, and the first set of knowledge products, mainly lessons learnt out of the CACILM process, disseminated;
- (iii) a sustainable land management research program designed and implemented;
- (iv) strategic development of the CMPF, promotion of policy dialogue, and efficient and effective coordination of the implementation of the CMPF; and
- (v) efficient and effective coordination of NPF implementation in all CACs.

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

No changes to GEO, DO or outputs/activities were noted in the TE report.

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 |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|

Based on the information in the project document, this Support Project was relevant to GEF’s strategic priorities under both GEF-3 and GEF-4 frameworks, and necessary for ensuring successful implementation CACILM child-projects. The project is consistent with OP 15 -Sustainable Land Management under the Land Degradation Focal Area, and the strategic priorities of targeted capacity building and implementation of innovative and indigenous sustainable land management practices. This Support Project provides essential components toward meeting the objectives of the CACILM program: an information system to enable progress to be determined and monitored, a means to ensure a multi-country flow of knowledge and information, research toward common, innovative SLM practices, and coordination of activities to capture advantages of scale. Furthermore, the project is consistent with national priorities as evidenced by the CACs’ adoption of a regional environmental action plan and their commitments of human and financial resources to the development of the CACILM PDF-B design phase, the NPFs, and the CMPF.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 4.2 Effectiveness | Rating: Moderately Satisfactory |
|--------------------------|--|

Based on the information in the TE report the outputs of this technical assistance project were largely commensurate with expectations, however the broader outcome of harmonized policies and free exchange of information, which is critical for successful implementation of the CACILM program, was not achieved. As a result of project activities, the participating institutions now have the technical capacity to implement an integrated land use planning and management framework, but they are not actually doing so. The institutions are not yet sharing results, information and research. The TE report assesses overall performance as successful noting that the project did build capacity and establish a foundation, but given the shortcomings in actually harmonizing policies and sharing knowledge, this review rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory.

The project established an institutional basis for the CACILM program through creation, staffing, and training of a Multicountry Secretariat (MSEC) and 5 National Secretariats (NSECs). The TA team also facilitated the first 4 meetings of the CACILM Steering Committee (SC), which is the governing agency for the program. Project monitoring and evaluation systems were designed, developed and implemented. On the planning side, the project organized the preparation of National Planning Frameworks (NPFs) in the five countries. The NPFs prioritize projects and technical assistance for each country.

A SLM-IS (Information System) was developed. This project collected and digitized key data (maps, land, water and climate resources, etc) from a wide range of sources. Analysis and an inventory of existing national cartographic

data and maps have been executed. The main database of SLM-IS is located in the MSEC and is accessible to all the five CACs through their NSECs.

A SLM-KM (Knowledge Management) system was also established. The TE reports that this has been “successful in knowledge creation and capture but has failed in knowledge sharing, retrieval and dissemination, as per original TA design.” The membership of the Community of Practice (COP) is limited and therefore defeats the purpose of widespread dissemination, which can be achieved through arranging an easily accessible internet site. Research work was carried out in seven areas of SLM in all five countries. The TE report notes that due to insufficient time and due to bureaucracy, it was difficult for the NSECs to obtain research results.

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

The project closed 18-months later than planned with some allocated funding (13%) still undisbursed. Despite the delay (reasons for which discussed below), all activities were carried out as planned and final costs were within budget. The TE report notes that there was a “a minor change in implementation arrangements” to “provide additional consultants, equipment, agreements with national level institutions, FAO and International Fund for Agricultural Development to facilitate implementation of SLM-KM and SLM-IS.” The TE report notes that project implementation and execution was efficient. Inputs from consultants and contractors were well utilized, and project management operated efficiently and effectively across the Central Asian countries.

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

Project outcomes are sustainable in the short- to mid-term.

Financial (L): The CACILM program has funding from GEF and other donors to continue activities until 2016.

Institutional (ML): The institutional arrangements created through this project have strong support from national and international partners. Countries have drawn up NPFs to guide national investments in SLM projects and activities. The SLM-IS is operational and being utilized to both develop tools and as an M&E tool. The lack of knowledge exchange and information sharing is of concern for the longer-term prospects for the program.

Socio-political (L): Based on information in the final PIR, the project has garnered broad based interest and support. 26 ministries and committees, 29 research institutes and centers as well as civil society and NGOs were involved in CACILM activities across the five CACs. All stakeholders were able to comment on the final reports and NPFs.

Environmental (L): No risks to environmental sustainability were noted.

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?

Based on reporting in the TE report, the expected co-financing amounts from GEF and ADB did materialize but with delays. FAO provided some in-kind assistance (trained specialists in SLM techniques) through a Partnership Agreement. There is no evidence that the project leveraged any additional co-financing.

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 TA was extended four times to 30 June 2010 for (i) revisions to the implementation schedule due to the delays in Global Environment Facility (GEF) cofinancing, (ii) provide time for transition to full implementation phase, and (iii) provide time for the publication of the Central Asia Atlas of Natural Resources.

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:

The project has benefited from country support and engagement in activities. The NPFs were prepared and endorsed by each national government. Representatives of national governments are actively involved with the CACILM Steering Committee and national governments have also established National Coordination Councils to coordinate processes domestically. Nevertheless, the project remains largely donor-led (led by ADB) and there is no evidence of explicit financial commitments by the beneficiary countries.

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 |
| <p>The project's M&E plan was based on a logical framework that focused on the catalytic and coordinating functions of the partnership within the overall objective of the CMPF. The logical framework specified targets for outputs and activities, outcome indicators, data sources and reporting mechanisms, and assumptions and risks. The M&E arrangements also included consideration of whether multi-country activities were in compliance with the environmental and social safeguards of donor agencies, and the quality of the shared understanding about the technical content of proposed SLM interventions. The M&E arrangements were vague on the responsibilities for monitoring and evaluation (i.e. who would be responsible for project M&E), and there was no estimated cost allocated for project M&E.</p> | |
| 6.2 M&E Implementation | Rating: Unable to Assess |
| <p>There is insufficient information in the TE report to rate implementation of project M&E. The final PIR notes only that some indicators were revised and that the information flow for CACILM M&E was strengthened. The PIR also mentions that reporting by the MSEC and NSECs was timely.</p> | |

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 |
|--|-----------------------------|

ADB was responsible for leading the CACILM partnership, coordinating programs at the multi-country and national levels, and supporting activities at the multi-country level. Project design highly relevant and well formulated with a detailed monitoring framework for the CACILM program. The timeframe allotted for achievement of project outcomes was too short however, and the project had to request multiple extensions.

Project funds were managed in a cost-effective manner by ADB. The final PIR notes that project implementation was marked by “low management and overhead costs” and a high level of co-financing through in-kind contributions. The resources allocated to the project in terms of consultants and support and supervision from ADB staff was adequate.

The TE report does note a minor change in implementation arrangements was done to provide additional consultants, equipment, agreements with national level institutions, FAO and International Fund for Agricultural Development to facilitate implementation of SLM-KM and SLM-IS.

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

The Project Document indicates both Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and ADB as executing agencies. FAO carried out the capacity building of SLMIS through a Partnership Agreement. FAO delivered the outputs and trained specialists except in Tajikistan (declined participation). ADB was responsible for leading the CACILM partnership, coordinating programs at the multi-country and national levels, and supporting activities at the multi-country level.

According to the TE report, the SLM research package was carried out by International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas (ICARDA) through a partnership agreement. ICARDA performed efficiently for the most part. But, two countries reported that their main SLM concerns were not addressed by ICARDA.

Neither the TE report nor the PIR note any major shortcomings in execution.

8. Lessons and recommendations

8.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

- (1) There is a lack of exchange of information at most levels between all CACILM Partners as there is no clear information sharing policy.
- (2) The co-funding agencies (GTZ and UNDP) were not performing as well as would have been expected as a result of a lack of an accountability mechanism.
- (3) It is counterproductive to develop an extensive database through SLM-IS and not make it easily available to all users via the internet.
- (4) There is no identified mechanism for the transfer of knowledge/research results to farmers in the rural areas in each CAC.

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

(1) CACILM should (i) have a clear policy for sharing all information at all levels between CACILM Partners and all stakeholders, and (ii) have in place clear mechanisms and rules on accountability for deliverables from contractors, whether they are international agencies or small contractors. When co-funding agencies are also contractors, normal accountability rules should apply.

(2) The databases and material developed in SLM-IS should be made easily accessible to all users, particularly in the CACs with proper gate keeping as necessary.

(3) Identify pathways/mechanisms in each CAC for the transfer of SLM-KM from National/NSEC level to their respective farmers in each of the CACs.

(4) Applied SLM-R should have a longer time frame of at least five years.

9. 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 report presents an overview of project outputs and outcomes. The report would have benefited from more detail with respect to achievement of objectives. | S |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated? | No inconsistencies were noted in the TE report. However, the TE report states that it only covers the period from Nov. 2006 – Dec. 31, 2008, although the project continued through June 2010. Consideration of the entire implementation period would have provided a better picture of the project. | MS |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | The report does not contain a sustainability assessment but does make recommendations for follow-up. | MU |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | The lessons learned are brief but well supported by the evidence presented in the TE report. | S |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | No cost information is presented. The TE report only presents total disbursement compared to allocated funding. | U |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | No evaluation of the projects' M&E design or implementation. | U |
| Overall TE Rating | The TE report would be greatly strengthened by inclusion of a sustainability assessment, evidence on project costs, and an assessment of project M&E. | MU |

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