

## Terminal Evaluation Review Form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3239	
GEF Agency project ID		3188	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF - 3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		CACILM: Capacity Building and on-the-ground Investments for Integrated and Sustainable Land Management - under CACILM Partnership Framework, Phase 1	
Country/Countries		Turkmenistan	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		15- Sustainable Land Management LD 3- Investing in Innovative Approaches in SLM	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Nature Protection of Turkmenistan and UNDP/GEF/GTZ	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Not involved	
Private sector involvement		Private farmers and livestock owners are stakeholders in this project.	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		Jul 2007	
Effectiveness date / project start		Jan 2008	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		Oct 2010	
Actual date of project completion		Nov 10, 2010	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.025	
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.975	0.669962
Co-financing	IA own	0.429	0.625
	Government	0.145	0.145
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.5 (GTZ)	1.013 (GTZ)
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1	0.67
Total Co-financing		1.074	1.783
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.074	2.253
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		Dec 2010	
TE submission date		Dec 2010	
Author of TE		Philip Tortell	
TER completion date		January 9, 2015	
TER prepared by		Dania M Trespalacios	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS	NR	MU
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	Various <sup>1</sup>	NR	U
M&E Design	NR	MS	NR	MU
M&E Implementation	NR	S	NR	MS
Quality of Implementation	NR	S	NR	MS
Quality of Execution	NR	S	NR	NR
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	S

<sup>1</sup>The TE has various sustainability ratings: Institutional Sustainability is rated Moderately Unlikely (MU), Financial Sustainability is rated Unlikely (U), Socio-economic Sustainability is Highly Likely (HL) (TE pg. 61)

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective is to stop and reverse land degradation trends in Turkmenistan. Turkmenistan faces pressing environmental problems of pollution of ground-water and surface water sources, deterioration of soils due to irrational agricultural practices, and desertification caused by overgrazing and unsustainable fuel wood collection. The project will concentrate on improving the technical know-how of land users, on stabilizing soil productivity in the project area, on a stronger participation of land users in decision making and on a better self-organization and cooperation particularly of the local stakeholders. (PD pg. 4)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of this project is to improve the capacity of land users for sustainable management of their land resources. The long term perspective of the project is to overcome the existing inconsistencies between land management policy frameworks and the actual needs of land users by initiating a participatory dialogue between key stakeholders, and by creating an enabling environment for improved land use. (PD pg. 3-4)

The main expected outcomes of this project are the following:

- 1- Land users have stronger capacities for Sustainable Land Management (SLM).
  - 2- Best land use practices have been developed in three project sites.
  - 3- Improved knowledge basis for SLM exists in three project sites.
  - 4- Stronger institutional and policy framework for SLM.
  - 5- Adaptive management and learning introduced for sustainability of project results.
- (PD pg. 4-5)

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

**There were slight changes** to the development objective of the project. The original Objective was to improve the capacity of land users for sustainable management of their land resources. The revised Objective sought improved land use and enhanced sustainability. (TE pg. 7)

## 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 <b>Relevance</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------	-----------------------------

The project outcomes are consistent with the GEF’s Land Degradation focal area objectives. The project focuses on sustainable management of land, forest and rangeland resources in three different ecological systems representative of Turkmenistan. The project will contribute to the conservation of local endemic species *Juniperus turcomanica*, and thus promote soil and biodiversity conservation in forest areas. The proposed project is consistent with the GEF Strategic Priorities 1 Capacity Building and 2 Implementation of Innovative and Indigenous Sustainable Land Management Practices. (PD pg. 4)

The project is consistent with Turkmenistan’s country priorities. The project is in line with Turkmenistan’s national environmental and development policy, including the Code on Land and Code on Water (2004), the National Environmental Action Plan of the President of Turkmenistan (NEAP, 2002), the National Action Plan to Combat Desertification in Turkmenistan (NAP/CD, 1996), the Sub-Regional Action Program to Combat Desertification in Central Asia (2003), and the Central Asian Countries Initiatives on Land Management (CACILM, 2004) (TE pg. 3-4)

4.2 <b>Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
--------------------------	--

The TE rates the “Status of delivery and effectiveness” as moderately satisfactory. (TE pg. 9) The TER downgrades this rating to moderately unsatisfactory, due to a very poor project performance: about half of the project’s expected outputs were either partially achieved or not achieved at all, and of the five project outcomes, only one was partially achieved.

The Project Document outlines 5 project outcomes, with specific outputs and indicators. The reports on the achievement of these outputs, although it does not report the achievement of the specific indicators. For example, the indicator for Output 1.1 was “Number of land users groups trained and actively participating in decision making”, and the target was “1500 land users trained in first two years of the project”. (PD pg. 19) The TE summarizes the project’s achievements, but does not provide detail or supporting evidence, and does not address specific targets. The TE provides individual ratings for each of the project’s five outcomes. (See Table 1) **Table 1:** Project outcomes, outputs, and results. (PD pg. 19-27, TE pg. 44-56)

Outcome	Output	Results
<b>Outcome 1:</b> Land users have stronger capacities for Sustainable Land Management  TE's rating for this outcome: <b>MS</b>	Output 1.1: Technical know-how of local land users is improved and allows sustainable land management	<b>Achieved.</b> Technical know-how of local land users has improved, especially in Sakar Chaga and Bokhodur.
	Original Output 1.2: Participatory land use planning adapted and function Revised Output 1.2: Local stakeholders enabled to elaborate Community Development Plans	<b>Partially achieved.</b> Community Development Plans have been elaborated by expert consultants with local participation. Local stakeholders have been introduced to Community Development Plans, but "they have not been enabled yet".
	Output 1.3: System for dissemination of knowledge and know-how is in place to replicate experience Revised Output 1.3: Information and know-how on SLM disseminated to stakeholders for replication	<b>Not achieved.</b> There is no evidence that this has been achieved.
<b>Outcome 2:</b> Best land use practices have been developed in three project sites  TE's rating for this outcome: <b>S</b>	Output 2.1: An on-the-ground investment scheme elaborated for each of the three project sites with land users and local administration	Not reported on by TE.
	Output 2.2: On-the-ground investment covering important aspects of land use implemented	Not reported on by TE.
	Output 2.3: Documentation of results of on-the-ground investment is available to insure replicability Revised output 2.3:	Not reported on by TE.
	Revised outputs for Nohkur site: 2.1 Better pasture mgmt. introduced 2.2 Water retention assured 2.3 Vegetable gardening extended 2.4 Afforestation extended	<b>Mostly achieved.</b>
	Revised outputs for Karakum site: 2.5 Better pasture mgmt. introduced 2.6 Dune fixation around settlements 2.7 Alternative energies for heating purposes	<b>Achieved.</b>
Revised outputs for Sagar Chaga site: 2.8/2.9 Better drainage and irrigation techniques introduced 2.10 Viniculture rehabilitation and development 2.11 Dissemination of diversified gardening techniques	<b>Partly achieved.</b>	
<b>Outcome3:</b> Improved knowledge basis for SLM exists in three project sites  TE's rating for this outcome: <b>MU</b>	Output 3.1: A need-oriented program for trials and targeted research elaborated in partnership with land users	<b>Achieved.</b>
	Output 3.2: Trials and targeted research furnish timely results which improve know-how basis of land users	<b>Achieved.</b>
	Output 3.3: Documentation on results of trials	<b>Not achieved.</b>
	Output 3.4: Thorough and participatory analysis of the various ecosystem services and functions in the 3 pilot sites	Not reported on by TE.
Outcome 4:	Output 4.1: NAP revision has improved	<b>Not achieved.</b>

Stronger institutional and policy framework for SLM  TE's rating for this outcome: <b>U</b>	mainstreaming of SLM into national programs	
	Output 4.2: Local Action Programs are elaborated and accepted as basis for improved land management at local level	<b>Not achieved.</b>
	Additional Output 4.3: Recommendations forwarded to the NSEC of CACILM for the amendment of the legal framework governing SLM	<b>Not achieved.</b>
Outcome 5: Adaptive management and learning introduced for sustainability of project results  TE's rating for this outcome: <b>Not Rated</b>	Output 5.1: Outputs and activities adapted continuously according to achievements and failures of the project.	Not reported on by TE. "This is not an Output but an activity which is carried out by the PMU."
	Output 5.2: The project's performance is monitored and evaluated.	<b>Achieved.</b>
	Output 5.3: Project results and lessons learnt disseminated for replication.	<b>Not achieved.</b>
	Output 5.4: Project units established in 3 project sites	<b>Achieved.</b>
	Output 5.5: Internal rules and regulations elaborated for the coordination between all actors of the project	<b>Achieved.</b>

From a brief look at Table 2 in this document, it is clear that the project results are less than satisfactory. About half of the expected outputs were partially achieved, or not achieved at all. Of the five project outcomes, only one was somewhat satisfactorily achieved.

Project effectiveness may also be judged on the achievement of the project's objective, based on the achievement of the objective's indicators. The Project Document specifies 3 indicators for the achievement of the project objective. These indicators were subsequently revised. The TE reports on the achievement of both the original and revised project objectives. (See Table 2)

**Table 2:** Original and Revised Indicators for Project Objective: Improved land use through application of sustainable land management practices by land users (PD pg. 19, TE pg. 42-43)

Indicator	Results
Original Indicator 1- 500 land users apply sustainable land mgmt. by yr.2, 750 by project end. At least 3 villages in project sites apply Participatory Land Use Planning (baseline: 0)	Insufficient evidence to report or rate.
Original Indicator 2- 300,000 ha of land, throughout 3 project sites, under sustainable land use practices by project end (baseline:0)	Insufficient evidence to report or rate.
Original Indicator 3- Revised National Action Plan approved by Government by yr. 2	<b>Achieved.</b> The NAP was revised and submitted to the government authorities.
Revised Indicator 1- Area at risk to erosion decreased in the project region (2.528km <sup>2</sup> )	Insufficient evidence to report or rate.
Revised Indicator 2- Vegetation cover in Karakum increased	<b>Achieved.</b> The project activities of stabilizing sand dunes, re-forestation of degraded land, avoiding saxaul for firewood, and decreasing overgrazing all contribute to an increase of vegetation cover which in turn is evidence of improved land use.
Revised Indicator 3- Production of cotton and wheat on the concrete project area of Sakarchaga (700 ha) has increased	<b>Achieved.</b> On the concrete plots where the project intervened by means on land levelling, improvement of water drainage and irrigation pattern, the yields increased.

From Table 2, it is clear that there has been some progress made towards the revised objective improved land use and enhanced sustainability. But this progress falls short of the expected results. The project had noticeable shortcomings. Project outcomes are not commensurate with expected outcomes, and some significantly fall short of project targets. The unsatisfactory results of outcome 4 in particular prevent the TER reviewer from assigning an effectiveness rating higher than moderately unsatisfactory.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
----------------	--

The TE rates project ‘delivery and effectiveness’ as moderately satisfactory. The TER reviewer finds there were noticeable shortcomings in efficiency as reported by the TE, and rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory.

The project was completed on time. The TE suggests that the budget given to Outcome 5 (Adaptive management and learning introduced for sustainability of project results) was disproportionately large in comparison to the other outcomes. (TE pg. 7) The TE reports that there were some delays in procurement and disbursement, which affected the project at times, and which necessitated special assistance from GTZ to ensure project continuity. (TE pg. 22) Financial commitments from UNDP were delayed, especially during the beginning of the project, due to difficulties on the part of the UNDP office in Ashgabat. Due to these financing delays, project implementation lagged behind the scheduled dates of activities. (TE pg. 55)

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Unlikely</b>
--------------------	-------------------------

The TE has various sustainability ratings: Institutional Sustainability is rated Moderately Unlikely (MU), Financial Sustainability is rated Unlikely (U), Socio-economic Sustainability is Highly Likely (HL) (TE pg. 61) The TE notes that risks to sustainability remain high. (TE pg. 8) The TER rates sustainability as unlikely.

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes is further detailed along the following dimensions:

**Financial Risks – Sustainability Unlikely**

The TE reports that “the unavailability of easy credit and the distorted market values for product make financial sustainability unlikely”. (TE pg. 8) The TE does not provide any other information on the issue of financial risks.

**Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Likely**

The TE reports that socio-economic sustainability is Highly Likely (HL) at the immediate local level but not very strong outside project sites. (TE pg. 8) The TE does not provide any other explanatory evidence for this rating. The TE’s rating for socio-political sustainability is adopted by the TER.

**Environmental Risks- Sustainability Not Rated**

There is insufficient evidence in the TE to rate environmental risks.

### **Institutional Risks – Sustainability Moderately Unlikely**

The legislation base and the policy for sustainable land management are not strong and as a result, Institutional Sustainability of project benefits is moderately unlikely. (TE pg. 8)

The project reports that outreach has been somewhat limited to its immediate stakeholders, and little effort was made towards managing information and knowledge so it may contribute towards the replication of results. Information management is seen as moderately unsatisfactory. (TE pg. 7)

## **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 TE reports that co-funding delivery has exceeded expectations, due entirely to the GTZ in-kind contribution, and somewhat offset by the lack of delivery of the UNDP cash co-funding. The amount of co-financing in this project was significant. However, it seems the materialization of co-financing did not positively affect the project's outcomes or sustainability, as both were less than satisfactory.

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?

There was no delay in the project end date. The TE reports that there were some delays in procurement and disbursement, which affected the project's implementation. (TE pg. 22) Financial commitments from UNDP were delayed, especially during the beginning of the project and as a result, project implementation lagged behind the scheduled dates of activities. The TE reports that, especially in the beginning of the project, financial commitments from UNDP/GEF were delayed considerably due to difficulties of the UNDP-office in Ashgabat. Mainly because of this, the project lagged behind with the implementation of all scheduled activities and achievement of sustainable results. (TE pg. 57)

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 high level of ownership of the project by the government side was illustrated by the personal involvement of the then Minister for Nature Protection in the Project Steering Committee. But the project is also owned and wanted by the local communities – as one Local Steering Committee unhesitatingly asserted, “this project belongs to us, to the people”. (TE pg. 17) The TE reports that the establishment of Local Project Management Teams selected from among local community members, the Local Steering Committees who have a meaningful say in project activities, the participatory approach employed by the project, and the use of local experts as consultants to the extent possible, have ensured the high level of ownership at the community level. (TE pg. 6) As a result of the on-going GTZ/MNP project on SLM which served as a precursor to this project, stakeholders consulted by the TE writer felt that they had been involved at the project formulation stages.

## 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: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

The TE assigns a rating of moderately satisfactory for the project's M&E Design. However, this TER assesses a rating of Moderately Unsatisfactory to M&E Design at entry, finding that there were significant shortcomings in design, including inappropriate indicators and targets, and unclear project objectives.

The TE reports that the M&E Plan identifies roles and responsibilities and a schedule for M&E activities. (TE pg. 39) It also states that the M&E design, plan and LogFrame have some shortcomings. The TE states that the "comprehensive section on Monitoring and Evaluation is full and detailed and the summary table of monitoring activities which also includes budgetary allocations can be considered as an M&E Plan, although it does not satisfy all the GEF requirements for such a plan". (TE pg. 16)

However, the project's M&E design had noticeable shortcomings, which became apparent at the beginning of the project, as original project objectives, outcomes and outputs were revised.

The Project Document gives various different versions of the project objective:

- to improve the capacity of land users for sustainable management of their land resources (PD pg. 4)
- improved land use through application of sustainable land management practices by land users (PD pg. 19)

The inconsistencies between these different versions are not insignificant: one objective aims to improve capacity, another aims to improve land use. Some of the project's outcomes were also changed during implementation. Another problematic aspect is the manner in which these changes were done. According to the TE, UNDP claims that it was unaware of the change in objectives, whereas GTZ claims that the changes in objectives was discussed in a workshop, and that despite the lack of formal approval, the changes were adopted. The TE reports that, as a result, the Project Management Unit operated with two versions of objectives and indicators: "one lot for its day-to-day monitoring of project performance, the other for its contribution to the annual PIR". (TE pg. 41) This situation reflects poor M&E design, revealing an original logical framework that was either insufficient or inappropriate, and a lack of a monitoring system that ensured effective communication between all parties.

The TE reports that of the 32 indicators that are used by the project, 7 are not considered indicators at all, 14 only partly meet the SMART criteria, and 4 do not meet the SMART criteria. (TE pg. 39)



The timescale of 3 years was unrealistically short for the achievement of project objectives, and thus some of the targets provided in the M&E plan are not realistic. A time scale of 5 years would have been more appropriate, considering the plantings carried out (gardens, fruit orchards, Juniper forest, etc.), involving communities, negotiating for land allocation, cultivating saplings, etc. (TE pg. 16)

In retrospect, it is clear that the M&E plan at entry was not practicable or sufficient, and had noticeable shortcomings, thus it is rated moderately unsatisfactory.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E implementation as satisfactory. It reports that the monitoring processes applied by the project and the use of the results of monitoring to inform management and take corrective action, have been satisfactory overall. (TE pg. 40)

However, the TE provides much evidence to the contrary. It reports that the two PIRs focus almost exclusively on Outcome 2: “it would seem that the project has not engaged in any assessment of its slow delivery on the other Outcomes”. (TE pg. 39) It may also be explained by the fact that Outcome 2 was successfully implemented, whereas the other outcomes had very unpleasing results. The PIRs adhere to the original objective and indicators, despite the early change of these, thus the TE calls into question the validity of the PIRs. (TE pg. 40)

The TE explains that the formal contract and Terms of Reference for the Terminal Evaluation were actually originally billed as the Mid-Term Evaluation of the Project. However, the project was well beyond the mid-point of its planned implementation time and was due to close operationally by the time the evaluation was to be completed, thus the Mid-Term Evaluation became the Terminal Evaluation. (TE pg. 10) This reflects quite a poor management of M&E activities.

Although two PIRs and a Terminal Evaluation were completed, it is unclear whether M&E informed the project’s implementation or made positive contributions to the achievement of outcomes. Due to these shortcomings, M&E implementation is rated 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
--	--

The TE rates project governance and project administration and management as satisfactory. It reports that management was democratic and in general effective. (TE pg. 7). This TER however assesses a rating of Moderately Satisfactory to Quality of Implementation, noting the weaknesses in the design of the project’s M&E system noted above, as well as difficulties that affected project’s procurement and disbursement operations.

The TE reports that members of the Project Management Unit acknowledged the support, guidance, and training received from UNDP. The UNDP was inclusive of the PMU’s GTZ-supported staff. However, the TE also provides conflicting information reported by GTZ: the PMU did not receive the full support and guidance initially expected from the UNDP Environment Unit to successfully implement the project, including communication and administrative support. (TE pg. 21)

The TE reports that management and control over financial operations were carried out successfully by UNDP, but that there were delays in procurement and disbursement which affected the project. (TE pg. 21) The TE also notes a lack of delivery of the UNDP cash co-funding. (TE pg. 33)

Due to noticeable shortcomings in project implementation, it is rated moderately satisfactory.

<b>7.2 Quality of Project Execution</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
---	---------------------------------

The TE assesses the Quality of Project Execution as Satisfactory. However, this TER finds there is insufficient information in the TE to support the TE’s rating, and therefore a rating of Unable to Assess is assigned here.

The project was executed by the Ministry of Nature Protection of Turkmenistan (MNP). Project activities were coordinated by a Project Management Unit (PMU) based in Ashgabat and implemented at three project pilot sites: Nokhur, Karakum and Sakar Chaga. (TE pg. 10)

The TE reports the project recruited its local teams from within the local community, including respected individuals conversant with the real needs of the local community to which they belong, with a good understanding of, and rapport with, the “main actors” in the community. (TE pg. 23)

The TE’s satisfactory rating on the quality of project execution stands in stark contrast to the less than satisfactory outcomes of the project.. Part of this poor performance may be blamed on the less than satisfactory quality of the implementation of the UNDP. The TE does not provide any concrete evidence of poor project execution. There is insufficient evidence to rate the quality of project execution.

## **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 reports that by the end of the project, in some areas land use will be more sustainable. (TE pg. 58) This project addresses the negative effects of land degradation, desertification and deforestation. Reforestation with Junipers in the Nokhur site has proceeded well. (TE pg. 64) In Karakum, the conversion of the school heating system in Bokhurdok from fuel wood to diesel has saved around 2ha per year of saxaul wood. (TE pg. 64)

However, the TE notes that activities were at a pilot scale, and thus significant impacts can only accrue as a result of replication by others. Land use practices in Nokhur and Sagar Chaga have improved, but sustainability and replication are not certain. (TE pg. 60) The TE concludes that the project cannot claim to have achieved any global environmental impacts, but that it has set the foundations for such impacts to be achieved. (TE pg. 58)

**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 reports that the project has had significant positive impact on some communities, farmers associations (Daikhan) and local authorities at the three project sites. It has raised awareness of sustainable land management issues, introduced new methodologies for combating land degradation and tested various approaches for reducing the stress on land without a reduction in the quality of life and standard of living of the communities affected. (TE pg. 59)

**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 reports the following changes in capacity:

- At each of the three project sites, there is good local awareness of sustainable land management, concepts are understood and some capacity is evident. There is also a fair degree of confidence tempered with the knowledge that outside help may be needed for some time yet. (TE pg. 64)

- In Karakum, the project, dug new wells and repaired existing ones, sand stabilization has proceeded well and some house owners emulated the project and stabilized dunes behind their houses. (TE pg. 64)
- In Sakar Chaga, the desalination measures employed by the project had the desired effect and productivity increased. (TE pg. 65)

b) Governance - The TE did not report changes in governance.

**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.

There were no unintended impacts in 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-relate and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

- **Replication- Adopted.** Some house owners emulated the project and stabilized dunes behind their houses. (TE pg. 64)

## 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 lists the following lessons learned (TE pg.65-66):

- The timescale of three years was unrealistic. The time allowed for GEF projects is often too short.
- Guidance is required on setting and using Indicators so as to ensure their usefulness. Often, project implementers set about trying to achieve the Indicators rather than the Objective and Outcomes.
- The timing of MTEs and TEs needs to be reconsidered. It would probably be most effective if it is carried out soon after a PIR is available.
- Co-funding needs to be taken more seriously and the GEF rules and procedures surrounding co-funding must be rationalized. In-kind contributions by government must be based on reality and must then be accounted for.
- Collaboration between UNDP and a bilateral partner (such as GTZ) has many advantages, but it is also risky. Project resources such as budget and personnel are best managed by one and the same project manager.
- The importance of a robust Exit Strategy and Sustainability Plan cannot be over-stated and there is a need for guidance on what is exactly required. In particular, a project must identify a champion and nurture it/him/her so the project legacy can be passed on.

The TE lists the following recommendations (TE pg. 9):

- The Ministry of Nature Protection should take steps to initiate a review of the approach/philosophy, policy, legislation and institutional framework for land management in Turkmenistan with the aim of removing barriers that are standing in the way of SLM.
- The PMU should accept that some of the project activities cannot be carried out in the remaining time, and that instead of persisting with starting new activities, the time should be devoted to securing benefits and products that have already been achieved. More specifically:
  - In Nokhur – continue the pursuit of stock number reductions and the leasing of garden plots in Garawul; but desist from planting more Junipers and ensure those already planted receive the care they require to survive
  - In Karakum – work to resolve the issue of wells/stock numbers/land degradation; persuade the school to invest some of the funds saved through the new heating system into planting of saxaul
  - In Sakar Chaga – proceed with the printing of the planned handbooks on aspects of SLM and make sure that they will be available for those you expect to replicate the project results
  - Under Outcome 3 – proceed with the publication of research results, not as scientific publications, but as sources of information and guidance to land use managers
  - Under Outcome 4 – there has been little progress towards this Outcome and it is a bigger task than the project can attempt – abandon the remaining activities under this Outcome
- The PMU should review all the reports and similar informative material that has arisen from the project, translate as appropriate so it can reach identifiable beneficiaries, record all in a searchable and accessible database to be located in, and managed by, the NIDFF. Hardcopies of relevant documents should be placed, for reference (i.e. accessible) in school libraries, local administration offices, Daikhan offices and similar key locations.
- The PMU should organize an Exit Strategy Workshop as proposed in this report and with the participation of all project personnel as well as those identified as being in a position to continue with the work of the project. The Workshop should achieve consensus on who is taking over the responsibility both for unfinished work as well as for products and benefits that need to be “adopted” and sustained by someone else.
- As part of the Exit Strategy, the PMU should identify those entities that can be expected to replicate its approaches to other parts of the country; alert them to the benefits of the approaches through sponsored visits to the project demonstration sites and prepare them so they can emulate the project successfully.
- In any future MNP/UNDP/GTZ partnership arrangement for a project, the management responsibility for resources (personnel, financial, etc.) should be vested in one project manager.
- Subject to funding support being available and the agreement of the Government, the project duration should be extended to around September 2011 so as to provide the time necessary to consolidate project products, develop and implement an effective Exit Strategy, and enhance the chances of sustainability for the project benefits and services.

## 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 reports on relevant outcomes and impacts. However, more detail is needed. The Project Document contains very specific targets for each indicator, but the TE does not report on the achievement of these targets, and summarizes the achievements of each indicator. For example, the indicator for Output 1.1 was “Number of land users groups trained and actively participating in decision making”, and the target was “1500 land users trained in first two years of the project”. (PD pg. 19) The TE summarizes the project’s achievements, but does not provide detail or supporting evidence, and does not address specific targets. The TE also does not indicate with project outcomes are original and which are revised- this must be deduced by comparing the TE with the PD.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent. However, the TER reviewer often disagrees with the TE’s ratings, and the TE does not present complete and convincing information, particularly when reporting on the achievement of indicator targets.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE explicitly rates the project’s financial, social-political and institutional sustainability, and also reports on the project’s lack of an exit strategy. In this area, the TE provides more detail than most TEs.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are adequate and supported by the evidence.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE includes the project costs per activity, and the actual co-financing amounts. Financial reporting is detailed and well reported on.	HS
Assess the quality of the report’s evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE examined both the design and implementation of the M&E systems. It provided sufficient information for the TER reviewer to form different conclusions to that of the TE.	S
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

$$0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(8) + 0.1(23) = 2.4 + 2.3 = 4.7$$

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER, other than PIRs, TE, and PD.