

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2020

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3302	
GEF Agency project ID		-	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		AfDB	
Project name		Climate Adaptation for Rural Livelihoods and Agriculture (CARLA) Project	
Country/Countries		Malawi	
Region		South Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LDCF- Least Developed Countries Fund	
Executing agencies involved		Environmental Affairs Department in the Ministry of Natural Resources, Energy and Environment	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Village Development Committees: Beneficiary	
Private sector involvement		SAWA Group; Kasinthula Research Stations and Land Resource Centre: Suppliers of materials	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		10/13/2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		10/12/2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		11/1/2015	
Actual date of project completion		06/30/2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.27	0.27
	Co-financing	0.2	0.2
GEF Project Grant		3	2.94
Co-financing	IA own	3.7	UA
	Government	1.39	UA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.2	UA
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3.27	3.21
Total Co-financing		6.49	UA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		9.76	UA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December, 2016	
Author of TE		Mr. Vinda Kisyombe	
TER completion date		January, 2020	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts Sohn	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Global Environmental Objective of the project was ‘to support actions that reduce and reverse degradation of environment and the natural resource base; introduce better adapted agricultural practices and reduce poverty through strengthened rural livelihoods’ in Malawi (PD, Pg, 62).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Development Objective of the project was ‘to improve resilience to the climate variability and future climate change by developing and implementing adaptation strategies and measures that will improve agricultural production and rural livelihoods’ (PD, Pg 23). Interventions were designed to support the following two components:

Component 1: Implementing practical community-level climate change adaptation actions that improve resilience and adaptive capacity as it relates to agriculture and livelihoods in vulnerable districts in Malawi, and

Component 2: Strengthening the capacity of National/District agencies to support community-based climate change adaptation actions.

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

The TE doesn’t report any changes in the Global Environmental or Development Objectives of the project.

4. GEF IEO 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 assesses the relevance of the project as ‘highly satisfactory’, which this TER has revised to be ‘satisfactory’.

The project was designed in response to Malawi’s high vulnerability to climate change and its impact on the agriculture and rural livelihoods. The project was well anchored on the Government’s policies such as New Agriculture Policy; National Irrigation Policy 2015; National Climate Change Management Policy and the decentralization policy. This was achieved through implementation of Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) and project formulation and implementation through district councils. The Project was also fully consistent with the 2006-2011 National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA) for Malawi, which aims at integrating environmental concerns into the country’s overall social and economic development strategy.

The project was designed to be consistent with GEF’s general policies and guidance, including those related to climate change. The project was also consistent with the goal, impact and objectives of GEF’s draft Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) programming strategy that prioritized supporting community -based adaptations and the shift to programmatic approaches. It also contributed to five of the nine outcomes of the draft 2010-2013 programming strategy for the LDCF.

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

The TE assessed the effectiveness of the project as ‘satisfactory’. Based on the evidence in the TE, this TER assessed the effectiveness of the project as ‘moderately satisfactory’. The project was successful in completing most of the activities towards supporting and strengthening community structures in adopting Climate Change Adaptation (CBA) activities in model communities; carrying out the community action planning and implementation of adaptation action; replicating CBA approach in other communities as well as district and national level capacity building. But the target related to improved irrigation was only partially met (30%) due to several factors including lack of coordination between extension and irrigation officers. Lack of agreement on land ownership for irrigation schemes developed under the project is likely to raise conflicts amongst the community members, limiting the use of infrastructure developed under the project. The project also suffered delays due to staffing issues which led to loss of agriculture seasons and subsequent delays in completion of some of the project activities. The project failed to develop a monitoring and evaluation system due to which the impact and outcome of the project, in terms of improvement in agriculture production and rural livelihoods, was not adequately captured in any of the available reports.

Component 1: Implementing practical community-level climate change adaptation actions that improve resilience and adaptive capacity as it relates to agriculture and livelihoods in vulnerable districts in Malawi

The TE assesses the achievement of activities under this component as ‘satisfactory’, which this TER has revised to ‘moderately satisfactory’. All the target sites (3) were successfully covered with interventions such as development for irrigation, construction of fish ponds; livestock development and bringing land under drought tolerant and high yielding crop varieties as well as plantation of fruit and other trees through distribution of seedlings. Community plans were also prepared in all 3 target sites. However, both the TE and Project Implementation Report (PIR), 2016, note that utilization of irrigation facilities was low, estimated at 30% on an average (TE, Pg 9). Some of the reasons for low utilization of irrigation infrastructure developed under the project included lack of coordination between the extension and irrigation officer; engagement of different contractors for borehole drilling and solar pump installations led to information gap that might have affected the water availability for irrigation; treadle pump technology which was labor intensive, costly and not eco-friendly (TE, Pg16).

The project reached 100% achievement in livestock development and exceeded the target (115%) in bringing target areas under drought tolerant crops. But the fruit tree propagation was achieved to only 47% due to its long gestation period and limited extension support because of lack of expertise in the area. Similarly, the target related to distribution of trees was not fully met (92%) due to lack of its immediate benefits and incentives perceived by the communities who preferred individual woodlots as compared to the trees planted on community lands.

Component 2: Strengthening the capacity of National/District agencies to support community-based climate change adaptation actions.

This TE concurs with the rating provided by the TE to the achievement of targets under this component as ‘satisfactory’. This component was aimed at supporting the capacity building activities to strengthen the ability of national and district governments to encourage and support community-based climate change adaptation. According to the TE, all the trainings of the national and district level officials including field extension workers, community leaders and members were conducted successfully as per the target and after a need’s assessment study in the second year of the project. As per the requirement, the project also produced one project handbook of best practices, with several copies available for dissemination.

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

The TE has used a four-point scale and assigned efficiency of the project as ‘satisfactory’. However, based on the evidence in the TE, this TER assigned the rating as ‘moderately satisfactory’. The project was delayed by more than one year mainly due to delay in timely recruiting of the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) staff. However, the TE notes that the project recovered from delays once the staff were recruited from the external market. The delays in recruitment of staff led to field teams not getting timely support resulting into loss of agricultural seasons for some of the interventions. The project also faced challenges in having a monitoring and evaluation system in place because of lack of consistency on the staffing. Both the TE and MTR (2016) also point out to the delays in submission of audit reports, with several issues brought out during audit remaining unresolved at the time of TE. For instance, explanation and refund expected from the Government during audit on ineligible expenses was still pending at the time of the TE (TE, Pg 18).

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

The TE has used a four-point scale and assigned rating to the sustainability as 'satisfactory'. Based on the evidence in the available documents, this TER assesses the likelihood of the sustainability of the project as 'moderately likely'. The project helped in creating community based systems such as revolving funds, seed banks, grain banks and establishment of nurseries; strengthened the capacity of staff at the national and district level as well as the traditional and village leaders; established ownership of the community members and district councils in project implementation; training of the project staff and the community leaders as well as beneficiaries/members in Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) technologies. But there is no substantive evidence in the TE to prove that project approach was mainstreamed in the district planning process, crucial for sustaining project outcomes in future. The PIR (2016) specifically takes note of the lack of exit strategy towards the end of the project, which should have been prepared to guide the project after its completion.

a. Financial sustainability: Moderately Likely

The TE assigned rating to financial sustainability as 'satisfactory' and this TER assessed the likelihood of sustainability as 'moderately likely'. The TE notes that communities had established systems such as revolving funds where individuals contributed through membership fees and water user fees charged to farmers for using irrigation facilities. These community funds are likely to help in the operation and maintenance of the infrastructure created through the project. The target communities also established other sustainability measure such as seed revolving schemes, grain banks, establishment of nurseries for vegetation plantation materials such as cassava and sweet potatoes that would ensure the continued access to high quality seeds and livestock by the project beneficiaries. The TE further notes that the Government had also incorporated some of the project activities in its national budget for continued support. But continuation of some of the project activities and its replication in other areas would need support from other donor projects and integration in government planning at the district level, the details of which are missing at this stage, due to which the likelihood of financial sustainability is rated as 'moderately likely'.

b. Socio-political risks: Moderately Likely

The TE has assigned the rating as 'satisfactory'. Based on the narrative in the available reports, this TER assigned rating to the likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes due to socio-political factors as 'moderately likely'.

As per the TE, the project had a good ownership of the community attained through participatory approach to both the project design and implementation. The project was implemented through decentralized structures in 3 district councils that helped in eliciting their full support during implementation and that is also likely to continue in future as well. The project also had adequate support from other key departments such as forestry, fisheries, land resources, etc., thereby enhancing participation and collaboration amongst the various sectors, which further improves the likelihood of sustainability of the project interventions. However, the TE also highlights that the project suffered due to lack of support from the Project Steering Committee and sustainability of the project could suffer if a particular department or ministry does not take a lead in supporting project activities after completion.

c. Institutional framework and governance: Moderately Likely

The TE assigned rating as 'satisfactory'. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assigned rating to the likelihood of sustainability of project outcomes due to risks from institutional framework and governance as 'moderately likely'. The project was implemented within the established structures of the government and 3 District Councils. As per the TE, the project strengthened the institutional framework and capacity, at the national, district and the village level, to sustain the project activities in future. The project enhanced the existing capacity through training of the subject matter specialists from the relevant departments at the National and District level including the field extension staff. As per the TE, the training provided to the community-based structures such as traditional leaders, village heads, Climate Adaptation for Rural Livelihoods and Agriculture (CARLA) committee leaders and Village Development Committees (VDCs) on Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) technologies, is also likely to improve the likelihood of sustainability of the project activities.

However, as the TE notes, lack of clarity related to land tenure for the land brought under irrigation activities could hamper the sustainability of the project activities. The land on which irrigation related activities were implemented, had two-fold ownership and would require an agreement between two parties sharing the land for sustaining irrigation activities in the future. Moreover, the PIR (2010) notes that the project lacked a detailed exit/continuity strategy to guide implementation of the activities after its completion. However, it's not clear from the TE, whether an exit strategy was prepared as per the recommendation (PIR, Pg 5), due to which likelihood of sustainability of the project outcomes is rated as 'moderately likely'.

d. Environmental risks: Likely

As per the TE, the activities supported under the project don't face any risks due to environmental factors and assessed the likelihood of sustainability as 'highly satisfactory', which this TER has revised to 'likely'. The project activities such as tree plantations on both communal and individual plots; afforestation along the river and other watershed catchments; and other conservation activities, enhanced the soil and water conservation and were in line with climate change adaptation and mitigation strategies, reducing the environmental risks to the outcomes of the project.

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 did not provide information on realization of co-financing. For instance, as per the Project Document, the government had committed about 20% of their technical budget as well as 240 person-months of technical time each to the project, for the implementation Component 1 of the project. Similarly, the project was planned to collaborate closely with other projects such as Smallholder Crop Production and Marketing (SCPMP), National Program for Managing Climate Change in Malawi known as CCP and Malawi African Adaptation Program Comprehensive Approaches to Climate Change Adaptation in Malawi known as AAP, whose activities directly related to the project and were considered as parallel financing. However, the TE did not report on realization of co-financing from either Government of Malawi or from the other projects.

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 was delayed by more than one year mainly due to delay in timely recruiting of the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) staff. The TE further notes that delay in recruitment of technical assistance staff as planned during appraisal led to loss of some agricultural seasons since the staff appointed by Government were committed to other activities within the department (TE, Pg 17). However, once the PIU staff was recruited from outside the Government, it helped the project to recover and enhance its rate of implementation resulting in achievement of most of the outputs by the closing date.

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 seemed to have a moderate level of support from the government during the initial stage, when it faced delays due to late recruitment of the project staff and lack of guidance from the Project Steering Committee (PSC), which led to loss of agriculture season and delay in implementation of some of the activities. The project also suffered due to lack of coordination from the key departments responsible for project implementation. However, the project had a good support from the district councils and once all the PIU staff was recruited with clear reporting lines, the project picked up momentum and completed most of its activities, although with extension of one year. The TE notes gaps in the capacity of the government in implementing the project but this was overcome in due course of time with regular training and capacity building initiatives integral to the project design.

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 did not assess nor provide a rating to the M&E design at entry. However, based on the evidence in the available documents, this TER assessed it to be ‘satisfactory’. The project document included a results framework with indicative SMART indicators and targets that provided a basis for monitoring and evaluation. It had a provision for monitoring and reporting at different stages with timelines and responsibilities assigned to different stakeholders along with allocation of separate budget for each activity including preparation of baselines.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Highly Unsatisfactory
-----------------------------------	--------------------------------------

The TE assessed the M&E implementation as ‘unsatisfactory’, which this TER revised to ‘highly unsatisfactory’. As per the TE, the project experienced challenges in developing a monitoring and evaluation system due to lack of consistency in staffing. Despite provision for a short-term M & E

consultant, Government opted to use its own staff who was overwhelmed with other commitments within the department and failed to devote adequate time on M&E function of the project. As a result, 'the project delayed submission of the quarterly progress reports, agricultural productivity data, data on Farmers Field School and other project monitoring aspects' (TE, Pg 18). The project also did not finalize the baseline data in time and evidence in the available documents suggest that the farmers expected to carry out the community based participatory monitoring and evaluation, were not adequately trained to effectively track progress of the project in the field. The MTR urged the project to revise the indicative indicators and targets set up during the design phase but there is no evidence in the reports if this was accomplished.

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

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the quality of project implementation as 'satisfactory'.

According to the TE, delay from the Bank in the approval of the project after GEF's approval led to delay in the commencement of the project. But the Bank's presence through its Malawi field office supported the smooth functioning of the project. The Bank held supervision missions in a timely manner that also prompted timely remedial measures supporting the project. The presence of an alternate Task Manager in the field office further enhanced follow ups on issues. The fiduciary clinics run by the Bank also played a crucial role in clarifying financial and procurement issues to the project staff.

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

The TE assessed the quality of project execution as 'satisfactory' but based on the evidence in the available documents, this TER revised the rating to be 'moderately satisfactory'. The project was implemented by the Department of Irrigation and Water Development (DoI) and Environmental Affairs Department (EAD) and the 3 District Councils. As highlighted in the Mid Term Report (MTR), the project suffered from coordination challenges between the Environmental Affairs Department and Department of Irrigation and Water Development (DoIW) despite the signing of Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) which clearly defined the roles of each institution. As a result, field teams did not get adequate support resulting into delays and loss of agricultural season for some of the interventions. The situation was further aggravated by the limited guidance the project received from the Project Steering Committee that did not hold regular meetings. However, recommendations from the MTR on training of the staff and clarity of reporting lines (MTR, Pg 6) between various project functionaries improved the management of the project in its second phase.

It is evident from the narrative in the reports that the government had capacity gaps in certain areas that impeded progress of the project. The TE highlights that the government had capacity challenges in the fiduciary section resulting into failure to timely produce audit reports and justify some of the expenses. Delays in the recruitment of technical assistant and short-term consultants (Gender, Agriculture Livelihoods and M&E officer) also impacted the progress of the project. But the TE recognizes that once the PIU staff was recruited from the external market, with recruitment of a project accountant with adequate experience, project management improved which helped progress of the project immensely during its last phase.

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 did not indicate any changes in environmental stress or status brought about by the project.

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 project resulted in increased food security in target areas. According to the TE, as a result of the introduction of drought tolerant crops (cassava, sorghum and millet), irrigation infrastructure, fish farming and livestock distribution, the number of months with food sufficiency increased from 3 to 9 months (TE, Pg 6).

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

1. As per the TE, 25 staff from the project headquarters at the national level were trained on climate change adaptation and model villages while 34 staff were trained on M&E. At district level, 131 staff

were trained on climate change adaptation activities and model villages while 64 staff participated in field exchange visits.

2. The project also supported training of beneficiaries on all the Climate Change Adaptation (CCA) activities.

3. Open days were conducted to enhance knowledge sharing and transfer of experience to other communities and the project handbook was also produced for dissemination of successful interventions.

b) Governance

The TE notes that communities established systems such as revolving funds where individuals contribute through membership fees. It also developed systems for water user fees for the farmers using irrigation facilities that would help in the operation and maintenance of the infrastructure created through the project.

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.

As per the TE, the introduction of boreholes to provide water for afforestation and fruit tree propagation nursery activities improved access to clean and safe water by households (TE, Pg 15).

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 information in the TE about the adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.

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 main lessons listed in the TE are as follows:

1. Activities with long gestation period are preferred less by the communities than those that provide immediate benefits.
2. Treadle pump technology which are labor intensive and motorized pumps which are costly and environmentally unfriendly are not suitable for smallholder farmers.
3. Beneficiary farmers prefer plantations on individual woodlots to communal woodlots.
4. Timely deployment of technical assistance is crucial for project implementation.

5. Identification of capacity gaps in the executing agency in a timely manner is crucial for attainment of objectives of the project.
6. Thorough analysis of the district capacity to implement particular project should be prioritized during project formulation.
7. A champion for multi sectoral coordination is essential for effective implementation of a climate change project.
8. Capacities of national and district agencies need to be enhanced to ensure sustainability of project activities in the target areas beyond project implementation period.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations listed in the TE are as follows:

1. Provide adequate extension services to irrigation farmers in the target sites.
2. Hand over all project activities to the local leadership in each site.
3. Support the beneficiary communities with nursery material, equipment and training.
4. Facilitate linkages between farmers and private sector companies.
5. Conduct a formal handover of the systems developed through the project to the traditional leaders and Climate Adaptation for Rural Livelihoods and Agriculture (CARLA) committees for continuation of these systems.
6. Undertake the appraisal of service providers and contractors engaged during project implementation and share results with the Bank for future reference.

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 IEO 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?	While the TE reports well on the project activities and outputs, it lacks evidence on the outcome and impact of the project. This is partially because the project lacked a system to track progress and capture impact. For instance, the report does not provide adequate information on impacts such as improvement in agriculture productivity and income/livelihoods of the beneficiaries. Also, since implementation was delayed, it might take some time before impact is visible in the field.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is more or less consistent, with evidence presented complete and convincing.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE provided a favorable rating to the sustainability but it is not supported by sufficient evidence. For instance, the TE does not discuss explicitly if the project developed an exit strategy as per the recommendation in PIR (2016) and the extent the national and district agencies are equipped and committed to sustain the project approach and outcomes.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons are adequately supported by evidence in the main body of the report	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE did not provide details on the co-financing, which was a major part of the overall project budget. It is unclear from the report if the project collaborated with other projects as envisaged during the design and if the corresponding co-financing was fulfilled.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE highlights main issues related to implementation of project's M&E systems.	S
Overall TE Rating		MS

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

No additional documents were used for the preparation of this TER