Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2017

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3362	
GEF Agency project ID		n/a	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		SIP: Catchments and Landscape Management	
Country/Countries		Eritrea	
Region		Sub-Saharan Africa	
Focal area		LD1 – Supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		15- Operational Program on Sustainable Management	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		4/3/2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		4/24/2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		6/30/2017	
Actual date of project completion		July, 2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.15	0.15
	Co-financing	0.16	0.16
GEF Project Grant		4.35	4.32
Co-financing	IA own	12.58	n/a
	Government	2.81	0.84
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	6.27	3.00
Total GEF funding		4.5	4.47
Total Co-financing		21.82	4.0
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		26.32	8.16
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		April, 2017	
Author of TE		William Critchley	
TER completion date		April, 2017	
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	-	S	-	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		MU	-	MU
M&E Design		MU	-	MS
M&E Implementation		MU	-	MU
Quality of Implementation		S	-	S
Quality of Execution		N/A	-	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	-	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the Global Environmental Objectives of the project are to overcome the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the structure and functional integrity of Eritrea's ecosystem resources through addressing the national, Zoba, Sub-Zoba, and community level bottlenecks and barriers to scaling up successful sustainable land management technologies and approaches.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the Project Document (PD), the Development Objectives of the project are "*To address the interlinked problems of poverty, food insecurity, land degradation, and biodiversity loss, through the development and promotion of innovative sustainable land management technologies and land use planning approaches with the aim of restoring, sustaining and enhancing the productive and protective functions of Eritrea's ecosystem resources." (Request for CEO endorsement, p.1)*. The project objectives have the following four components:

Component 1 – Promotion of SLM Approach at National, Regional and Zoba levels

1.1 Establishing a national Eritrean SLM platform； 1.2 Establishing SLM platforms at Zoba level; 1.3 Establishing an Eritrean SLM Investment Framework (ESIF) and 1.4 Developing an Eritrean SLM Knowledge Base and Information System (ESIS)

Component 2 – Development of Effective and Innovative SLM Approaches (in a minimum of 32 Kebabis)

2.1 Community-Based Natural Resource Assessment and Land Use Planning; 2.2 Addressing Food Security, Poverty and Land Degradation through Community- Based Investments in Sustainable Land Management; 2.3 Participatory Impact Monitoring and Evaluation; 2.4 Institutional Capacity Building for Community-Based Land Use Planning; 2.5 Testing and Demonstrating Alternative Renewable Energy; 2.6 Adaptive Farmer - Centered Participatory SLM-related Research

Component 3 – Project Management

3.1 Series of Reports documenting: (i) progress with implementation (ii) local and global environmental impact (iii) quantity/ economic value of ecosystem services (iv) findings/ conclusions/ recommendations from supervision and MTR

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

None.

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**

Land degradation has been a growing threat in Eritrea for many years. The approach adopted by the 'Catchment and Land Management Project' (CLMP) to break the cycle of land degradation and poverty was relevant and consistent with both the National Environment Management Plan for Eritrea and the National Plan of Action to Combat Desertification, which recognize the need to address the problem of land degradation, and to restore, sustain and enhance the productive and protective functions of the country's natural ecosystem resources. The project outcomes were also consistent with the strategic approach and objectives identified through the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and the Initial Communication, in order to fulfill Eritrea's requirement under the UN-CBD and UN-FCCC, respectively.

The project was designed to make contribution to the overall operational goal of the GEF focal area on land degradation (GEF 4 LD focal area), by catalyzing partnerships between concerned institutions, land users, and other stakeholders, at the community (village), local government (Zoba and sub-Zoba), and national levels, with the aim of addressing the interlinked problems of land degradation, poverty and vulnerability within Eritrea. It also constituted a part of the GEF Strategic Investment Program for Sustainable Land Management in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP) and provide technical and financial support for the development of the Eritrean national SLM platform.

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

The TE assigns the effectiveness of the project a rating of 'satisfactory'. But based on the evidence in the TE, this TER assigns it a rating of 'moderately satisfactory'.

The project was successful in setting in place an institutional infrastructure to take SLM forward in Eritrea and demonstrated the effective implementation of SLM through an innovative participatory planning approach at decentralized, local level combined with achievements on the ground – in many cases well surpassing targets. However, the TE assessment was based on the desk-based review of various project reports and emails/phone interviews with various stakeholders. Hence, it is difficult to assess the performance of the institutional platform - Eritrean Sustainable Investment Framework (ESIF) and Eritrean Knowledge Base and Information System (ESIS), established through the project. The project was particularly weak in the area of monitoring and evaluation- specifically it failed to track and monitor project impacts. Because no figures are available so far on critical indicators of the global environmental benefits achieved by the project – especially increased vegetation cover and habitat diversity, soil and water conservation, or carbon sequestration – it is difficult to ascertain if the outputs have the weight and credibility needed to influence policy and decision-makers, or to facilitate the replication and upscaling of CLMP's practices through existing or future project. For instance, the TE notes a lack of synergy between the project and another project supported by IFAD – National Agriculture Project(NAP). According to the TE, '*Annual Work Plan and Budget AWPB of 2015 (of NAP) is almost entirely silent on CLMP (whose acronym does not even warrant a mention in the extensive A&A list)'.*

But, overall, it seems that the project played an important role in furthering an environmental mandate emanating from the previous project - Post–Crisis Rural Recovery and Development Program（PCRRDP) and institutionalizing the ways and means of taking this forward in a decentralized form, guided by a dedicated team at national level. On the ground there is strong (though as yet numerically unsubstantiated) evidence that vegetative rehabilitation and production are improving. As the TE notes '*The stage has been set for the Community- Based Natural Resource Management (CBNRM) planning approach combined with several of the technologies to be rolled out nationally'.*

Component 1 – Promotion of SLM Approach at National, Regional and Zoba levels **– Satisfactory**

As per the TE, all of the targets under the Component 1 were met –national level and Zoba level sustainable land management platforms, and an operational sustainable land management steering committee and technical committee, were all set up and are reported to meet regularly. The project also supported establishment of Eritrean Sustainable Investment Framework (ESIF) and Eritrean Knowledge Base and Information System (ESIS) that were also approved by government and development partners.

Component 2 – Development of Effective and Innovative SLM Approaches (in a minimum of 32 Kebabis) **– Satisfactory**

The TE reports a slight shortfall in the development of Kebabi level community based natural resource assessment and land use plans, with up to 85% of the targets achieved. But there were significant overachievements in terms of catchment conservation - the target on the amount of land enclosed for revegetation in the case of permanent enclosures was exceeded by a factor of ten (72,000 ha compared with the target of 7,000 ha). Two outputs/ outcomes under Component 2 were not delivered satisfactorily. Firstly, energy saving technology, where only 2 solar pumps (target of 10) and 7 biogas plants (target of 20) were installed. Nevertheless, as per the TE, these shortages were compensated largely by the particularly successful spread of energy-saving stoves. Secondly, adaptive research to verify an innovation package of SLM also didn't come off the ground, with the majority of CLMP's technological interventions being pretty standard, in terms of on-farm SLM, rather than vegetative or agronomic. But, as the TE notes, '*the introduction of conservation agriculture was an exception and shows early promise'.*

Component 3 – Project Management – **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE doesn't comment on the quality of the project management supported through the project, although it shows all the targets being met under this component. As mentioned in the MTR and M&E section of the TE, quality of implementation of M&E was not up to the mark and didn't meet the expected results. For instance, although a National M&E officer was assigned the responsibility in 2011, he received specific inputs and training on the subject only in 2013. MTR states that the M&E officer devoted only 20-30% of his time to M&E as he was assigned with other roles too, and neither had the capacity nor time to monitor achievements and impact of the project. For instance, the M&E officer

deemed the task of carbon sequestration far too complex, and understandably so, to monitor. Travel to the field was also a constraint due to heavy bureaucracy involved in leaving the duty station in Asmara. These difficulties also had a negative impact on the quality of the annual reports and PIRs, which were of little use to improve project performance and allow for adaptive management.

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

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the efficiency of the project as 'moderately satisfactory'. Formulation of the nationally agreed Eritrean SLM investment framework for better harmonization and coordination of SLM development efforts (by the government, development partners, NGOs and private sector) was a cost-effective way to combat and address land degradation. Although none of the available reports discuss the efficacy of SLM investment framework, its formulation through the project is a step in the right direction. Also, the community based participatory land use planning approach adopted by the project was a cost-effective approach with beneficiary communities taking more direct responsibility for assessing the problems and resolving them. As also corroborated by the TE, the project had a high level of community involvement that helped propel the rate of implementation and achievement of targets. Some of the interventions, such as 'cut and carry'

system, adopted by the project to protect the rangeland enclosures, proved to be a cost-effective way to improve profitability and achieve vegetative regeneration leading to ecosystem restoration in the long run.

However, the TE notes that the project was initially constrained by the limited capacity of the staff, which was later addressed through a large number of training courses for extension staff and land users. The MTR also identified some of the issues that delayed, or activities had to be rescheduled due to lack of capacity, long procurement procedures that impacted the project efficiency. But these issues were addressed to some extent later on during the project.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Unlikely**

The TE uses a different scale to assign the rating to the sustainability of the outcomes. The TE assigns it a rating of 'moderately unsatisfactory' and based on the evidence in the TE, this TER assigns it a rating of 'moderately unlikely'. As described along the four dimensions of the sustainability below, key elements of sustainability such as know-how, partnerships and engagements are in place but would still need consolidation and fine-tuning in order to ensure institutional sustainability of project outcomes. Climate change poses a serious threat to environmental sustainability and most of the field investments of the project.

Financial: Moderately likely

According to the TE, the project is likely to be followed up through a follow on IFAD project that will require the use of this project's experience and trained personnel and investments in catchment conservation. The Eritrean SLM Investment Framework (ESIF) produced and approved by government and development partners is expected to facilitate further investment in SLM and replicate this project's positive interventions. There is also a keen interest from the Government of Eretria (GoE) to follow up with an application for a grant from GEF's 7th replenishment, the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) or even the Green Climate Fund. Some of the interventions are likely to be supported directly by the communities. For instance, there is also some evidence in the TE that communities are paying in some situations for guards to protect enclosures from incursions by cattle. It has equally been said that there is some voluntary expansion of activities by people who have been involved in the project. However, none of these statements are validated in the field.

Institutional: Moderately Likely

As per the TE, the project helped to entrench institutional stability by working through the government structure, and most notably the Ministry of Agriculture (MOA). Some of the aspects promoted by the project are already adopted by the MoA. For instance, the MoA incorporated participatory land use planning in its new 5-year strategic plan (2017-2021). The national and decentralized Zoba level structures and platforms supported by the project demonstrate empowerment at all levels and provide long term institutional framework to the project activities. The establishment and functioning of the

Eritrean SLM Investment Framework (ESIF) and the Eritrean Knowledge Base and Information System (ESIS) are also steps in sustaining the initiative institutionally. However, The TE also notes that another IFAD project – National Agriculture Project (NAP), which became effective in 2013 does not mention any linkages with CLMP within its project documents, although it is working in some of the same areas. It seems that partnerships and engagements need to be pursued and consolidated further to ensure sustainability and replication of the interventions supported through the project.

Sociopolitical: **Moderately likely**

As evident from the available midterm and evaluation reports, the project had a good support at the national level as well as the local communities. The TE states that communities at the Kebabi level were involved in the implementation of many activities, and not just planners and decision makers at the national level. The PIR, 2016 reports 30% representation by women 'at various levels of decision making' that can also help strengthen institutions and assist in ensuring sustainability. However, one potential threat, identified by the TE, is the lack of land security under the prevailing Dessa system, where fields are rotated after seven years of cultivation – thus acting as a disincentive to investment in the land. It is not clear if the project was able to address this challenge adequately and hence it can pose a potential threat to the sustainability of the some of the land-based interventions.

Environmental: Moderately unlikely

As identified in the MTR, climate change is the main environmental risk that can undermine success and sustainability of project outcomes due to its negative impact on the health of Eritrea's agro-ecosystems and on the livelihoods of the rural poor. Eritrea being at the eastern tip of the Sub-Saharan/Sahelian belt of Africa, is widely recognized as one of the most vulnerable regions to climate change at the global level. Although few data are currently available on climate-related impact in Eritrea, evidence from research in all neighboring countries (Sudan, Djibouti, Yemen, Ethiopia) suggest a clear trend of increasing temperatures, unpredictability and local decrease of rainfall, and intensification of extreme weather events that can seriously undermine SLM interventions and investments. Investments carried out through the project are expected to increase the resilience and reduce environmental-related risk in the target areas. But, more work is needed in this direction. The MTR strongly suggests that IFAD supports the GoE to secure climate finance (mainly GEF LDCF/SCCF) to secure the environmental sustainability of actual and future investments through climate adaptation and risk reduction work.

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?

According to the TE, the documented co-financing contributions are significantly less than what was actually contributed by the GoE and the local communities/beneficiaries. As of May, 2016, 39% of GOE

financing was contributed, which, according to the TE, was understated. The project was implemented within the structure of MoA and the Zoba administrations and used many physical facilities provided by the GoE, whose value was not evaluated, captured and reported. Similarly, the documented beneficiary contribution also falls short of the planned input (almost 50% realized). The reason documentation fell short is that to capture these in-kind contributions required signatures from various officials, thus considerable amount was not accounted for and underestimated. All project management costs associated with office facilities, equipment, etc., was to be covered under PCRRDP co-financing, shown as part of the IFAD contribution, but the extent to which such costs were covered is not clear from any of the available reports.

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?

MTR noted several activities delayed or rescheduled during the initial year due to capacity, procurement, or financial problems, but all the activities of the original work plan picked up during the course of the project and were completed in time. As per the dates given in the TE, the project was delayed by a month, but it seems it didn't require formal extension.

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 had good support from the government. The project aligned well with the relevant national economic, environmental and climate change strategy papers and action plans. The National SLM platform and other committees established through the project got the support from the government and is, reportedly, strong and functional. The model of decentralization promoted through the project of transferring decision making and implementation responsibility to the Zobas and communities at the Kebabi levels got a good support from the government and strengthened Eritrea's decentralization process.

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**

The TE assigns rating to the M&E design at entry as 'moderately unsatisfactory' but it doesn't provide any evidence to substantiate these ratings. Based on the information in the PD, this TER assigns a rating of 'moderately satisfactory'.

The M&E plan included in the project document was quite comprehensive with set of indicators for each of the project outputs. Type of M&E activities, responsible parties and the corresponding budget along with the time frame was clearly defined in the project document. The M&E plan also had the provision of participatory monitoring involving the communities directly benefiting from the project. Key indicators for the global environmental benefits were also identified, although in some cases, as also noted in the MTR, were biased towards quantitative aspects vis-à-vis the quality of the intervention. For instance, for assessment of the restoration of rangelands, catchment areas and riverine ecosystems, it would have been useful to couple quantitative indicators (number of hectares) with qualitative ones (survival rates for seedlings, number of species, proportion of indigenous and multi-purpose species). The project also recognized the importance of good-quality baseline information in the monitoring of environmental benefits, which was also budgeted for but did not provide much hint on how this could be administered during M&E implementation.

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

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the M& E implementation as 'moderately unsatisfactory'. The project M&E has been a weak link throughout the project's life cycle. First, the project had an ineffective M&E system in place - it seems that the project lacked capacity and time to keep track of achievements or impact. The project collected data on targets, however, it failed to track the indicators relevant to impact assessment. This is also noted by the Environmental Impact Assessment commissioned by CLMP that states 'The lack of data, particularly on...food security and critical global environmental benefits...is restricting the project's ability to influence policy and decision makers'. TE also reiterates that while there was strong emphasis in the project's reporting on physical target in terms of SLM measure, impact in terms of improvement in farm yields, benefits accruing to households, and quantitative and spatially defined land degradation improvements, was not captured.

According to the MTR, National M&E officer received specific inputs and training on the subject two years after assuming responsibility and devoted only 20-30% of his time to M&E due to other responsibilities. Travel to the field was also a constraint due to heavy bureaucracy involved in leaving the duty station in Asmara. These difficulties had a negative impact on the quality of the annual reports and PIRs, which were of little use to improve project performance and allow for adaptive management. But, as per the TE, the project strongly benefited from the emergence of the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) as a tool, adopted in the later stages of the project, for making adjustments to the project's priorities, targets and expenditure.

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 agrees with the rating assigned by the TE to the quality of project implementation as 'satisfactory'. The TE notes that IFAD's supervision was overall very effective and valued by CLMP and the GoE, both in terms of encouragement, inspiration and direct technical input. IFAD provided regular monitoring and supervision; conducted Project Implementation audits on a quarterly basis and carried out annual supervision missions. The TE testifies to the quality of mission reports being very informative in terms of capturing progress of the project as well as future course of action chalked out and agreed with project authorities. The TE also notes that IFAD had developed a strong relationship with the government of Eretria and that communication was still on-going between IFAD and CLMP regarding some of the issues such as land degradation assessment methodology showing its continued commitment to the project.

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

The TE hasn't provided any rating, nor assessed this aspect in detail. Based on the evidence in various available reports, this TER assigns a rating of 'moderately satisfactory'. As per the MTR, the project experienced a slow start due to factors including a lack of motivation of the staff (who felt that the extra burden of the project was not coupled with appropriate incentives), problems of transportation and procurement, and administrative bottlenecks. But, after the inevitable slow start-up and an over-run at the end of the project period (by one month as per the TE), the project picked up momentum: personnel and facilities were made available, more relevant training was carried out, a series of coordination and planning meetings were held, and with coaching and support from IFAD, CLMP made impressive progress as noted by the TE. But, as described in the section 6.2 above, project management was weak on monitoring and evaluation, for a number of reasons, such as lack of capacity and time. Also, since the project progress picked up mainly after the MTR, it seems that project staff was busy achieving targets and monitoring and evaluation function got sidelined.

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.

With respect to the GEBs that are expected to ensue from a GEF-financed programme, the only evidence of calculating such benefits was the carbon assessment study (using FAO's EX-ACT model) that was carried out by an IFAD consultant. This study calculated positive gains from project interventions: an average positive balance of 11.5 t/ha carbon dioxide equivalents over 20 years. The best project impact, significantly, was calculated to be from enclosures where increased biomass stands led to an estimated 60 t/ha (carbon dioxide equivalents over 20 years) (TE pg 19).

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 was based on the desk review of available documents/progress reports and phone interviews/discussions with project stakeholders and didn't involve field verification. Aspects such as change in income and household well-being were not monitored by the project and constrained by lack of hard, empirical evidence, personal interaction and field visits.

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 MTR, various workshops, training sessions and study visits were organized to strengthen the capacity of government agencies, Zoba and sub- Zoba staff and extension agents, and Kebabi-level

communities for SLM practices. This also included training on renewable energies, and Land Degradation Assessment Tool (LADA) to Kebabi and extension workers.

2. Awareness generation through public awareness camps stimulated by the initiation of a 'National Greening Day' (NGD) which is coordinated and advised by the National Technical SLM Committee constituted through the project.

b) Governance

As per the TE, some of the aspects promoted by the project are already adopted by the Ministry of Agriculture. For instance, the Ministry of Agriculture incorporated participatory land use planning in its new 5-year strategic plan (2017-2021). The national and decentralized Zoba level structures and platforms supported by the project demonstrate empowerment at all levels and provide long term institutional framework to the project activities. The establishment and functioning of the Eritrean SLM Investment Framework (ESIF) and the Eritrean Knowledge Base and Information System (ESIS) would provide opportunities to guide the planning and implementation of investments targeted at addressing the interrelated problems of land degradation, food insecurity and rural poverty in future.

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.

None.

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.

According to the TE, the project is likely to be followed up through IFAD's Fisheries Resources Management Programme（FReMP) project that will require the use of this project's experience and trained personnel and investments in catchment conservation. The Eritrean SLM Investment Framework (ESIF) produced and approved by government and development partners is expected to facilitate further investment in SLM and replicate this project's positive interventions. There is also a keen interest from the Government of Eretria (GoE) to follow up with an application for a grant from GEF's 7th replenishment, the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) or even the Green Climate Fund (GCF).

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.

1. The project has shown that national decentralization can be profitably woven into project design.

2. The Government of Eriteria's policy has been used to underpin the innovative community-based planning processes. Projects that 'go with the flow' stand a much better chance of success.

3. Project 'layering' can be very effective. Post–Crisis Rural Recovery and Development Programme (PCRRDP) was successfully followed by this project and the National Agriculture Project (though the two are poorly linked), and these feed into Fisheries Resources Management Programme（FReMP) and future programs.

4. This project has benefitted from a succession of similar projects designed and guided by International Fund for Agricultural Development（IFAD), which has a comparative advantage over other agencies and should capitalize upon that.

5. The innovative local participatory planning approach should be seen as a major success. While 'hardware' (technical) achievements might capture the eye, 'software' is even more important.

6. M&E has proved to be a problem. Systems must be simple and guidance given to better capture co-finance, assess impact, but also to underpin future investments with evidence.

7. Adaptive research is a frequent feature of this type of project design, yet rarely succeeds. The bridge between researchers and practitioners is easy to design but difficult to build.

8. After initial problems with concepts and implementation, this project rightly identified capacity as a limiting factor. Capacity levels need to be carefully assessed in the design of ambitious projects.

9. Energy saving is an important contributor to reduced deforestation, and more efficient stoves have proved, very popular. Neither solar energy nor biogas have been emphasized enough.

10. Many activities will carry on after this project has come to an end – guided by the exit strategy. Thus, no terminal evaluation can capture all of a project's eventual achievements and legacy.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendation listed in the TE are as follows:

1. Lessons from this project must be used to help drive forward and guide the development of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in Eritrea's rural areas and fed into the National Agricultural Project (NAP) as well as new initiatives such as Fisheries Resources Management Program (FReMP).

2. The experience within the two Zobas can and should be up scaled now and rolled out, progressively, to the rest of the country – though in a flexible and responsive way.

3. Community-based land use planning has worked in many countries in Sub Saharan Africa and has been proven in Eritrea under this project. It is recommended that this is the way forward.

4. More thought should be given in future design of simple and meaningful M&E tools that are employed right from the start of a project and go hand-in-hand with implementation: tracking co-financing and exploring voluntary uptake need special focus.

5. It is strongly recommended that support is continued by International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) to assist in establishing and maintaining monitoring of soil/ vegetation carbon fluxes, and hence land degradation.

6. Capacity building has proved an essential prerequisite to achieve the improvement that this project has experienced. 'This human capital' should be maintained as far as possible in the system.

7. Land tenure issues need to be addressed better: Sustainable Land Management (SLM) is contingent on security of tenure.

8. The piloting of negotiations and agreements between this project/ Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) and other ministries involved in dam construction regarding environmental protection should be continued.

9. There should also be serious consideration given to designing a specific follow-up project, with a 'Ridge to Reef' nature that cuts a cross section from the current Zobas down to the coast.

10. It is key that the Project Completion Report includes a strong and targeted 'Exit Strategy'

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?	The TE was constrained by lack of hard, empirical evidence, personal interaction and field visits but still it made good assessment based on the available reports and phone/email interactions. TE report was based on achievement of targets and not the outcome or impact indicators as project lacked data on these counts	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE did justice to the report to the extent possible and presented sufficient evidence gathered through phone/email interactions and available reports.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project	The report covered this aspect quite in detail.	**S**

sustainability and/or project exit strategy?		
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lesson learnt are comprehensive, substantiated by evidence and contextualized.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	It seems that the TE spent sufficient time and effort to get details on co-financing but the accounting system followed by the project didn't account for all the co-financing contributions and hence it was difficult to determine actual contributions. It was also not clear if IFAD co-finaning materialized.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE covered this aspect adequately	**S**
Overall TE Rating		**S**

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