1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3368	
GEF Agency project ID			
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		AfDB/IFAD	
Project name		SIP: Participatory Integrated Watershed Management Project (PIWAMP)	
Country/Countries		Gambia	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP1: to develop an enabling environment that will place Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the mainstream of development policy and practices at the regional, national, and local level; and SP2: to upscale SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods.	
Executing agencies involved		Government of The Gambia – Ministry of Agriculture	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Part of the Steering Committee	
Private sector involvement		Stakeholders	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		February 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		March 2014	
Actual date of project completion		June 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.1	0.1
	Co-financing	0.10	-
GEF Project Grant		4.4	4.4
Co-financing	IA own	11.99	14.25
	Government	1.34	1.80
	Other multi- /bi-	1.15	1.53

	laterals		
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	-	-
Total GEF funding		4.5	4.5
Total Co-financing		14.58	17.58
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		19.08	22.08
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 2016	
Author of TE		Mamadi Baba Ceesay and Donald C. Sock	
TER completion date		February 9, 2017	
TER prepared by		Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project was "to address the interlinked problems of rural poverty, food insecurity, and land degradation, through the development and promotion of innovative sustainable land management technologies and community-based participatory watershed/landscape management planning approaches, with the aim of restoring, sustaining and enhancing the productive and protective functions of The Gambia's upland and lowland ecosystem resources" (PD pgs 45-46). The project also aimed to "overcome the causes and negative impacts of land degradation and climate change on the health, structure and functional integrity of The Gambia's lowland and upland ecosystem resources while realizing global, national and local environmental benefits" (PD pg 46).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's Development Objectives was "to enable rural resource poor communities in The Gambia to alleviate poverty and food insecurity by preventing and reversing declining land productivity through a community based participatory approach to watershed/landscape management planning, with targeted SLM investments, aimed at increasing the productivity and profitability of their crop, livestock, forestry and ecotourism based enterprises" (PD pg 46). The project intended to achieve its objective through two components (PD pg 47):

Component 1 – Sustainable Land Management institutional strengthening; and
Component 2 – Community-based watershed/landscape management.

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

There were no changes made to the objectives and activities during implementation.

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 project was relevant to GEF's land degradation focal area and its Strategic Priority 1 "to develop an enabling environment that will place Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in the mainstream of development policy and practices at the regional, national, and local levels" and Strategic Priority 2 "to upscale SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods" (PD pg 44). The project was aligned to Strategic Programs, such as, (i) supporting sustainable agriculture and rangeland management; (ii) supporting sustainable forest management in production landscapes; and (iii) investing in innovative approaches in SLM (PD pg 44).

In terms of country relevance, the project was consistent with Gambia's environmental and rural development priorities and was aligned to policies such as The Gambia Environmental Action Plan (GEAP II, 2009-2018), the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP II-2007-2011) and the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy (ANRP 2009-2015) (TE pg 5). As climate change is adversely affecting migratory bird species in the semi-arid to sub-humid environment in Gambia, the project was relevant to program priorities under the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD), sustainable land management priorities of the related Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) (PD pg 44).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE rated the project's effectiveness as Satisfactory as the project "established the relevant institutional frameworks, formulated the GAMSIF, implemented 72 micro projects comprising lowland and upland soil and water controlled infrastructure, improved degraded woodlands and improved vegetative cover in 13 protected sites" (TE pg vii). The project achieved all its targets in two components aimed at strengthening Sustainable Land Management institutional capacity and establishing community-based watershed/landscape management. The TER has not assessed the third component related to project management. Considering the achievements of all the relevant outputs, the TER gives a Satisfactory rating.

Achievements of the outputs under two relevant components are listed below:

Component 1: Sustainable Land Management (SLM) institutional strengthening:
Under this component, there were six sub-components corresponding to six outputs in order to establish a national and six regional SLM platforms, formulate SLM Investment Framework, develop SLM knowledge base and information system, and build capacity of key planning and advisory support service providers. The project was successful in constituting National Technical Committee, National SLM Steering Committee and National SLM Consultative Forum, and also established regional Technical Committees in all six Agricultural Regional Directorates (ARDs). For the output on formulating the Gambia SLM Investment Framework (GAMSIF), the project completed the Framework in September 2014, and mobilized finances from TerrAfrica for the launch. However, at the time of the TE, the Framework was still pending formal approval from the government (TE pg 7). To develop a SLM knowledge base, the project conducted a study on indigenous knowledge systems and undertook a study tour for 15 senior staff to enhance their knowledge on Conservation Agriculture. Although learnings from the study tour could have been used for policy development, as per the MTR this was not pursued and "high attrition rate within MOA could result in key tour participants not being available to contribute to the policy formulation for mechanization" (MTR pg 7). Furthermore, the project held induction training for 48 participants from 6 regional technical committees on watershed delineation and mapping, training-of-trainers for 60 SLM Technical Committee members as well as developed a training Manual on SLM for regional technical committees (TE pg 8). It also conducted Step Down Training for farmers which was attended by 576 members from Village Development Committees with 50% female participants (TE pg 8).

Component 2: Community-Based Watershed/Landscape Management:
This component had five sub-components with corresponding outputs aimed to prepare watershed/landscape management plans, ensure food security, implement participatory monitoring and evaluation, develop institutional capacity for implementation of plans, and demonstrate conservation agriculture tools and techniques. The project managed to conduct a community participatory assessment and planning workshops in 36 villages and developed "micro investment project portfolios in a fully participatory manner for restoring, sustaining and enhancing the productive capacity and protective functions of these resources" (TE pg 8). It also held community level briefing/sensitization meetings, and discovery-based field learning exercises. To ensure food security, the project made interventions to improve community market access by improving inter-village roads, enhancing soil fertility, building water retention dikes and spillways (MTR pg 9, TE pg 8). These micro-interventions were appreciated by the beneficiaries, however, due to recommendation by the Joint Supervision Mission to focus on natural resources restoration, the component's targets were reduced by 25% (TE pg 8). To implement participatory M&E, the project developed and validated an M&E manual, and Village Secretaries were provided with calculators, measuring tapes and weighing scales. However, very few Secretaries kept regular record and there was a need for raising awareness on collecting meaningful information for monitoring and learning (TE pg 10, MTR pg 10). For the output to demonstrate Conservation Agriculture tools, the project acquired six tractors and 36 animal drawn rippers for

encourage sustainable tillage practices. However, according to the TE, no demonstrations or trainings for utilization of the tools were conducted (TE pg 10).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

The TE gave a Satisfactory rating to the efficiency of project implementation because of substantial physical achievements of outcomes which surpassed the targets in most cases (TE pg 14). The project "adopted a participatory approach promoting interventions that are simple, low-cost and replicable and within the priorities of the communities" (TE pg 14). The TE stated that the project disbursed about 115% of the funding to component 2, but with careful planning and co-financing with PIWAMP, it was able to have savings for the other two components. For further cost savings, the project employed only essential staff, recruited a national Technical Assistance, and utilized the Project Steering Committee to gain policy guidance (TE pg 14). However, the project experienced numerous delays due to late project signing, issues with recruiting a Technical Assistant, and late arrival of demonstration equipment (TE pg 14). The delays resulted in project deadline extension of more than a year. Thus, the TER gives a Moderately Satisfactory rating to project's efficiency.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: Likely

The TE gave a Likely rating to the project's sustainability. The TER also gives the same rating as the financial, sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, and environmental risks are low. Although during implementation the project evidenced some negative environmental impacts, it embedded climate change and environmental sustainability in the investments of the project through creation of Social and Environmental Management Plan. The following is assessment of sustainability criteria:

Financial resources: The TE reported that the beneficiaries "established in most cases sustainable funding mechanisms through community resource mobilisation for sustenance of the investments" (TE pg 15). For example, there were already in existence village savings and credit associations to upscale successful investments. The TE noted that the national SLM platform would also help in financial sustainability "through mainstreaming the concepts and principles of SLM into the environmental management, and economic development, plans and policies of those institutions with administrative and technical responsibility for economic development, environmental preservation, and land use, within The Gambia" (TE pg 15). As the investment framework had been launched, the buy-in from donors would unlock investments in SLM related activities. The TE also mentioned that the National Land Management Development Management (Nema) / Strengthening Climate Resilience of the National Agricultural Land and Water Management Development projects (Chosso) would ensure continuation of SLM activities (TE pg 15).

Sociopolitical: During the project, the government worked with community members to execute the project and stakeholders from national, regional and community levels participated actively. For example, farmers, herders and other land user groups were actively involved in participatory assessment and planning activities which "increased the ability of the participating communities to control their own natural resources and to promote local ownership as they realise the benefits accruing to them as direct users of the land resources at the local level. These benefits will ensure that communities sustain the project" (TE pg 15). The TE stated that "the Village Development Committees (VDCs) and farmer organizations support would continue their activities in the project area post SLMP" and Nema had planned to continue to work with village based groups (TE pg 15).

Institutional framework and governance: The TE stated that the project's "institutional capacity building activities of all the key stakeholders will facilitate sustainability of the SLM" (TE pg 15). For example, the training and exposure of SLM practices to Regional Agricultural Directorates and the Multi-Disciplinary Facilitation Team (MDFT) have been instrumental in development of Community Action Plans. As the MDFT's mandate is to engage with communities, they would provide technical support to SLM activities. The Village Development Committee were actively involved in development activities in the village level and they have been "sensitised by the project that after project closure they should be in a position to hire the services of Service Providers (SPs) based on the engagement between them and SPs engendered by the project" (TE pg 16). Additionally, the Village Farmers' Associations are also sustainable institutions as their functions are to provide for village development (TE pg 16).

Environmental: The TE noted few environmental threats due to the project which were later corrected. For example, "the improved road linking Tampoto and Kanuma in the NBR had affected the flow of water downstream which resulted in the inundation of some compounds within the village". The project constructed three Irish crossings to allow easy flow of excess runoff water downstream. To be able to address negative impacts, the project developed the Social and Environmental Management Plan (ESMP) to identify and implement mitigation measures for any adverse impacts caused by the project. As per the TE, the ESMP "provided guidance on procedures and key determinants in environmental monitoring and management" (TE pg 37).

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 actual co-financing amount of $17,575,922 was more than the expected amount of $14,577,557. The implementing and executing agencies as well as beneficiaries of the project provided co-financing for implementation (TE pg 36). The TE mentioned that the project spent around 114% of the co-

financing amount on Component 2 as it was the core component of the project. For component 1, 66% of co-financing was disbursed and 55% was used on project management (TE pg 35).

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

The project had numerous delays at the start-up and during implementation. There was a prolonged delay of six-months due to changes in Project Coordinator at PIWAMP, late recruitment of Technical Assistant for SLM, and issues with acquiring tillage equipments for demonstration trials. There was also a delay in implementing micro-projects on natural resources restoration because of the initial focus on physical interventions like the improving inter-village roads, building spillways and footbridges (TE pg 14). Due to these delays, the project was extended for one-year.

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 country ownership was high as the government took several actions for the benefit of the project. For example, the Director of Aid Coordination at the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs participated in the trek with SLMP staff, and high level officials participated in the IFAD led Supervision Missions' meetings. The government endorsed the findings in the Supervision Missions and signed all Aide Memoires for the Project (TE pg 30). The TE noted that the project received community support and participation as it was demand driven with micro-projects and interventions that addresses environmental, social and economic concerns (TE pg 31).

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 rated the M&E design at entry as Highly Satisfactory and the TER maintains the same rating. As per the TE, the project "envisaged a participatory data collection, monitoring and evaluation framework from the village level to the regional and then to the national level" (TE pg 32). The M&E design had provisions for six monthly activity reports, inception workshop, baseline study and M&E workshop to discuss findings from baseline, annual implementation reviews, mid-term evaluation, and project

completion report. The project estimated the M&E to $200,000 (PD pgs 80-83). The project had provision for commissioning of environmental study as part of the baseline as well as a special impact study to determine extent of environmental benefits. The project designed a number of SMART impact and output level indicators (TE pg 32). Some of the indicators were revised following the Joint Supervision Mission by the AfDB and IFAD, however, the TE does not give the reasons for the changes made (TE pg 32).

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

The TE gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to M&E plan implementation. The initial M&E plan consisted of the socioeconomic baseline and the ESMP and both were completed as well as validated (MTR pg 11). The project produced a Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Manual (PM&E) as a guidance to communities to do monitoring. Along with the Manual, the project provided "Village Household Listing, Crop Harvest, Tree Planting, Seed Loan and construction monitoring forms for wells, causeways and bridges, dykes and spillways, etc" (TE pg 33). It was reported that the SLMP secretaries collected and recorded data on household population, trees planted, survival rate, total area reclaimed and total area under cultivation (TE pg 34). However, the TE noted that due to different levels of literacy amongst the secretaries, some of the them were keeping detailed records, while the others had scanty records (TE pgs 34 & 38) Also, the project established framework for data collection, analysis, storage and dissemination called the Gambia National Agricultural Database (GANAD) (TE pg 34). The project submitted the project implementation reports, quarterly reports, annual reports, and mid-term review. However, the MTR noted that only one of the two annual progress reports were prepared in line with GEF reporting standards (MTR pg 11). Given the minor shortcomings in M&E reporting, the TER also gives Moderately Satisfactory rating to M&E implementation.

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: Highly Satisfactory

The TE did not provide a rating for quality of project implementation but gave a Highly Satisfactory rating to AfDB and IFAD's supervision and backstopping. Both the agencies fielded supervision mission to the project which helped to keep the project on track. In total there were 10 supervision missions and

they comprised of teams with mixed skills. The teams provided useful guidance to enhance project implementation and adhere to appraisal targets (TE pg 35). The agencies also gave substantial co-financing and provided technical support to prepare the SLM investment framework. The agencies helped in making sure that the M&E implementation was in compliance with GEF reporting requirements, however the MTR noted that out of the two annual progress reports submitted, only one was in aligned to GEF reporting (TE pg 32, MTR pg 11). In regard to project design, the project's logical framework was aligned to the theory of change and provided "a lucid strategy for the project following a logical hierarchy with activities linked to clear tangible outputs and output linked to outcomes" (TE pg 6).

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

The TE did not provide an assessment of the quality of project execution. However, the TE noted that the Ministry of Agriculture, the executing agency, took a decentralized approach in which activities were implemented at national, regional and community levels. The project undertook 36 community level field interventions as well as adopted the annual work plan and budget, produced annual external audit reports, and annual progress reports. The management unit carried out procurements for works such as for construction of roads, dykes, and bunds. It also conducted trainings for capacity building and carried out study tours (TE pg 32).

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 project's construction of bunds had reduced soil erosion and prevented flooding of the village and settlements (TE pg 25). As per the TE, "a total of 3,258.36 ha were halted from soil erosion…against an appraisal target of 7,500 ha" (TE pg 10). The construction of causeway, footbridges and dykes helped in slowing down speed of run off while diverting water protecting settlements from flooding. These structures also "increased water infiltration ensuring greater moisture retention and maintained soil fertility. Beneficiaries reported increased crop production from fields due to increased yields and area under cultivation" (TE pg 11).

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 invested in SLM interventions such as restoring and enhancing productive functions of lowland and upland ecosystems. These activities resulted in "significant increase in the returns from livelihood activities at the community and individual household levels" (TE pg 23). The lifetime of food stock also increased from 1-3 months to 4-6 months. Although the project was unable to establish regional woodlot nurseries, the project experienced backyard tree nursery by individual farmers. In many of the nurseries, the farmers planted cashew orchards that serve as an income source (TE pgs 23-24). The TE noted that a catalytic role played by the project was the expansion of the Rural Health Team's coverage into inaccessible areas. The accessibility contributed to improvement of the quality of life of the beneficiaries (TE pg 24). In addition, improvement of inter-village roads improved mobility and "reduced drudgery, saved lives of babies and mothers and enhanced access to social facilities such as markets, health centers" (TE 25).

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 project produced a capacity building training manual to serve as reference guide for field extension agents working with community based groups (TE pg 19). It organized a 10-day study tour to Burkina Faso for 15 multi-sectoral personnel "to enhance the senior policy makers and technical experts' knowledge of different tillage techniques" (TE pg 22). To create awareness, the project produced videos and radio dramas on conservation agriculture, wildlife management, and other issues (TE pg 22).

b) Governance: The project created the SLM investment framework and a SLM handbook integrating climate change and natural resource management in order to make it relevant to the work plans. It also produced a participatory M&E handbook for systematic recording and analysis of information by the beneficiaries (TE pg 20).

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.

The TE did not report any unintended impacts.

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.

The TE reported that the project was able to create public awareness which "brought SLM to the forefront of sustainable agricultural development in the country" (TE pg 18). Due to the project, Community Action Plans were formulated in 36 communities in the six agricultural regions (TE pg 20). The creation of SLM investment framework is a "precursor to a full country SLM investment plan to operationalize the framework, which will be prepared during the implementation of the GAMSIF" (TE pg 21).

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.

Lessons learnt are (TE pg 39):

a) Projects should complete procurement processes to avoid delays in implementation especially as construction activities are based on seasons;
b) In interventions related to restoration of natural resources, such as woodlands and protection of habitats, beneficiaries be fully involved;
c) SLMP lost time to recruit international expertise, and so, projects should try to recruit locally/nationally rather than seeking international experts;
d) Projects should ensure contractors are fully informed of the specific site and topic of the assignment to be covered;
e) There should be a database of contractors to facilitate referencing and tracking poor performers;
f) There should be capacity building activities for farmers and frontline workers such as training on conservation agriculture through modules;
g) The surface of causeways should be surfaced with gravel so as to make them durable, ease traffic and reduce potential acidification within seasonally saline zones;

h) Village farmer associations and development committees should be trained in natural resource management for awareness and appreciation of the linkage between natural resources and livelihood opportunities; and
i) There should be an effective coordination mechanism in place with prescription of roles when multiple partners are involved in implementation of the project.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The recommendations are (TE pgs 39-41):

a) There is a need to develop an updated Land Resources Study which can inform watershed planning and mapping. Also, the Gambia Sustainable Land Management Investment Framework should be launched immediately and resources should be mobilized for implementation;
b) To facilitate implementation of the Investment Framework, "there is urgent need to articulate a mechanization policy to guide conservation agriculture and sustainable SLM practices, formulation of a mechanization policy should be given urgent attention" (TE pg 40);
c) Projects like NEMA and Chosso should support the current project to conduct demonstration trials for up-scaling of the tillage practices; and
d) There should be more community awareness of SLM practices through narrations in videos with sub-titles in local languages. Videos should be aired on Gambia's radio and television services for nationwide dissemination and organize video shows using mobile vans at the SLMP targeted communities.

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 report contains elaborate assessment of project outcomes and impacts. It is both thorough and consistent with project design	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report's ratings are consistent with evidence which has been fully substantiated.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report gives a very detailed assessment of sustainability criteria, however, it does not evaluate the exit strategy.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The report lists lessons learned but does not provide adequate evidence. It also duplicates the lessons in recommendations.	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE included co-financing amounts and costs per the components, but does not provide costs per activities.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report assessed the M&E system well and provided appropriate ratings.	**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).

The TER did not use any additional sources.