

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

Please note that several documents necessary for the production of this TER were provided in French. Those included the Mid-Term Review and Terminal Evaluation Report. For those documents, information was translated from French as part of the review process, but did not go through professional translations. The quotes provided in the document represent the TER author's best approximation of the original meaning.

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3379	
GEF Agency project ID		GEF-FSP-14-MR	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Promoting Sustainable Land Management in the Oasis Ecosystems of Mauritania	
Country/Countries		Mauritania	
Region		West Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LD-SP1	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Environment, MAED	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		November 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2012	
Actual date of project completion		April 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	--	--
	Co-financing	--	--
GEF Project Grant			
Co-financing	IA own	11.4	12.3
	Government	4.89	4.98
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	--	--
	Private sector	--	--
	NGOs/CSOs ¹	1.26	0.38
Total GEF funding		4.19	4.19
Total Co-financing		17.56	17.64
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		21.75	21.83
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 6 th , 2015	

¹ This line represents co-financing from project beneficiaries in the form of in-kind support.

Author of TE	Philippe Nguala Luzietoso, Moulaye Tera, Naoufel Telahigue, Anne Françoise Thierry, Rima Al Azar, Ibrahima Bamba, Philippe Remy
TER completion date	December 2 nd , 2015
TER prepared by	Caroline Laroche
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)	Dania Trespalacios

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project aims to combat land degradation and desertification in the arid and semi-arid oasis territory, as well as to conserve rangeland ecosystems in their periphery (Project Document, 2009, p.20).

The environmental objectives for this project are: to manage the land and water resources of the oases in a sustainable manner, and conserve local biodiversity so as to control and mitigate land degradation and desertification, and protect the natural integrity, functions and services of oases ecosystems resources in the arid and semi-arid plateaus of Mauritania. (Project Document pp.76-77)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project aims to help sustain agricultural production in the oases and contribute to the alleviation of rural poverty.

More specifically, the development objectives for this project are the sustainable improvement of the livelihoods of oasis residents, farmers and herders:

1. To significantly reduce land degradation and enhance land and water productivity through targeted on-the ground investments (thus demonstrating a successful and sustainable reversal of land productivity in bright spots)
2. To promote environmentally- friendly income-generating activities and energy-saving options

(Project Document pp.77-78)

Note that the intention was for the balance between the environmental and development objectives to “work in favour of a better maintenance of the ecological integrity of the oases and their peripheral

rangelands, while concurrently ensuring that local populations realize the economic value of their environment. “ (PD p. 23).

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

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during implementation.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE assigns a relevance rating of Satisfactory to the overall Oasis Sustainable Development Program, of which the GEF project was one of the components. This TER also rates the relevance of this project as satisfactory.

The project is consistent with the objectives of the GEF-4 on land degradation, and with sub-objectives 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 2 (To upscale SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods). Indeed, the project consisted in addressing “desertification and poverty reduction in the oases of Mauritania through an integrated strategy of removing barriers and mainstreaming SLM, complemented with specific investments to mobilize and empower oases dwellers (farmers and herders) as partners in managing the natural resources” (Project Document p. 25). The TE (p.25) notes that the project created “a favorable environment to the integration of SLM in all relevant decision-making processes”²

The project is also consistent with national priorities, being fully aligned with the Mauritanian Government’s anti-poverty strategy (TE, p.3), and having successfully targeted the country’s rural poor and responded to their needs. The project responded “to several important strategic axes that are inscribed in the Mauritanian environmental policies, such as (i) supporting the implementation of an enabling environment and removing critical barriers to mainstream SLM in government policies and

² Translated from French by TER author.

programs, (ii) the use of integrated participatory models, (iii) capacity-building to combat land degradation, including technical and managerial assistance to farmers/herders associations; (iv) focusing investments on proven technical innovations that provide concurrent environmental and economic benefits, and (v) the promotion of environmentally friendly income-generating activities for poverty reduction“ (Project Document, pp. 43-44).

Finally, the project was highly relevant in strengthening the environmental components of the OSDP-PDDO programme managed by IFAD, in particular in developing sustainable solutions to identified environmental problems. As mentioned in the Project Document (p.24): “The GEF alternative will introduce the concept of participatory land-use planning; provide additional means for specific SLM activities that are not eligible under the OSDP-PDDO and that do generate environmental benefits of global nature. The proposed GEF investment will make the OSDP-PDDO ecologically sustainable while it will generate global environmental benefits. It will also contribute to overcoming an important baseline gap on awareness raising, environmental IEC and capacity strengthening.” Those activities having been realized during the project, this TER considers the environmental relevance of this project to have been high.

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

The TE rates the effectiveness of the GEF component of the OSDP-PDDO program as moderately satisfactory, with important variations in the effectiveness of different project components. This TER also rates effectiveness as moderately satisfactory due to two out of three components being rated moderately unsatisfactory or lower.

As mentioned above, the two main objectives for this project were:

1. To manage the land and water resources of the oases in a sustainable manner, and conserve local biodiversity so as to control and mitigate land degradation and desertification, and protect the natural integrity, functions and services of oases ecosystems resources in the arid and semi-arid plateaus of Mauritania
2. Sustainable improvement of the livelihoods of oasis residents, farmers and herders.

In order to meet these two objectives, three project components were defined. The TE assesses effectiveness against these three components:

Component 1: Creation of an enabling environment for mainstreaming SLM in all relevant decision making processes.

The TE rates this component’s effectiveness as unsatisfactory for not meeting the objectives set in the project document and for being poorly documented. According to the TE (p. 106), “the integration of SLM into development strategies and decision-making processes is not effective”. Indeed, “despite institutional support at the Environment Ministry, activities related to SLM knowledge management, the monitoring of natural resources at national level, and the formal integration of SLM measures into oasis

ecosystems have been very limited and the small effects they have had are not very visible” (TE p. 106).
Examples of unsatisfactory activities include:

- A National Council for SLM, established in 2008, was supposed to meet every trimester but, by 2014, had only met three times; this was not sufficient to adequately promote SLM in Mauritania (TE p. 106).
- The Environment Ministry has not yet set up mechanisms to evaluate the extent to which SLM has been integrated into national policy (TE p.107).
- Regional SLM plans have not been completed, and a groundwater monitoring network has not been set up (TE p.107).

Component 2: Public awareness and Capacity building for national and local institutions to support integrated SLM

The TE rates this component’s effectiveness as moderately unsatisfactory for being slightly below the objectives set in the project document and poorly documented. Several actions have been taken to strengthen institutions and build their capacity to better implement SLM policies and projects. For example, regional MEDD (Environment Ministry) delegations have received new IT and office supplies, and since 2013 have master protocols and action plans. Much has been done to raise awareness and educate the local population about SLM, including training sessions, the production and dissemination of didactic material, and the production of radio programs on SLM. However, the public awareness component has not fared very well, with evidence that the population still does not fully recognize the environmental benefits from SLM, focusing instead on economic advantages. (TE pp. 108-109)

Component 3: Land productivity rehabilitation and poverty reduction through SLM investments

The TE rates this component’s effectiveness as satisfactory as most planned activities were conducted and directly improved the lives of rural oasis populations (TE p.105).

Overall, project activities under this component enabled the effective protection of oases against wind erosion and sand dune encroachment. Important investments were made in infrastructure for SLM promotion, and in the promotion of environmentally friendly income-generating activities. Key accomplishments include:

- Protection of 609 hectares of cultivated land (only 300 hectares were originally planned)
- Stabilization of 244 hectares of dunes
- Construction of water conservation infrastructure
- Preservation of the local biodiversity of the date palm-tree by establishing conservatories and setting up a pollen bank.
- Improvement of irrigation water management techniques, and promotion of water-saving technologies
- Promotion of butane as an alternative fuel to wood
- Installation of new fences not made out of wood

However, a few investments, including the planting of 10 000 fruit trees in 2014, were not made due to low interest from the population.

In summary, there was a fair amount of variation in the effectiveness level of various project components, with two of them being unsatisfactory or moderately unsatisfactory, and one of them being satisfactory. The project was able to achieve some of its environmental objectives, and contributed towards the achievement of other development objectives. Effectiveness is therefore rated as moderately satisfactory.

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

The TE rates the efficiency of this project as Moderately Satisfactory, but does not provide a clear justification for the rating. The TER rates it as satisfactory due to the smooth fund disbursement and management, as overall good return on investment for this project.

The GEF funds were managed by IFAD, thereby sharing administrative and management costs. Due to difficulties in implementing activities planned at the beginning of the project, some of the budget that was supposed to be spent on specific components was reallocated to others. In particular, funds were reallocated away from components 1 and 2 to component 3. While it is positive that the project was able to reallocate fund between components in order to focus on effective activities, this TER wonders if component 1 and 2 might not have been more effective had more of the planned activities been conducted, and more resources provided.

The cost per beneficiary was 53% lower than originally expected, having decreased from \$US 316,52 to \$US 148,13. (TE p.24) This is almost entirely due to the fact that the oasis population was about twice as large as originally anticipated, and this should therefore not be seen as an important efficiency gain. The TE does not present an overall cost-benefit analysis of the project achievements, but uses a case study to show the environmental and development impact of the OSPD-PDDO project. In the case study presented (Oasis of Tirebane), return on investment is calculated to be of 22.68%, which is highly satisfactory (TE p.25).

Finally, the project was extended and able to operate for 16 months longer than originally anticipated for the same cost.

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

The TE rates the sustainability of this project as Satisfactory. This TER assesses a rating of moderately likely, as most of the sustainability risks were addressed during the project, but some of them were still a concern upon project completion.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Moderately likely 

The TER does not mention the planned future for the Promoting Sustainable Land Management in the Oasis Ecosystems of Mauritania project. This review finds no evidence of further funding for an additional phase to the project, and there is no evidence that funding could come from alternative sources. However, the TE sometimes references the 'project next phase', suggesting a continuation might be in the pipeline.

Socio-political and Institutional Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

The project comprised an educational/awareness component to ensure that the local population understands the environmental issues addressed by SLM, and the benefits for them from the implementation of SLM practices. While this had some success, there is still a long way to go for the local population to really become aware of environmental issues, and there is therefore a risk for SLM practices to be gradually dropped if AGPOs (Participatory Oasis Management Organisations) stop encouraging their members to pursue them (see section below on institutional risks). There is so far no plan for educational/awareness activities to be maintained. (TE p.27)

The TE states: "The sustainability of SLM investments made is to a large extent linked to the quality of the infrastructure built and the mobilisation and organisation capacity of the AGPOs. Upon project end, the sustainability of outcomes will principally rest upon the capacity and the will of the AGPO to promote SLM practices to their members AGPOs are well-established organisations in the oases. Their ability to promote sustainable development now rests on three factors (i) the adequate functioning of AGPO specialized committees; (ii) the adequate functioning of AGPO unions, which have an important role to play in terms of knowledge exchange and relationship-building with external institutions and actors and fundraising; the ability of MICOs (Microfinance institutions) to become modern microfinance institutions, able to respond to the financial needs of oasis populations." (TE p. 117)

Indeed, the sustainability of the project appears to largely rest on the will and interest of the AGPOs in pursuing SLM and encouraging its members to do so. The TE mentions that 90% of AGPOs were evaluated as being well functioning, and that the strength and capacities of AGPOs and their unions were strengthened as part of the project. The TE rates the institutional sustainability as likely. (TE p.26).

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely

As agricultural activities intensify in the oases, the pressure on groundwater might become too large and unsustainable. This should be carefully studied when attempted to promote the development of agriculture in the oases. (TE pp. 110-111)

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?

Actual co-financing was US \$17.64m or 100.49% of the originally committed sum of US \$17.56m; there were therefore no financial constraints imposed on the project due to co-financing.

The GEF project was a supplementary component to an existing IFAD project (OSDP-PDDO), and could not have taken place on its own. Indeed, the co-financing amounted to about four times the amount contributed by the GEF. In that respect, the co-financing was absolutely essential to the achievement of project objectives.

For example, "the GEF project coordination and management cost, including monitoring and evaluation, is kept at about 12 % of GEF contribution, with OSDP-PDDO covering the expenses of coordination at central level" (Project Document, p.64). In addition to pooled management costs, the co-financed funds provided large investments and complementary initiatives without which the GEF-funded activities would have been unsustainable.

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

There are no reported delays in project start or implementation.

The project end was extended from December 2012 to April 2014 in order to (1) align the end of the GEF component with the end of the IFDA project and to (2) improve the sustainability of the project (TE p.21). This had the effect of improving project outcomes and sustainability, as more time was available to make the required environmental investment and to provide continuous training on SLM to the local population.

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:

Unfortunately, the main mechanism through which the Mauritanian government was going to drive change, the CNC-GDT (Conseil National de Coordination de la GDT – National Council for SLM Coordination) has only met three times to support the integration of SLM into national strategies and policies (TE p.10). The Mauritanian government was also in charge of setting up the groundwater monitoring network through the CNRE (National Water Resources Center). The lack of active participation from various government bodies directly impacted project outcomes, especially those that depended to a large extent on government activities. This also significantly reducing the impact of the project and its sustainability.

We consequently assess country ownership as quite low, although this is not a topic that was clearly addressed in the TE.

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 project appears to have had a clear M&E strategy in place from the start, including the monitoring of results and tracking of progress. The Project Document (pp.58-61, 125-128) clearly describes the planned M&E activities, reporting structure, M&E time frame and M&E responsibilities. A plan was made for a baseline assessment to be made, and smart indicators were defined and presented in the Project Document (pp. 76-83) in the form of a well defined logical framework including goals, objectives, objectively verifiable indicators, means of verification and relevant project risks to consider. M&E for this project was integrated to the OSDP-PDDO project M&E, which was designed to be participatory (TE pp. 116-117).

Overall, this TER assesses M&E design at entry to have been highly satisfactory due to it having met all good practice guidelines for M&E design, and sufficient to monitor and evaluate project success.

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

The TE confirms that the OSDO-PDDO participatory M&E strategy was overall successfully implemented. Planned evaluation activities for the project seem to have been successfully conducted, with two high-quality reviews (mid-term and final) having been produced for this project.

However, monitoring activities for the GEF component of the project do not appear to have been as successful. According to the TE, "despite the completeness of the M&E system set up at the beginning of the project, the project suffered from severe monitoring data gaps, delays in data provision, and poor data analysis. Generally, activity reports are very descriptive and do not always contain the quantitative information required on activities and results achieved, or relevant comparisons to baseline or performance indicators defined in the project document (TE

p.117)”. The TE explains that shortages in personnel and the difficulty in hiring an M&E specialist before 2012 contributed to the some of the project’s poor M&E practices (TE p.13).

The TE provides some evidence that the recommendations made in the mid-term review and the data collected as part of monitoring activities were provided in time to be used to adapt and improve project performance (TE p.73). For example, the TE suggests that the mid-term review catalyzed the development of a stronger partnership with local and regional authorities, which was essential to the success of the project. On the other hand, there also appears to be important recommendations made in the mid-term evaluation that were not taken into consideration, including one related to the better planning of commercialization activities (TE p.30).

Given this project’s overall functional M&E system and some data collection weaknesses, this TER assigns a rating of moderately satisfactory.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The implementing agency for this project is the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD). The TE does not provide a rating for project implementation. This TER assesses project implementation as satisfactory.

The GEF successfully collaborated with IFAD to design a complementary project to the Oasis Sustainable Development Programme. GEF financing complemented IFAD’s support to poor rural oasis communities by furthering the positive environmental impact of the IFAD project and boosting the sustainability of the project. This TER found the project design to be very detailed and well developed.

IFAD was in charge of project implementation and, according to the TE, demonstrated a high level of flexibility that ultimately improved project outcomes. IFAD successfully managed to

oversee the project, supervise activities and make useful recommendations for improvements. (TE p.23)

The TE does not mention any implementation shortcomings from the GEF or IFAD.

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

The TE rates the performance of the Rural Development Ministry (MDR), the main executing agency for this project, as moderately unsatisfactory. This TER also assesses project execution to have been moderately unsatisfactory due to severe shortcomings of the MDR that affected project outcomes.

The OSDP-PDDO project was implemented by a Programme Coordination Unit (UCP) and four Regional Support Groups, supervised by the MDR. The MDR respected the technical administrative autonomy of the UCP, and disbursed its co-financing in a timely and regular fashion.

However, during the project, collaborations had to be broken with some of the regional government bodies due to their lack of performance. Those bodies included the MDR regional delegations from Adrar, Hodh El Chargui and Hodh El Garbi). In addition, the position of M&E manager, which the MDR was in charge of filling, stayed vacant for at least two years. The MDR's collaboration with the Environment Ministry did not generate any meaningful result. Finally, an important activity the MDR was supposed to accomplish, the setting up of a groundwater monitoring network, did not take place, further demonstrating the MDR's shortcomings in executing planned project activities. (TE pp.23-24)

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 inclusion of the GEF project in the IFAD OSDP-PDDO project “effectively generated environment and economic benefits by catalyzing investments in SLM, sand dune

encroachment, agro-biodiversity management and water resources management.” (TE p.105) Overall, project activities enabled the effective protection of oases against wadi flooding, sand dune encroachment and animal misdemeanor. The project also successfully protected the genetic heritage of the date palm tree, improved water irrigation techniques and promoted better water resource management techniques. The project also reduced human pressure on the natural environment. (TE pp. 108-110) All of those achievements would not have taken place in the absence of the GEF project and represent important environmental change.

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 “improved the means of subsistence of oasis populations through environmentally-friendly investments” (TE p.105). The environmental practices promoted as part of the OSPD-PDDO most definitely contributed to the increase in the resilience of local populations to climate change in those parts of the Sahel particularly sensitive to extreme weather events (droughts, floods). The innovations developed in terms of water management and genetic diversity of the palm tree have contributed to reducing the negative impacts of climate change for households (TE p. 110).

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

Efforts were made to build the SLM capacity of several relevant actors, including delegates of the Environment Ministry and 473 AGPO members. However, an insufficient follow-up has meant the capacity-building activities have not been particularly effective. (TE p.108)

b) Governance

There were no changes in Governance reported by this 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.

The TE and other project documents do not mention any unintended impact.

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.

It was the intention of the project for the demonstrable effects from SLM to trigger further support for the approach and extend it to much of the oasis territory (PD, p.23). Indeed, this project took a 'pilot' approach, with the intention that the approach taken would be up-scaled to "cover the majority of the oasis territory" and elsewhere (PD, pp.47-48). However, at project completion, there was no evidence of scale-up.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The TE does not provide key lessons specific to the GEF component of the project, but general lessons learned as part of the OSPD programme, of which this project was a component. Lessons are broad and generalizable, and therefore could have application for other GEF projects. For this reason, the TER lists all key lessons below.

1. The committee in charge of capacity-building in the AGPO is an important driver in the organizational and technical development of oasis associations
2. Partnerships with local and regional authorities have, since the beginning of the project, been a determining factor for success.
3. Commercialization activities need to be planned and anticipated so as not to handicap the value chain.
4. A certain number of technical innovations related to irrigation and palm tree conservation need to be disseminated.
5. The role of unions and Economic Interest Groups (GIE) need to be made very clear.
6. The necessary means to conduct M&E need to be made available as early as the project design stage.
7. The comparative monitoring of AGPO performance has positive effects in terms of competence increase. (TE pp.29-31)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

The TE does not provide recommendations specific to the GEF component of the project, but recommendations formulated for the OSPD programme, of which this project was a component. Lessons are broad and generalizable, and therefore could have application for other GEF projects. For this reason, the TER lists all key recommendations below.

1. Continue the AGPO autonomization process
2. Promote frameworks for consultation
3. Continuously develop AGPO capacities
4. Ensure the viability of MICOs
5. Promote the valorization and commercialization of oasis products
6. Continue promoting solar pumping
7. Improve knowledge of available water reserves.
8. Promote oasis entrepreneurship and further consolidate revenue diversification
9. Continue to improve land access.
10. Consolidate scientific research on the palm tree
11. Mobilize resources to consolidate resources and scale up activities

(TE pp.32-35)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF EO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Very detailed outcomes description, both in terms of narrative and data.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and ratings are always substantiated with quantitative (whenever possible) and qualitative evidence, referring to the project document's proposed indicators. Annexes are rich in evidence. Report does not offer clear ratings for project implementation and M&E.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	Sustainability is adequately discussed in its various components.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned section is extremely detailed, offers a comprehensive overview of lessons, and will provide a useful reference to any potential next phases of the project.	HS
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity)	Yes, all actual cost and co-financing figures are included.	HS

and actual co-financing used?		
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	M&E systems are only briefly discussed in the report, and no rating is given. However, the M&E design at entry is described, as well as issues encountered during implementation. The report contains information about how information generated by the M&E system was used, but this is not discussed in the M&E section	MS
Overall TE Rating		HS

Formula used: $0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(6+5) + 0.1(6+6+6+4) = 3.3 + 2.2 = 5.5$

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

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