

# Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3383	
GEF Agency project ID		GEF 15	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Agricultural and Rural Rehabilitation and Development Initiative (PASADEM)	
Country/Countries		Niger	
Region		West and Central Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SO1: 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.  SO2: To upscale SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods.	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		AREN and Karkara	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		9/4/2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		10/6/2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2016	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.15	0
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		4.2	4.13
Co-financing	IA own	8.59	21.17
	Government	2.26	2.6
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	4.43
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	1.03	0.31
Total GEF funding		4.35	4.13
Total Co-financing		11.87	28.51
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		16.22	32.64
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		11/9/2016	
Author of TE		IFAD Evaluation Office	

<b>TER completion date</b>	11/28/2017
<b>TER prepared by</b>	Ritu Kanotra
<b>TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)</b>	Spandana Battula

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the CEO Endorsement, the Development Objective of the project is to reduce poverty and food insecurity in rural households in the Maradi region by empowering them to identify and adopt sustainable land management practices that are appropriate to the local context, and that will increase the productivity and profitability of their crops, livestock and forestry in the short term, while ensuring the long-term livelihood strategies and well-being of current and future generations (CEO Endorsement, Pg 20).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the CEO Endorsement, the Global Environmental Objective of the project is to overcome the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the structure and functional integrity of the Maradi region's ecosystem resources through addressing the barriers and bottlenecks to scaling up successful sustainable land management technologies (CEO Endorsement, Pg 20). The project had two components as detailed below:

**Component 1: Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in development planning at the departmental and local level-** Specific outputs included a multi-stakeholder Sustainable Land Management platform established for the Maradi region, meeting on a regular basis; A core group of district and commune level subject matter specialists to work with rural communities in the planning, implementation and monitoring of community based Sustainable Land Management investment plans, Sustainable Land Management information dissemination and knowledge management systems improved within Maradi region.

**Component 2 – Reversing Land Degradation Through On-the-ground Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Investments-** Specific outputs included a minimum of 36 village areas having undertaken a base line assessment of the degradation status of their natural resources and prepared community-based gestion de terroir investment plans for Sustainable Land Management interventions and covered under a variety of innovative field level Sustainable Land Management practices; where the environmental and socio-economic impact of implementing plans are regularly monitored and assessed with village development committees and operational watershed/landscape management sub-committees trained and equipped to plan, implement monitor field level Sustainable Land Management activities within their area of jurisdiction.

**Component 3 – Promoting Conservation Agriculture and Environment-Friendly Alternative Income Sources** - A minimum of 100 farmers centred conservation agriculture validation trials and demonstration conducted with the aim of identifying and disseminating locally appropriate conservation agriculture practices; a set of detailed recommendations for the promotion of alternative ‘environment friendly’ ecosystem resource based livelihoods suited to the ecosystem resources of the Maradi region; a set of technical manuals for the promotion of alternative environment friendly income generating activities; a series of training sessions on managerial and technical skills for the promotion environment friendly income generating activities and for the promotion of environment friendly income generating activities with technical backstopping for the implementation of micro-projects.

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

The TE doesn’t report any changes in the global environmental or development objectives of the project.

#### 4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

Based on the evidence in the CEO endorsement document, the TER assesses the relevance as ‘satisfactory’, the same rating assigned by the TE. The project was designed to contribute to the overall operational goal of the **GEF focal area on Land Degradation (LD)**, with specific long-term strategic priorities as **SO 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 **SO 2: To upscale SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods**, both of which were aimed at integrating the environmental concerns into national development planning. The project responded and was fully consistent with the **National Plan for Environment and Sustainable Development (1998)** and the **Sectoral Consultation on Environment (2004)**. The project represented a major advance in implementation of both the **National Action Programme of the UNCCD (NAP/CCD-NRM, 2000)** and the **Rural Development Strategy (RDS, 2003)**.

4.2 <b>Effectiveness</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE provides a summary of achievements, based on which this TER concurs with the rating assigned to the effectiveness of the project as ‘satisfactory’. The project achieved significant results across all the components, including establishment of a regional Sustainable Land Management platform and a tri-partite partnership with World Food Program (WFP) and a partner organization for implementation of the Cash for Work activities; capacity of a wide range of institutions (NGOs, communes and Government departments) enhanced paving the way for sustainable land management in the Maradi region,

restoration of degraded lands in all 36 target villages and promotion of conservation agriculture including support to the income generating activities at the target sites.

**Component 1: Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in development planning at the departmental and local level - Satisfactory**

According to the TE, the project was instrumental in the establishment of regional Sustainable Land Management platform and the institutional capacity building of NGOs (7) and groups for implementation of Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR); 3 NGOs for the restoration of degraded lands; 20 communes and 6 departments for the recovery of agro-pastoral lands. The project also facilitated an innovative tripartite partnership with World For Food Program and a partner NGO (AREN and Karkara) for the implementation of Cash for Work activities made it possible to exceed all the initial objectives in terms of land reclamation. A technical assistance agreement signed with the Regional Directorate of Environment, who appointed focal points to the project to ensure the technical follow-up of the activities. Village Management and Monitoring Committees (COGES), were also set up to ensure local management and regular monitoring of the developed sites.

**Component 2 – Reversing Land Degradation Through On-the-ground Sustainable Land Management Investments - Satisfactory**

As per the TE, the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) interventions were implemented through the Cash for Assets (CFA) approach in partnership with World Food Program (WFP). The project supported the recovery of degraded lands in all 36 target villages; the recovery of degraded agro-pastoral lands on 13,780 ha, production of 1,170,657 forest seedlings by local nursery growers, seeding of grass forage species on 14,446 ha, promotion of the ANR on 90 481 ha.

**Component 3 – Promoting Conservation Agriculture and Environment-Friendly Alternative Income Sources - Satisfactory**

As per the TE, the intervention under this GEF component allowed to conduct tests in 83 Farmer Field Schools (FFS) and fund 5 Income Generating Activities (IGAs). Other achievements included 140 ha of eucalyptus plantations deserted to support agricultural conversion of reconverted land, 15 km of firewalls. The funding allowed to disseminate 11,000 improved stoves to reduce wood fuel consumption, restore 16 ha of pasture land and build 6 pastoral wells. As per the TE, ‘the average yield of rainfed crops increased by 20 to 80% depending on the crop (from 213 kg/ha to 459 kg/ha for millet)’ (TE, Pt 7).

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

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE as ‘satisfactory’. The amount of co-financing realised was more than the actual commitment at the design stage, as the project collaborated with other programmes as World Food Programme (WFP) and exceeded targets for some of the outputs under the project. The TE notes that the investment cost ratio (90.24%) and administrative cost (9.76%) of the GEF component funding was slightly higher than the projected rate at project design (7.5% for USD 314 000), which according to the TE, was still satisfactory despite the significant operating costs mainly due to inflation, the longer implementation period of the project (the project was endorsed in 2009 and implementation started in 2011) and increase in the number of activities supported through the project.

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

The TE assesses the overall sustainability of the project as ‘satisfactory’, which this TER has rated as ‘moderately likely’. While the project had good support from the government, with ownership from all the relevant stakeholders at the national and local levels, and the communities convinced about the benefits, there is still a risk to the outcomes of the project if the communities are not able to get a suitable market and prices for their produce, due to significant poverty in the area. Risk to sustainability is assessed along its four dimensions below:

**Financial: Moderately Likely**

The TE confirms that the Sustainable Land Management field level investment provided tangible financial benefits to those rural households involved in their implementation, who are also likely to sustain their profitable livelihoods. The TE notes that the project outputs will be further consolidated and scaled up as part of IFAD's Family Farming Support Programme in Tahoua, Maradi and Zinder (ProDAF) regions that will include new GEF funding from 2017 as well. But the TE notes that despite efforts through the project and in the past, poverty in the Maradi region was still high, which posed a challenge in getting a fair price and market for agricultural produce, due to which the financial sustainability is rated as ‘moderately likely’.

**Socio-political: Likely**

The project had good support from the government that also reached out to other stakeholders such as NGOs and local communes that enhanced the local ownership of the project. Their involvement in planning and implementation of the village area's *gestion de terroir* plans contributed to the improved management of the local land resources and the sustainability of the Sustainable Land Management investments.

**Institutional: Likely**

Involvement of key national, and local level institutional stakeholders in the planning and implementation of project activities, is expected to contribute to the long-term sustainability of the project's investments. The project built the technical capacity of the various institutions and led to the establishment of Sustainable Land Management platform that is likely facilitate the sustainability of the project through integration of concepts and principles of Sustainable Land Management into the plans and policies linked with environmental management and economic development of the Maradi region.

**Environmental: Likely**

The TE briefly mentions the risk due to climate change but doesn't elaborate on this point. The Project Document also didn't identify any environmental risks, due to which it can be assumed that the project outcomes do not face any immediate risks from external environmental factors.

## 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?

Against a total of \$11,878,000 committed in the CEO endorsement document, the project mobilized a total co-financing of \$28,509,000. The project partnered with World Food Program (WFP) for implementation of the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) related activities that brought an additional co-financing of \$4,434,000 to the project. Also, as per the TE, IFAD contribution was recorded at \$21,169,000 as against the original commitment of \$8,583,000. This is probably due to collaboration with other IFAD projects in the area. Such partnerships resulted in increase in the area and activities covered under the project.

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 is no mention of delays in the implementation of the project.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The project seemed to have a good ownership from the government. The project achieved most of the targets with significant contribution from the government, both in terms of the co-financing and cooperation between the various government departments at the national and regional level.

## 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.

<b>6.1 M&amp;E Design at entry</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE didn't assign a rating but based on the evidence in the project document, this TER assigns it a 'satisfactory' rating. The project document included a detailed logical framework as the basis of M&E (PD, Pg, 62). It included indicative indicators that needed to be 're-examined and improved upon' before the start of implementation (PD, Pg 6). It is not clear if these indicators were re-worked before implementation. However, it clearly specified the responsibilities, different reporting requirements and timelines, had a provision for baseline and for participatory monitoring, with budget assigned to different components of the M&E, due to which it is provided with a 'satisfactory' rating.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: <b>Unable to assess</b>
------------------------	---------------------------------

There is no information in the TE to assess this aspect.

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

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the 'quality of project implementation' as satisfactory. The TE noted that 'the technical assistance provided by IFAD, has been a strong lever in implementing support activities for beneficiary populations' (TE, Pt 10) , which shows that IFAD technical backstopping was satisfactory. The project was also able to collaborate with other IFAD projects in the region, with a higher amount co-financing contribution from IFAD than was originally planned, due to which the project exceeded targets for some of the outputs.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
----------------------------------	-----------------------------

This TER concurs with the rating assigned to the 'quality of project execution' as satisfactory. The evidence in the report indicates that the project had a good support and was executed in collaboration with the various concerned departments (at national and regional level) within the Ministry of Agriculture, the main executing agency of the project. The project was also able to foster partnerships with various NGOs and communes and tap into their expertise, which shows that executing agency reached out to wider stakeholders for implementation of the project. The project was also able to mobilize a higher level of co-financing from the government than was originally planned, indicating sufficient support received from the government in implementing the project.

## 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.

As per the TE, 'protection capacity of the plant cover against erosion and bad weather increased from 25% to 60%. The vegetation increase has a positive impact on carbon sequestration. Thus, the carbon



footprint is positive (6,142,621 tco<sub>2</sub>eq of carbon), not including the enteric fermentation linked to the breeding activity' (TE, Pt 7).

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.

As per the TE, 'implementation of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) activities allowed to transfer more than 3 billion CFAF in the form of Cash for Works (CfW) and significantly reduced household food insecurity in the project's localities. The average yield of rainfed crops increased from 20 to 80% depending on the crop (from 213 kg/ha to 459 kg/ha for millet)' (TE, Pt 7).

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 institutional capacity building of local organisations - seven NGOs and groups (Association des Jeunes d'Aguié (AJA), Association pour le Développement Intégré par la Participation Communautaire (ADIPAC), Plan Global pour l'Environnement et le Développement Rural (PGDER), Promotion d'un Modèle de Développement (PROMODEL), YANAHI, TATALLI, Groupement RNA de Dan Saga) for skills in the implementation of Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR) and three (3) NGOs (Association pour la Redynamisation de l'Elevage au Niger (AREN), NGO Karkara and Goulbi) for the restoration of degraded lands. As per the TE, these institutions are likely to be involved in the future for similar intervention in the area.

#### b) Governance

As per the TE, the project led to the establishment of a regional Sustainable Land Management platform and a tri-partite partnership with World Food Program (WFP) and another partner organizations (NGOs AREN and Karkara) for implementation of the Cash for Work activities (TE, Pt 9).

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 doesn't 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.

As per the TE, the consolidation and scaling-up of activities is planned as part of IFAD's Family Support Programme in Tahoua, Maradi and Zinder (ProDAF) regions. ProDAF, which began in 2015, also included new GEF funding from 2017.

## 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 key lessons listed in the TE are detailed below:

1. Multi-stakeholder partnership with development partners and technical assistance provided by IFAD has been a strong lever in implementing support activities for beneficiary populations. This partnership is also a good example of collaboration between United Nations Agencies operating in the same region for sustainable land management
2. Establishment of a sharing and exchange framework through monthly meetings of project implementation stakeholders facilitated the coordination and management of activities in the field, ensuring coherence of activities.
3. Establishment of an infrastructure management system (inputs and seeds bank) that puts farmers' organisations at the heart of the process is a guarantee of the project's achievements sustainability.

### At Sustainable Land Management implementation level

4. *Sida cordifolia*, an invasive species that cannot be controlled in a single year of intervention, and hence the need to make a consolidation for several years, with a strengthening of herbaceous seedling.
5. The effective involvement of the administrative and customary authorities, especially in the awareness-raising activities, favoured the scaling up of the Assisted Natural Regeneration (ANR).
6. The Sustainable Land Management (SLM) platform – a multi-stakeholder consultation framework created to promote the adoption of SLM practices must seek financial independence beyond support of the project.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

1. Site management plans are drawn up and implemented by the beneficiary communities as internal mechanisms capable of making sustainable exploitation of the sites. This innovative approach allows the various recovered sites to self-finance the development work they need.

2. Implementation of the GEF component also made it possible to understand that Sustainable Land Management actions, designed and carried out by the beneficiaries allows the long-term increase of crop, animal production and incomes.

3. Need to strengthen the technical, institutional and organizational capacities of the Village Management and Monitoring Committees (COGES) to fully play their roles as production/marketing actors able to access credit or other types of financing to develop Sustainable Land Management.

4. The communication and results sharing workshop recommended to extend the agreement with the University of Maradi to validate the technical and socio-economic impacts of Sustainable Land Management good practices and give them scientific value in the perspective of scaling up actions.

## 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?	It's not possible to comment on the quality of the TE written in French. This TER was prepared on the basis of English summary of the original TE written in French. Since it couldn't refer to the details in the TE, this TER is unable to comment on the 'quality of the TE'.	UA
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	-	UA
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	-	UA
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	-	UA
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The information related to co-financing and total cost was found to be in sufficient detail in the English summary of the TE.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	-	UA
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>UA</b>

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

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.