

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2015

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3384	
GEF Agency project ID		P109737	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		WB	
Project name		Nigeria Scaling Up Sustainable Land Management Practice, Knowledge, and Coordination	
Country/Countries		Nigeria	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation (LD)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LD SO 1 & 2; SP 1	
Executing agencies involved		Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development	
NGOs/CBOs involvement			
Private sector involvement			
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		7/8/2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		12/16/2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2013	
Actual date of project completion		12/31/2013	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		6.8	
Co-financing <sup>1</sup>	IA own	71.35	
	Government	21.8	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	4.96	
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	.99	
Total GEF funding		6.8	6.8
Total Co-financing		99.1	
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		105.9	6.8
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 28,2014	
Author of TE		Sheu Salau	
TER completion date		12/11/2015	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

<sup>1</sup> Co-financing information is not provided in the TE. Figures for co-financing at endorsement are taken from the Midterm Review co-financing document.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	S	U	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		M <sup>2</sup>	NR	MU
M&E Design		NR	M <sup>3</sup>	MU
M&E Implementation		NR	M	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	MU	MU
Quality of Execution		S	S	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		--	U	U

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective (GEO) of the project is “to improve the enabling environment for scaling up sustainable land management in participating communities” (TE pg. vii).

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective (DO) of the project is the same as the Global Environmental Objective (please see above).

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

The TE notes that the GEO/DO was not formally revised (TE pg.3), however the GEO/DO was stated differently in the PD than in the TE and the PIRs. In the PD, the GEO/DO reads: “to reinforce capacities of stakeholders to reduce the threat of land degradation and climate risks on ecosystems in participating communities (PD pg. 11).

## 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.

<sup>2</sup> The TE uses a different scale for assessing sustainability. The TE provides a rating of Moderate for the “overall risk to development outcome.”

<sup>3</sup> The World Bank uses a different scale for assessing M&E; M=Modest.

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

The TE provides a rating of High for project relevance. This TER, which uses a different scale, adjusts this rating to **Satisfactory**.

The project is in line with the country’s strategies for increasing sustainable agricultural practices, particularly the President’s 7 Point Agenda, Nigeria’s Vision 2020, Nigeria’s UN National Action Programme to Combat Desertification, and the National Economic Empowerment and Development Strategy (NEEDS). The project also builds on previous GEF investments in Nigeria. The project was designed to be fully integrated into the World Bank International Development Association (IDA)-supported Third National Fadama Development Project (Fadama III), a large-scale national community-driven rural development program. The previous iteration, Fadama II, had a GEF project which promoted alternative land use practices (CEMP). This project was designed to follow-up on successful experienced and lessons from CEMP (TE pg. 2).

The project outcomes were also consistent with GEF’s Land Degradation (LD) focal area. The project contributes to the implementation of LD Strategic Objective 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 Objective 2, *to upscale SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods*.

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

The TE provides a rating of “substantial” for “Achievement of Global Environmental Objectives.” This TER downgrades this rating to **Moderately Satisfactory** for project effectiveness. The project achieved key results that contribute toward creating an enabling environment for the scaling up SLM. However, the TE, while demonstrating the scope and scale of the project’s initiatives, provides limited evidence of an increase in *capacity* of participants, which is the main outcome of the project. The TE does note that by project end, stakeholder perception of the presence of an enabling environment for SLM had shifted upward from 3.23 at baseline to 5.66 on a Perception Based Composite Index (TE pg. 14).

It should be noted here that the TE does not assess the expected outcomes of the project as outlined in the project’s logical framework. In general, the TE discusses broad categories of activities which loosely track with the project design. Alternatively, this TER assesses the expected outcomes as outlined in the logical framework. A summary of the achievement of results, by outcome, is provided below:

## Component A: Capacity Building, Communication and Support

- **Outcome 1: Improved participation of communities in management of natural resources**  
Under this outcome, it was expected that at least 10%, or 740 Fadama Community Associations (FCAs), would have selected SLM sub-projects for inclusion in their Local Development Plans (LDPs). The project exceeded this target by 260% (1,924 FCAs) (TE pgs. vii-viii). 93% of these sub-projects were fully implemented (TE pg. 12).
- **Outcome 2: Improved capacity of stakeholders to advise on or implement SLM**  
Under this outcome, it was expected that at least 7,400 FCAs would be reached through training and/or communications on SLM practices/planning. By project end, 5,185 FCAs were reached, achieving 70% of the target. In addition, 3,672 community facilitators, extension and advisory staff, and government staff were reached through trainings, out of the expected 4,714 (78%) (TE pg. vii). At project end, 286,621 hectares were brought under SLM practices across participating states (TE pg. 14).
- **Outcome 3: Strengthened capacity of participating local government authorities for participatory planning**  
Under this outcome, it was expected that 62 Local Government Areas (LGAs) would receive training on land use planning, and the project fully achieved this target (TE pg. vii). In addition, the project provided all 62 LGAs with computer and Arc GIS software to be used for rural land use planning. However, the TE provides no evidence that the capacity of LGAs for participatory planning was strengthened.
- **Outcome 4: Improved capacity of Federal and State institutions to coordinate on rural land and water management across sectors**  
Under this outcome, it was expected that at least 20 state governments would participate in the development of Nigeria's multi-sector SLM Investment Framework. By project end, 30 state governments had participated, exceeding the target by 150% (TE pg. viii). The SLM framework was ultimately adopted by the government of Nigeria and a National SLM Committee was created (TE pg. 13).

## Component B: Monitoring, Evaluation and Knowledge

- **Outcome 5: Knowledge on SLM is increasingly accessible to stakeholders.**  
Under this outcome, it was expected that improved monitoring tools would be developed to track the adoption of SLM practices and changes in land productivity, and two such tools were developed by project end. In addition, 90 key people were trained in applying the new monitoring tools and a SLM information system was developed (TE pg. vii-ix)

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

The TE provides a rating of “substantial” for project efficiency. This TER, which uses a scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project experienced a five month delay in project start-up due to a tenuous political situation in late 2010/early 2011 (TE pg. 5). That said, the project was completed within the expected timeline and there is no indication that the initial delays affected the achievement of project outcomes. Additionally, the project was fully integrated into the existing management structures of the Third National Fadama Development Project (Fadama III) which resulted in cost-savings and reduced the initial learning curve of project staff (TE pg. 6).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: <b>Moderately Unlikely</b>
--------------------	------------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of “moderate” for the overall risk to development outcome, although it provides little evidence to justify this rating. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Moderately Unlikely** for project sustainability.

#### **Financial Resources**

This TER assesses the sustainability of financial resources as **Moderately Unlikely**. With the World Bank’s support, the government of Nigeria has developed a new \$500 million project, the Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project (NEWMAP), to reduce vulnerability to soil erosion in targeted sub-watersheds. The TE notes that NEWMAP has taken on “some of the good practices” of the project and has complementary components, such as (1) support for on-the-ground interventions to help reduce vulnerability to land degradation, (2) support to institutions and information services which will strengthen the enabling environment for effective implementation of erosion and watershed management, and (3) support to enhance Nigeria’s capacity to promote low carbon, climate resilient development (TE of. 10). However, there has been no indication that there are financial resources available to directly sustain the project’s outputs.

#### **Socio-Political**

This TER assesses socio-political sustainability as **Moderately Unlikely**. There is no evidence provided in the TE to suggest that any of the awareness raising efforts and trainings translated into an increase in capacity which could sustain project activities in the future. A survey in 2014 did find that 93.1% of beneficiaries found the project to be highly relevant to their needs, which suggests that they see it in their interest to continue project activities (TE pg. 37).

## **Institutional Framework and Governance**

This TER assess the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Moderately Likely**. The adoption of the SLM Investment Framework has led to a more coordinated cross-sectoral approach to SLM in Nigeria (TE pg. 13). 30 states also produced their own state-specific investment frameworks (pg. 40). The National SLM Committee is also preparing a National Agriculture Resilience Framework which supports SLM practices. Additionally, the government established an Environment and Climate Change Unit within the Department of Land Resources. However, these initiatives are relatively new and likely tenuous, and the TE does note that government commitment varies between federal and state levels (TE pg. 18).

## **Environmental**

There is not enough information provided in the TE to assess environmental sustainability.

## **5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes**

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE does not provide any information regarding co-financing, although \$99.1 million in co-financing was committed at endorsement. Additionally, the Midterm Review co-financing document indicates that \$3.61 million in co-financing was disbursed by the midterm review.

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

The project was delayed initially due to the political situation in late 2010/early 2011. Despite the initial delays, the TE notes that the project activities were implemented expediently and the project was completed on time (TE pg. 19). The TE does not indicate that the initial delays affected the project outcomes or sustainability.

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 TE does not directly address country ownership over the project, although it does note that the government demonstrated a strong commitment to the project (TE pg. 20). The TE also notes that the direct disbursement approach to communities engendered ownership over the project (TE pg. 8). Additionally, the Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development was the executing agency for the project which indicates some level of ownership over the project.

## 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>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
------------------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E Design at entry. Dedicated funding for M&E is provided for in the PD (\$.80 million), including provisions for M&E staff within Fadama III's national coordination office (NFCO). A baseline survey was conducted in 2009 under Fadama III and the data collected from this survey was intended to provide information on household/community perceptions of land quality and risk reduction measures and adoption rates of SLM practices. The PD also outlined plans for developing and implementing four monitoring tools for tracking the following information: (1) composite index on stakeholder perception, (2) adoption rates of SLM practices, (3) global and local environmental benefits from the SLM practice, and (4) land productivity, land degradation, and overall ecosystem function nationwide. (PD pg. 81).

However, the results framework outlined in the project document, while logical, does not fully track with the program design outlined in the narrative. The program design laid out in the narrative is organized by sub-components that are not explicitly linked to the outcomes outlined in the logical framework. It is therefore difficult to ascertain the expected outcomes of the project. Furthermore, the outcome indicators provided in the logical framework are not sufficient for tracking progress toward project objectives. The indicators simply track the scope and scale of the project (number of people trained, number of communities reached through training, number of participating state governments, etc.). The composite index tracked changes in stakeholder perception of the enabling environment for SLM, rather than actual changes in SLM enabling conditions.

<b>6.2 M&amp;E Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-----------------------------------	--

The TE does not provide a rating for M&E Implementation. The TE does note that the project had a functioning M&E system, and that the M&E officers were adequately trained at the national and sub-national levels. The State Fadama Coordination Offices (SFCO) were able to regularly track and report on output and outcome level indicators (TE pgs. 8-9). It is unclear from the TE whether the monitoring tools proposed in the PD were developed and utilized, other than the composite index on stakeholder perception. There is no evidence presented in the TE that would suggest that the project tracked global and local environmental benefits from SLM practice, for example. The TE does note that the M&E data

collected “formed the basis for the technical assistance carried out regularly by NFCO to states, engagement with policy makers at all levels and provided input into the focus of supervision missions)” (TE pg. 9).

## 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.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
--	--

The TE provides a rating of Satisfactory for Bank Performance in Ensuring Quality at Entry and Quality of Supervision. This TER downgrades this rating to Moderately Unsatisfactory for Quality of Project Implementation due to inconsistencies in the project design and inadequate indicators. The TE also notes that the project scope was somewhat ambitious given the length of the project (pg. 6). On the other hand, the decision to integrate the project into Fadama III was largely successful. Additionally, the World Bank and the government of Nigeria led joint supervisory missions of the project on a regular basis and provided support to building the NFCO’s capacity in procurement and financial management (TE pg. 19).

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

The TE provides a rating of Satisfactory for Implementing Agency Performance,<sup>4</sup> and this TER concurs. The Federal Ministry of Agriculture and Water Resources was responsible for the execution of the project under the National Food Reserve Agency (NFRA). The NFRA delegated the coordination of project execution to the National Fadama Coordination Office (NFCO) (PD pg. 21). The TE notes that the NFCO staff were competent and familiar with World Bank operational procedures, with limited initial project learning curves (TE pgs. 6-7). Although there were initial delays in start-up, the project was able to implement the planned activities within the given timeframe. Overall, M&E and financial requirements were managed satisfactorily and the grant was fully-disbursed (TE pg. 20).

---

<sup>4</sup> The TE refers to the Executing Agency as Implementing Agency



## 8. Assessment of Project Impacts

**Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.**

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not cite any environmental changes that occurred by the end of the project.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

There are no socioeconomic changes cited in the TE. The project did incorporate SLM compatible income-generating sub-projects, but the TE does not report any changes that resulted from these sub-projects.

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 TE provides limited evidence to support an increase in capacity, although this was the main focus of the project. The TE does note that 3,672 community facilitators, extension and advisory staff, and government staff were reached through trainings on SLM practices (TE pg. vii). At project end, 286,621 hectares were brought under SLM practices across participating states, which suggests some change in capacity (TE pg. 14).

## b) Governance

As a result of this project, a multi-sector SLM Investment Framework was adopted by the Nigerian Government (TE pg. 13). 30 states also produced their own state-specific investment frameworks (pg. 40). An Environment and Climate Change Unit has also been established within the Department of Land Resources (TE pg. 10).

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 does not cite 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 mentioned above, the government of Nigeria has developed a new \$500 million project, the Nigeria Erosion and Watershed Management Project (NEWMAP), which incorporates aspects of the GEF project (TE pg. 10). The TE does not note any other instances of mainstreaming or replication.

## 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 states the following lessons learned (pg. 21):

- **Utilizing a CDD approach, with community capacity building as an entry point, can be effective for promoting sustainable livelihoods of communities who depend directly on their natural environment and improving governance of SLM.** The project demonstrated the positive role of trained communities; facilitator and other stakeholder can play in restoring degraded soils. Through this bottom-up approach that expanded local capacity and promoted community empowerment, the project achieved important results in improving the enabling environment for scaling up of SLM. Individual participating communities and network of facilitators including other key stakeholder drove project implementation processes through participatory model that promoted co-responsibility.

- **Sustainable Land Management efforts provide an important opportunity to engage women as active agents of reversing land degradation rather than passive recipients of adaptation support.** Women are disproportionately vulnerable to the impacts of land degradation, and this must be addressed when supporting communities' ability to reverse its negative impact and adapt to climate variability. This way, project will achieve twin goal of addressing land degradation and as well promote gender mainstreaming in natural resource management.
- **Incentives matter for scaling up SLM practices.** Reducing land degradation and adoption of SLM often comes at a cost and tend to require medium to longer term investment by land user. However, some market failures such as lack of credit, technology or knowledge could serve as barrier to such investment. Market based incentives such as co-financing (matching grant) from government have proven to be effective in helping land user overcome initial investment constraints.
- **Ambitious targets overstate the scope of what project could deliver.** There is a need to balance between having maximum project impact and overstating scope of what project can realistically achieve. Unrealistic targets limit the scope of impact of project upfront and places undue burden on project implementation unit to deliver results. During project preparation it is important to set realistic targets so as not to overstretch PIUs or spread impact of project too thinly.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not provide a recommendations section.

## 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 does not assess expected outcomes, but rather discusses broad categories of activities. There is some indicator data provided which demonstrates the scope and scale of the project.	<b>U</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence provided is not sufficient to substantiate most of the ratings provided.	<b>U</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report provides a brief assessment of financial, social, institutional and governmental risks to the development objective and post-completion operations.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are not comprehensive and no recommendations are provided.	<b>U</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not provide any information on co-financing.	<b>HU</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides an inaccurate analysis of the M&E design at entry. It's assessment of M&E implementation is adequate.	<b>MU</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>U</b>

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

Midterm Review Co-Financing Report