1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3390	
GEF Agency project ID		GEF – FSP – 013 SZ (PIR 2012, p.1)	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Lower Usuthu Sustainable Land Management Project (LUSLM) (at the baseline titled LUSIP-GEF)	
Country/Countries		Swaziland	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Land degradation; Biodiversity; Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF Focal Area Strategy: land degradation, biodiversity and climate change/ GEF strategy LD-SP1, BD-SP7, CC-SP4	
Executing agencies involved		Swaziland Ministry of Agriculture and Cooperatives; Swaziland Water and Agricultural Development Enterprise (SWADE)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		secondary executing agency; through consultations (e.g. Yong Nawe, Word Vision and the Lutheran Development Service (LDS) (PD, p.23)"	
Private sector involvement		through consultations (the name of the private companies involved\not specified. Private sector is part of the inter-sector dialogue established through the project) (PD, p.8,p.29)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		05/27/2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		07/2010 (effectively 07/2011, TE, p.4)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		06/2014 (TE,p.4)	
Actual date of project completion		03/2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M) (PD, 04/08/09, p.56)	**At Completion (US $M) (TE,p.4)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1.973	1.973
Co-financing	IA own	6.167	
	Government	2.321	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	0.183	
Total GEF funding		1.973	1.973
Total Co-financing		8.671	8.671
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		10.644	10.644
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		07/2015	
Author of TE		N/A	
TER completion date		12/07/2015	
TER prepared by		Chenhao Liu	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

"The objectives of the LUSIP-GEF are to reduce land degradation, biodiversity loss and mitigate climate change through the application of sustainable land management practices which will contribute to mitigation of, also adaptation to, climate change." (PD, 04/08/2009, p.29)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

"To promote development and mainstreaming of a harmonised, cross-sectoral approach to SLM at the national level; to reduce land degradation, biodiversity loss and mitigate climate change in the Lower Usuthu River Basin area through the application of sustainable land management practices which will contribute to adaptation to climate change; and to improve the livelihood opportunities, resilience and food security of rural communities (men, women and children), including catalyzing development of a range of alternative complimentary livelihood opportunities." (PD, 04/08/2009, p.29)

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

There has been no change in Global Environmental Objectives and Development Objectives.

Based on the feedback of MTR (Mid-Term Review), some indicators in the project's logic framework have been revised downward to make them more realistic to be achieved (TE, p.8)

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**

In a 6-point scale, the TE rated the project's strategic relevance as "Highly Satisfactory". In line with the TE, in a binary scale (Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory) this TER rates the project's strategic relevance as "Satisfactory". The project is consistent with development priorities/strategies at national and international level.

"The project has been designed to ensure sustainability, replicability and harmony with national development goals. "(PD, p.40) Particularly, the TE has specified the relevance of the project area to the country's primary strategic frameworks for development, such as The 1997 Swaziland Environmental Action Plan (SEAP), 1999 National Development Strategy (NDS), The 2007 Poverty Reduction Strategy and Action Plan (PRSAP), all of which call for a balanced approach in addressing sustainability and poverty reduction. (PD, p.10)

"The project is aligned to (GEF) Strategic Objective 8 of the Climate Change Focal Area: "To support pilot and demonstration projects for adaptation to climate change", through enhancing the resilience, and increasing the capacity, of local communities within the project area to cope with the adverse impacts of climate change on the land resource, and promoting sustainable energy production from biomass. The project is consistent with the GEF Biodiversity Focal Area Strategy as it directly supports Strategic Objective 2: "To mainstream biodiversity conservation in production landscapes/seascapes and sectors", and the implementation of the Strategic Programme 7, "Prevention, control and management of invasive alien species", in the project area. Finally, the project was also a part of the Strategic Investment Program for Sustainable Land Management in Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP) (LUSLM's umbrella project, which is also funded by GEF), contributing to its long-term Programme Goal and Intermediate Results." (TE, p.12-13)

The project is also consistent with IFAD priority "Strategic Objective 5 of the 2011-2015 Strategic Framework: 'A natural resource and economic asset base for poor rural women and men that is more resilient to climate change, environmental degradation and market transformation" (TE, p.4)

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

The TE rated two areas related to the project's outcome effectiveness in a 6-point scale (1-6): 1. The sub-category "Effectiveness" under "Attainment of Objectives and Planned Results" ("4"); 2. "Achievement of Outputs and Activities" ("5"). This TER will rate the project's outcome effectiveness as "Satisfactory". The project has achieved majority of its preset objectives, with some underachievement as well as overachievement.

The TE is vague in specifying in detail the achievement of certain outputs/outcomes. Instead, the PIR 2014 (the most updated PIR currently available) issued in August 2014 has specified and rated the achievements of each specific outcome under the project logic framework (PIR 2014, p.4-p.13), which will be the main source of information for the analysis supporting this TER's rating. The PIR reflects the project status as of August 2014, which is still a few month before the project's closure. The TE, although not specific in listing the project's outcome achievements, added more evidences regarding the project's final outcome achievement. The following analysis will support this TER's rating by comparing the project's actual achievements against the preset outcomes/outputs:

Component 1 –Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Approach Promoted at National Level (PIR 2014 rating: Highly Satisfactory)
Expected Outcomes/ Outputs
Outcome 1.1 Legal and operational framework for SLM improved- Output a. Steering Committee (platform) organized and coordinating inter-sectoral dialogue on SLM; b. SLM policies reviewed, adapted to SLM objectives and legislation enacted;
Outcome 1.2 Operational framework for SLM improved- Output a. National level policies on SLM communicated to local level; b. Development and enforcement of laws, regulations and guidelines for SLM;
key achievements include: National Project Steering committee formed, and it meets quarterly and provides meaningful strategic direction to project implementation; a land bill (National Land Act) was drafted and presented to government authorities for review; 8 out of 10 planned Chiefdom Development Plans were completed and implemented; 391 households have established permaculture gardens; 435 households have been trained and have constructed rain water harvesting tanks; 110 ha of land are under permaculture gardening and conservation agriculture; 301 ha of land have been rehabilitated; 198 ha of land have been rid of alien invasive species; Manuals on 10 different SLM practices have been developed and reviewed by stakeholders; 537 households have been trained and are practicing conservation agriculture; 403 farmers with indigenous poultry businesses; 380 farmers with bee keeping businesses; 55 farmers involved in hay making and sale; 88 farmers involved in goat farming (dairy and meat); 4000 trees planted (fruit trees, indigenous trees and wind breakers)

Furthermore, the TE also indicated some unrecorded achievements under component 1 by end of project: 50 ha gullied land rehabilitated/ under restoration; 198 ha rangeland was under SLM; evidence of spontaneous uptake by neighboring households(unquantified) of permaculture gardening; 132 peri-urban communities in Manzini and Mbabane was trained on permaculture gardening; teachers trained in introducing permaculture into school curriculum at national level; groups of artisans (men and women) formed spontaneously to satisfy growing demand for Rooftop water harvesting tanks; 30 youth and children becoming involved and promoting beekeeping in schools as well as keeping records for illiterate parents; beehive construction businesses set up

From the above comparison of expected outcomes/outputs and actual achievements, it is clear that: outcome 1.1 has been achieved, but establishment of inter-sectoral dialogue still need confirmation. For outcome 1.2, output b has been achieved, but achievement of output a requires clearer evidence for support as there is no part in the list of actual achievements indicating "National level policies on SLM communicated to local level."

Component 2 – Sustainable Use of Land Resources (PIR 2014 rating: Highly Satisfactory)
Expected Outcome/Outputs

Outcome 2.1: **Use of land resources planned sustainably**- Output a: Chiefdom sustainable land management plans prepared;
Outcome 2.2: **Chiefdom sustainable land management plans implemented**- Output a. Local communities improve management of rangelands and livestock systems; b. Sustainable land management approaches adopted in smallholder cropping areas; c. Afforestation / reforestation / forest conservation activities to increase tree cover; d. Fuelwood efficiency promoted; e. Invasive alien species control measure in place; f. Conservation areas set-up to promote locally important ecosystems and species;
Key Achievements Include: 8 Chiefdom Development Plans have been completed and launched, and the last two are in the process of being developed. Community training has been conducted in a variety of SLM practices (1389 men and 2943 women). About 110 ha of land were put under sustainable land management practices (permaculture and conservation agriculture); 5 tree nurseries were established and are now operational; 197,566 ha of rangelands are currently being freed of AIPs (Alien invasive plants); and 301ha are under rehabilitation and re-use; A market for organic produce was established, and communities were trained in the construction of fuel-wood efficient stoves, which have been installed in 2 schools and 6 households to date. 44 households are using pilot fuel efficient stoves. Communities have been trained in the construction of rain water harvesting tanks and 435 household tanks constructed to date. 10 Training manuals and brochures (on SLM) were developed.

From the above comparison of expected outcomes/outputs and actual achievements, it is clear that: outcome 2.1 has been achieved; output a, c, d, e, f for outcome 2.2 was achieved with clear evidence, while output b's achievement requires confirmation.

Component 3 – Alternative sources of livelihood that are compatible with sustainable use of land resources promoted (PIR 2014 rating: Highly Satisfactory)
Expected Outcome/Outputs
Outcome 3.1: **Alternative sources of livelihood compatible with sustainable use of land resources provided**-Output a: Community livestock production made more efficient and sustainable; b: Commercial benefits of SLM (sustainable land management) reach local people;
Key Achievements include: 403 farmers are engaged in indigenous poultry businesses; 380 farmers are engaged in bee keeping businesses; 55 farmers are involved in hay making and sale; 88 farmers are engaged in in goat farming (dairy and meat). All of these farmers are in the process of being trained in business management.

From the above comparison of expected outcomes/outputs and actual achievements, it is clear that component 3 has been fully achieved.

Component 4 – Project managed effectively and results disseminated appropriately (PIR 2014 rating: Satisfactory)
Expected Outcome/Outputs
Outcome 4.1: **LUSIP-GEF project management structures are operational and effective**-Output a. Project management operational;
Outcome 4.2: **Lessons Learnt from LUSIP-GEF are shared**-Output a. Dissemination of project information / results;
Key Achievements: Operational administrative structures in place (through LUSIP);Use of viable financial procedures(through LUSIP);Dissemination of project information and results being done through various media; Tracking of performance indicators being done.

From the above comparison of expected outcomes/outputs and actual achievements, it is clear that expected outcome and outputs of component 4 has been realized. But more information is still required before reaching the conclusion that outcomes are reached with satisfaction.

Overall, the overall achievement of project's expected outputs/outcomes is desirable, but for certain outputs/outcomes there are still distance toward high satisfaction. Thus, a rating of "Satisfactory" for the project's outcome effectiveness is justified.

4.3 **Efficiency**	**Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory**

In a 6-point scale (1-6), the TE rated the project's outcome efficiency as "3". This is correspondent to the grade "Moderately Unsatisfactory" under the 6-point grading scale of the GEF IEO. This TER will adopt the rating of TE and give a "Moderately Unsatisfactory". The evidence is clear: although project's cost-effectiveness has been in general recognized, some evident shortcomings exist in this regard and the project suffered from delay at its start-up which had negative impact.

According to the TE, "Overall the majority of targets have been achieved within budget" (TE, p.17) "Most of the interventions are potentially low cost, though the initial pilots (e.g. the Chiefdom Development Plans) are too expensive currently to roll out widely." (TE, p.6) This fact, however, indicates a limited cost-effectiveness of the project. And, the project's budget has led to outputs which is inconsistent with the project's objective, such as "the recently built poly-tunnel project".(TE, p.17)

Furthermore, due to "complications in arrangements for management and staffing", the project had a "slow start-up" which resulted in the extension of "almost a year" and the slow start "has undoubtedly had a negative impact" (but unspecified by the TE as to what impacts) even though the project has "compensated and picked up momentum" in the late stage. (TE, p.22)

4.4 **Sustainability**	**Rating: Likely**

In a 6-point scale (1-6), the TE rated the project's overall sustainability as "5" with well-rounded discussion. In a similar approach to this TER, the TE rated the project's sustainability by rating individually the four sub-categories of sustainability: Financial Sustainability ("5"); Socio-political sustainability ("5"); "Institutional Sustainability ("5"); Environmental Sustainability ("5"). This TE will adopt a 4-point scale (Highly Unlikely, Moderately Unlikely, Moderately Likely, Likely), and rate the project's overall sustainability as "Likely", which is based on the individual assessment of the four sub-categories of sustainability as per below:

Financial Resource Sustainability-Likely

"Resources have been mobilized from IFAD, GoS (Government of Swaziland), 'stakeholder' partners and community in-kind." (TE, p.18) So far the most promising financial resource for sustaining the project's

achievement comes from the community business/entrepreneurship which is part of the project's achievement: "There are good upscaling prospects through the proposed IFAD-funded Smallholder Market-Led Project where business models, including indigenous chickens, beekeeping and fruit production developed under the LUSLM can be stimulated and expanded. Branding of honey and poultry has helped sell products and create a market. It is also envisaged that 'spin-off' enterprises such as the groups that make beehives, and those who build water tanks will continue to thrive. Most importantly a basis has been set for confidence in investing within SLM (Sustainable Land Management) and its derivatives. The IFAD Supervision Report of March 2014 believes that the CDP (Chiefdom Development Plan) process will gradually help in the move away from dependency to a "culture of entrepreneurship." (TE,p.18)

Socio-political Sustainability-Likely

The project's socio-political sustainability is likely. The high-level country drivenness has laid a solid foundation for the project's socio-political sustainability: "There is interest at all levels and a sense that the CDP (Chiefdom Development Plans) process has been embraced and will act as a catalyst for other developments – as well as a basic model that can be spread through the Ministry of Tindkundla, nationwide."(TE, p.20) Besides, the project design has sufficiently taken into account the local socio-political tradition of decision-making through establishing a participatory process of developing CDPs, which is also a constructive factor to the project's sustainability: **"**Chiefdom Development Plans, underpinned by their participatory preparation processes through the Chiefdom Development Committees will help to ensure socio-political sustainability – through building upon the traditional system of governance. There is strong evidence that chiefs have bought-in to the process and one chief interviewed said he felt 'more accountable' to his people as a result of the process." (TE, p.18) "A potential threat is that the project itself cannot in itself ensure significant change in land tenure or land use systems (which are key to the development of sustainable land management)." (TE, p.18)

Institutional Sustainability-Likely

The project "has helped to entrench institutional stability by working through SWADE (The Swaziland Water and Agricultural Development Enterprise) and the Ministry of Agriculture. These are institutions that will continue, and are not ephemeral project structures. Key also has been the formation of a formidable coalition of well-established NGOs, and within that consortium, harmonizing advice. While this has not yet worked perfectly (some extension messages on conservation agriculture for example remain inconsistent), it helps break down the barriers of territoriality and competition between agencies. Following on from the above point on institutional sustainability, the use of Chiefdoms as planning entities ensures strong support from the government and the Ministry of Tinkhundla. Throughout the project period there has been good support for – and engagement of women: this will help strengthen institutions at all levels." (TE,p.18)

Environmental Sustainability-Likely

"The project addresses land degradation, energy, biodiversity and climate change which are critical environmental issues in Swaziland. A wide palette of technical approaches has been set out – intensive

home gardens/ 'permaculture', hay-making (where enrichment planting of legumes could improve the fertility balance), orchards, indigenous poultry production and conservation agriculture: all are elements of sustained environmental improvement." (TE, p.18) The project's potential environmental sustainability is also supported by its significant capacity building component: "The overall LUSLM approach is also embedded in government machinery and the communities. An impressive training program has built up human capital: it is further noted that there are a considerable number of land users who have been trained in environmental issues (1400 men and 3000 women)." (TE, p.19) There are also parts of the project's achievements whose further improvement may contribute more to the project's environmental sustainability, such as more number of NRM committees are to be established, and more cost-effective approach of gully rehabilitation with more acceptable engineering. (TE, p.19)

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 didn't single out a chapter discussing co-financing, but it incorporates some relevant information during its discussion of other topics. The LUSLM project's co-financing is from government and beneficiary (community) contribution, and based on the financial information from the executing agency (SWADE), the realization rate of co-financing is around 84% (3,766 m USD/4,477 m USD) by the end of the project. (TE, p.25) The TE didn't specify any linkages between the level of co-financing and project outcomes.

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?

Due to "complications in arrangements for management and staffing", the project had a "slow start-up" and the slow start "has undoubtedly had a negative impact even though the project has "compensated and picked up momentum" in the late stage and was extended for almost 1 year. (TE, p.22) And the delay at the project's start-up is due to the inefficiency of the SWADE, which is the project's chief executing agency. The project has "picked up momentum" (TE,p.6) in its later stage, and relevant policy documents have not specify any negative impact on project's outcome and sustainability due to the delay.

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:

There is a high-level motivation of participants due to the project's high-level country ownership. "There is no doubt that this is a Swazi-driven project and is espoused by all partners with pride. There is interest at all levels and a sense that the CDP process has been embraced and will act as a catalyst for other developments" (TE, p.20) " the ownership of the process is clearly claimed by GoS (Government of

Swaziland) officials, project staff, chiefs and people alike. There is clearly a sense of national pride in the achievements and possibilities for the future." (TE,p.20)"This evaluator has seldom witnessed such a sense of ownership when interviewing officials – and the turnout at the presentation of preliminary findings was testimony to how important this initiative is to the nation: LUSLM has gained country-wide renown."(Te,p.20)

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**

M&E design. Project should have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress in achieving project objectives. An M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, and so on), SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, realistic, and timely) indicators and data analysis systems, and reporting and evaluation at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should be specified. Dedicated funding for M&E should be provided in a project's budget. Responsibilities for undertaking M&E activities should be specified. Questions to guide this assessment include: In retrospect, was the M&E plan at entry practicable and sufficient (sufficient and practical indicators identified; timely baseline; targets created; provisions made for the effective use of data collected; analysis systems specified including studies and reports; practical organization and logistics set forth in terms of responsibility for, and scheduling of, M&E activities)?

In a 6-point scale, the TE rated the entire M&E design as "4", which is a level correspondent to "Moderately Satisfactory" in the grading scale for evaluation at the GEF EO. The TE's rating of "4" is based on the comment "Little evidence of a strong M&E system: ad hoc" (TE, p.7), which is not strongly linked to the well-roundness of the M&E design. Thus, upon a review of information relevant to the project's M&E design at entry, this TER will rate the M&E design at entry as "satisfactory". The project's M&E plan is well-designed and specific at the baseline.

The project has a comprehensive plan for M&E at its baseline, as set out by the Project Document (PD, p.59-p.61). The plans includes a baseline arrangement, a project logic framework which includes sets of specific and measurable indicators to measure each component of project objectives (such as "Number / rate of changes in sectoral policies, laws and regulations enacted reflecting SLM /biodiversity / climate change mitigation considerations to track the project's progress in realizing its outcome of "Sustainable Land Management Approach Promoted at National Level"), plans for periodic monitoring (such as Mid-Term Review), key stakeholders/personnel and implementation plan, planned outputs, and budget. Also, LUSIP-GEF M&E activities will be country-driven and provide opportunities for consultation and

participation. “local institutions to be fully consulted with, informed and briefed about the plans, implementation and the results of evaluation activities.”(TE, p.127) All these information could well support a “Satisfactory” rating for the project’s M&E design at the baseline.

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

M&E plan implementation. An assessment will be made on the quality of M&E implementation over the project’s lifetime, as well as the extent to which provisions were made for continuing M&E following project closure where warranted. Such an assessment will cover whether the M&E system was in place and allowed the timely tracking of results and progress toward project objectives throughout the project; whether annual project reports were complete, accurate, and with well-justified ratings; whether the information provided by the M&E system was used to improve and adapt project performance; and whether proper training was provided for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure that data will continue to be collected and used after project closure. Question to guide this assessment include: Did the project M&E system operate throughout the project? How was M&E information used during the project? Did it allow for tracking of progress toward project objectives? Did the project provide proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?

In a 6 point scale (1-6), the TE rated M&E plan implementation as “3”, which correspondent to “Moderately Unsatisfactory” in the GEF IEO’s grading scale for evaluation. In reference to the rating and relevant evidence presented by the TE, this TER will rate the M&E implementation as “Moderately Unsatisfactory”.

There is sufficient evidence supporting a medium low rating for the M&E implementation for a number of evidence of limited performance and limited availability of data:” Little data was available before the consultant’s arrival: a summary of achievements was only put together during the mission, and a number of the data needed to be clarified as they were not clear. The IFAD RCE (Regional Climate and Environment Specialist) was of great help in this regard. An impact analysis was still pending at the time of draft reporting.” (TE, p.23) “No data was seen from attempts to track biodiversity”. (TE, p.24) Furthermore, the TE concludes that the project “has not been short of funds for M&E, but has not used them efficiently enough.”(TE,p.7)

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 TE didn't rate the quality of project implementation, but it rated some dimensions relevant to the project implementation/execution in a 6-point scale (1-6): Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management ("4"); Financial Planning/ Control ("4"); IFAD Supervision and Backstopping ("5"). Considering the role and activities of the IFAD as the project's chief implementing agency, this TER will rate the quality of project implementation as "Satisfactory". The IFAD has been successful in fulfilling its role as the implementing agencies, but with a few cases in which it could have had better performance.

As the implementing agency, the IFAD takes the responsibility of ensuring "effective project management and implementation by the project management team and the GoS (Government of Swaziland). IFAD also makes sure that the GEF component is recognized, and monitored. All plans and reports developed by the PMU are submitted to IFAD for approval."(TE,p.27)According to the TE, "in general IFAD's supervision has been very much valued by LUSLM and the GoS, both in terms of encouragement, inspiration and direct technical input." (TE,p.27) "IFAD also mounts Project Implementation audits on a quarterly basis and carries out 6-monthly supervision missions with appropriate members of staff and external consultants as required. The mission results in Supervision Reports, which record agreements on steps to take, as well as commenting on the progress of the project." (TE,p.27) And, the TE gave credit to the IFAD staff for his "supervisory role" during the Terminal Evaluation" (TE,p.27). However, the IFAD failed to carry out a potentially important mission planned, whose existence "could have forestalled the construction of the poly-tunnel greenhouse", and "would also have been of great help in assisting the LUSLM staff to put together monitoring and evaluator data in time for the TE, and to have helped to bring them up to speed with financial matters." (TE, p.27)

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

The chief executing agency of the LUSLM project is Swaziland's Ministry of Agriculture. The Swaziland Water and Agricultural Development Enterprise (SWADE) de facto administers the project on behalf of the Ministry of Agriculture. The national project management office, based in SWADE's LUSIP (Lower Usuthu Smallholder Irrigation Project, LUSLM's parent project) program office, is headed by a National Program Manager, who is responsible for the daily program management and will report to the Ministry of Agriculture. (TE, p.13) The TE's evaluation of the SWADE's role and activity revolves around its function of program/finance management, and rated the "Financial Planning/Control" as ("4") in a 6-point scale (from 1-6). The TE further gave credit to "Implementation Approach and Adaptive Management" by rating it as ("4"), for the project management's wise approach in properly innovating and adapting management approach based on existing project, and its commitment to partnership building which facilitate the project implementation. (TE, p.23) This TER will rate the quality of project

execution as “Moderately Unsatisfactory “due to the marked shortcomings of SWADE in fulfilling its role assigned.

According to the TE, the SWADE has been delegated the responsibility to manage the GEF project finances and administrative procedures including recruitment of staff and general procurement by the Ministry of Agriculture. However, the MTR (Mid-Term Review) has identified that “lack of attention from SWADE, due in part to late project start up and problems with staff recruitment and procurement of critical assets like vehicles project implement depends on staff using their own vehicles or just not attending to work that needs to be done”… “Financial disbursement has suffered due to these delays with the project having spent only 8% of their total budget after one year since mobilization. This is very low burn rate which might influence decisions; especially in government”. (TE, p.24) The slow start-up of the project caused by the inefficiency of SWADE “has undoubtedly had a negative impact.” (TE, p.22) Even though the TE has found improvement in this regard, but it further identified the SWADE’s failure at the project’s closure of completely and timely reporting of the project’s financial data. (TE, p.24-26)

Apart from highlighting the inefficiency of the SWADE, the TE gave credit to the fact that “project management acted innovatively in arranging for secondment of staff from LUSIP to LUSLM”. (TE, p.23), which makes the project implementation and management style “differentiated” from LUSIP, while making use of LUSIP’s knowledge base and experience. Also, the project management’s commitment to partnership building has “accelerated implementation and will also help to ensure long-term sustainability of harmonized (non-conflicting) messages” (TE, p.23). But these merits can’t hide the inefficiency of SWADE, which was highlighted by the TE regarding the project execution and has significant impact of the overall project operation. Overall, a rating of “Moderately Unsatisfactory” for the project execution is well-justified.

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.

According to the PIR 2014, as of August 2014 the following environmental change was in place: (PIR 2014, p.4-p.13)

110 ha of land are under permaculture gardening and conservation agriculture; 301 ha of land being are rehabilitated; 198 ha of land being rid of alien invasive species; 4000 trees planted (fruit trees, indigenous trees and wind breakers); About 110 ha of land under SLM (permaculture and conservation

agriculture); 5 tree nursery established and operational; 197,566 ha of rangelands are currently being freed of AIP (Alien Invasive Plants) s; 301ha are under rehabilitation and re-use;

Furthermore, according to the TE, as of July 2015: (TE, p.22)

50 ha gullied land rehabilitated/ under restoration; 198 ha rangeland under SLM (Sustainable Land Management); increased agrobiodiversity within the system; protection of local biodiversity for its nectar; potentially (anecdotally at least) improved yields through better pollination.

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.

According to the PIR 2014, as of August 2014 the following socioeconomic changes were in place: (PIR 2014, p.4-p.13)

391households have established permaculture gardens; 435 households have been trained and have constructed rain water harvesting tanks; 537 households are have been trained and are practicing conservation agriculture; 403 farmers with indigenous poultry businesses; 380 farmers with bee keeping businesses; 55 farmers involved in hay making and sale; 88 farmers involved in goat farming (dairy and meat); A market for organic produce established; 44 households using pilot fuel efficient stoves; Communities trained in the construction of rain water harvesting tanks and 435 household tanks constructed to date; 403 farmers are engaged in indigenous poultry businesses;380 farmers are engaged in bee keeping businesses; 55 farmers are involved in hay making and sale; 88 farmers are engaged in in goat farming (dairy and meat);

According to the TE, as of July 2015: (TE,p.22)

groups of artisans (men and women) formed spontaneously to satisfy growing demand for tanks; spinoffs include 30 youth and children becoming involved and promoting beekeeping in schools as well as keeping records for illiterate parents; beehive construction businesses set up;

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

According to the PIR 2014, as of August 2014: (PIR 2014, p.4-p.13)

8 out of 10 planed Chiefdom Development Plans were completed and being implemented; 435 households have been trained and have constructed rain water harvesting tanks; Manuals on 10 different SLM practices have been developed and reviewed by stakeholders ;537 households have been trained and are practicing conservation agriculture; Community training conducted in a variety of SLM practices (1389 men and 2943 women) ; Communities trained in the construction of fuel-wood efficient stoves constructed in 2 schools and six households to date. Communities trained in the construction of rain water harvesting tanks and 435 household tanks constructed to date; 10 Training manuals and brochures (on sustainable use of land resource) developed; All of these farmers involved in developing "alternative livelihood " have been trained in business management.

Furthermore, according to the TE, as of July 2015: (TE,p.22)

Training given to 132 peri-urban communities in Manzini and Mbabane.

b) Governance

According to the PIR 2014, as of August 2014: (PIR 2014, p.4-p.13)

The National Project Steering committee formed, and it met quarterly and provided meaningful strategic direction to project implementation; the land bill (National Land Act) was drafted and presented to government authorities for review; Operational administrative structures were in place (through LUSIP);Use of viable financial procedures(through LUSIP);Dissemination of project information and results being done through various media; Tracking of performance indicators being done.

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 identified some extra yet unidentified impacts and suggests recording them (TE, p.22)

"While the data compiled by the project attests to the achievements that LUSLM has recorded, during the course of the TE it became clear there are further unarticulated accomplishments that need to put on record. Thus, after discussions with the project team the following (at least) can be added to the above list:

i) Extra land restoration achievements not planned under project

- 50 ha gullied land rehabilitated/ under restoration
- 198 ha rangeland under SLM

ii) Extra home garden/ permaculture achievements

- evidence of spontaneous uptake by neighboring households(unquantified)
- training given to 132 peri-urban communities in Manzini and Mbabane

- teachers trained in introducing permaculture into school curriculum at national level
- increased agrobiodiversity within the system

iii) Rooftop water harvesting tanks

- groups of artisans (men and women) formed spontaneously to satisfy growing demand for tanks

iv) Beekeeping

- spinoffs include 30 youth and children becoming involved and promoting beekeeping in schools as well as keeping records for illiterate parents
- beehive construction businesses set up
- protection of local biodiversity for its nectar
- potentially (anecdotally at least) improved yields through better pollination"

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The project has no immediate scale-up identified, but the TE has identified a few potential scale-ups/replication, such as "There are prospects of follow-up though an IFAD loan (the Smallholder Market-Led Production project, SMLP) to help spread small business activities and their related impacts more widely. SMLP according to the IFAD Supervision Report of March 2014 "will be built on the lessons and impacts achieved by the project"."(TE,p.19) , and following this project "there is also a keen interest from the GoS (Government of Swaziland) to follow up with an application for a grant from GEF's 6th replenishment."(TE, p.19) Also, the project's impact was being sustained by activities of the project's stakeholder partners within the project area (TE, p.19)

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 summarized the following lessons learned: (TE, p.8)"

1. While Swaziland has a very long history of SLM/ NRM interventions, many of which have disappointed, LUSLM has demonstrated that the correct interventions at the right time can have impact, and 'strike a chord'.

2. Forming a collation of development partners ('stakeholders') and harmonizing messages avoids the problems of territoriality between agencies and conflicting advice.

3. Awareness-raising through branding – both of the project (with a logo), and specific products (for value addition) is a powerful tool.

4. Innovation and imagination should always be allowed space in a project: the involvement of the university's School of Journalism and Mass Communication has proved invaluable in awareness raising, and training students in the 'media marketability' of agricultural development.

5. Monitoring and evaluation have proved again to be a problem area: however coaching and guidance from the implementing agency can be very helpful – setting in place procedures and looking for 'unexpected impacts' and 'multiple co-benefits' as well as tracking predetermined indicators.

6. Projects such as LUSLM can easily become so involved in their development agenda that they lose track of the higher objectives of supporting agencies, especially the GEF – thus give inadequate attention to global environmental benefits.

7. Policy development for national law modification can only be taken to a certain level by a development project: from that point (e.g. drafting a Land Act) it can only act by persuasion – backed by policy-demonstration from the field.

8. Study tours, whether domestic or international can be extraordinarily powerful as demonstrated by the Chiefs' trip to Tanzania. They should always be built into these types of projects. Where possible they should be reciprocal 'cross-visits'.

9. Upscaling is not just limited by willpower or effort – but often by capacity too. Knowledge products such as those produced under LUSLM are very valuable.

10. Even after decades of development work, there continue to be some perpetual problems: one tangible example is construction design of gabion weirs (or other check dams) in gullies. There is plenty of documentation and hands-on experience available – it must be made available.

11. While new (and more realistic) quantitative targets were apparently agreed as a result of the MTE these were not specified in the revised log frame attached to the MTE report: such important revisions must always be clearly set out and formalized.

12. It is evident that many activities will carry on under LUSLM using counterpart funding for several months after the end of GEF funding, thus in this situation a terminal evaluation cannot capture all of a project's eventual achievements."

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE had the following recommendations: (TE, p.9-10)"

1. Though the current exercise is termed a 'Terminal Evaluation' it can equally be looked upon as a learning exercise at a specific stage during a process.

Lessons and recommendations from this exercise should be used to help drive forward and guide the development of SLM in Swaziland's rainfed rural areas – and fed into the design of new initiatives including IFAD-GoS's Smallholder Market-Led Project and follow-up GEF initiatives.

2. A cluster of proven technologies has been shown to work under LUSLM – promulgated by the project team and partners.

A package of SLM-based, income earning technologies is now ready to be spread more widely throughout Swaziland. This can be based around home gardens ('permaculture') including fruit trees, beekeeping, indigenous chickens, roof tanks for water harvesting, hay making and nutrition gardens – with associated integrated fertility management. Multiple co-benefits will be realized.

3. Much impact cannot be captured through conventional M&E methods: though these are essential for project tracking.

Be aware of, and look out for, unexpected impact as a spin-off from development initiatives. For example the engagement of children in record keeping, encouraging their interest.

4. Technical SLM guidelines are important – and their distribution to recipients is crucial.

Make sure that guidelines capture essential ways and means of ensuring 'best practice' nationally. There exist guidelines throughout Africa that can help in content and format.

5. Conservation agriculture (CA) undoubtedly has potential in Swaziland, but it can only succeed by trials and testing and by monitoring impact.

Conservation agriculture should be promoted in Swaziland, but great care taken not to confuse farmers with simultaneous campaigns for conventional ploughing. The end result should be a clear definition of CA options based on data from the field and farmer testimonies.

6. Energy saving technology has not yet made any significant impact under LUSLM.

Efforts must be continued to work with energy saving stoves and biogas initiatives under follow-up project – not dropped as having 'failed'.

7. Chiefdom Development Plans have been a highlight of the project.

Ensure that the CDP process is continued – but make sure (a) costs are reduced (b) NRM committees are part and parcel of the plans and areas to be treated are demarcated (c) 'before and after' posters are produced as well as glossy booklets outlining the plans.

8. The study tour to Tanzania has proved a great stimulus to the CDP process.

Follow-up the study tour with plans for future visits – both internationally and internally: strive to invite the hosts to Swaziland for further fruitful exchange.

9. Global environmental benefits are the main objective of the GEF but have been given little attention as yet under LUSLM.

Continue (through whatever project or process) to monitor GEBs – especially soil/ vegetation carbon fluxes to confirm the value of current and future GEF investments

10. SLM under LUSLM has been relatively broad – but there are other technologies also. Explore measures such as water harvesting from roads, live hedges, vegetative methods of donga rehabilitation and enrichment planting with legumes of contour grass strips and hay fields."

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?	The TE is vague is specifying the achievement of each preset outcomes, only a general discussion is provided.	**Unsatisfactory**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, evidence convincing but insufficient, ratings are well-substantiated	**Moderately Satisfactory**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project assessed the project's sustainability in detail, but it didn't mention the project's exit strategy	**Moderately Satisfactory**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and they are comprehensive	**Satisfactory**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE included some relevant financial information, but the information is not specified to the level of detailing project costs per activity and actual co-financing used	**Moderately Unsatisfactory**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The project's M&E system has been assessed, but for its problem it will be better to support with specific examples	**Moderately Satisfactory**
Overall TE Rating: 0.3 × (a + b) + 0.1 × (c + d + e + f) = 0.3 × (2 + 4) + 0.1 × (4 + 5 + 3 +4) = 1.8 + 1.6 = 3.4		**Moderately Unsatisfactory**

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

In the preparation of this TER, no additional documents were referred to as the source of information apart from PIRs, TE, and PD.