

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3391	
GEF Agency project ID		409	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Reducing Land Degradation in the Highlands of Kilimanjaro Region	
Country/Countries		Tanzania	
Region		East Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Sustainable Land Management	
Executing agencies involved		Tanzania Office of the Vice President	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		May 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		September 2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.125	NA
	Co-financing	.5	NA
GEF Project Grant		2.6	2.6
Co-financing	IA own	0.6	0.75
	Government	16.7	16.7
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	4.3	1.35
Total GEF funding		2.725	2.6
Total Co-financing		21.6	18.8
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		24.325	21.4
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		9 October 2015	
Author of TE		Dr. Mandy Cadman	
TER completion date		January 7, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
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	HS	--	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	ML	--	L
M&E Design	NR	MS	--	MS
M&E Implementation	NR	HS	--	S
Quality of Implementation	NR	HS	--	S
Quality of Execution	NR	HS	--	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	HS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The original overarching global environmental objective of the project is “to provide land users and managers with the enabling environment (policy, financial, institutional, capacity) for SLM adoption (Council Document (CD) p.19).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

This environmental objective supports a higher-level goal of the project, namely “to ensure that Sustainable Land Management (SLM) provides the basis for economic development, food security and sustainable livelihoods, whilst restoring the ecological integrity of the ecosystems of the Kilimanjaro Region” (TE p.6).

The project has four main outcomes:

- (1) Policies and institutional framework established for supporting sustainable land management.
- (2) Markets support expansion of livelihood options in Kilimanjaro to reduce pressure on agriculture and natural resources, and increase income.
- (3) Institutions with capacities and skills to increase knowledge, skills, technologies and change in attitude for adoption and adaptation of SLM.
- (4) Project managed effectively, knowledge and skills for SLM provided to resource managers at all levels, and lessons used to upscale SLM in the region and the country.

(TE p.6)

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

Mid-way through the project, the Global Environmental Objective was slightly modified and is now “to provide land users and managers with the enabling environment (policy, financial and

institutional capacity) for the adoption of SLM within the six districts of the Kilimanjaro Region (Moshi Rural, Hai, Siha, Rombo, Mwanga and Same) and within Moshi Municipality.” (TE p.6)

Following the Midterm Review, changes were made to address some of the shortcomings identified in the Strategic Results Framework. Changes were made to certain targets and indicators (TE p.20). This TER will address project performance against the updated targets and indicators.

4. GEF EO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory, an assessment this TER agrees with. Indeed, due to its close alignment with both GEF and Tanzanian priorities, this project merits a relevance rating of satisfactory.

The project’s objective is to improve sustainable land management adoption in Tanzania. The objective is very clearly aligned to those of the GEF’s Land Degradation Focal Area, supporting the Sustainable Land Management objective. It is also part of the Strategic Investment Plan (SIP) of the GEF-funded New Partnership for Africa’s Development (NEPAD).

The project is also very well aligned with Tanzanian national policies that also promote sustainable land management. For example, Tanzania as a National Action Plan to Combat Desertification, a National Agricultural Policy, a National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty and “several other policies relating to agriculture, livestock, irrigation, food security, natural resource management and social development”, all of which contain elements related to promoting sustainable land management (TE p.6). In addition to its own national policies, Tanzania is a signatory to the United Nations Convention on Combatting Desertification (UNCCD). Land degradation is a critically important issue in Tanzania, and the Government is committed to improving the situation.

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

The TE rates effectiveness as highly satisfactory due to “the effectiveness with which the outcomes have been delivered” but rates the overall quality of the outcomes as satisfactory only due to the fact that “there are a few areas in which remedial action is still needed” (TE pp.8-9). This TER rates effectiveness

as satisfactory due to the fact that most intended outcomes have been achieved, which is an impressive achievement given the important setbacks faced by the project early on.

“The project has successfully delivered most of the intended **Outcomes** (as per the revised project plan) with targets being exceeded or met for more than 90% of the outcome-level performance indicators.” (TE p.8). This TER will present project achievements under its main three outcomes as defined in the Council Document.

1. Policies and institutional framework established for supporting sustainable land management.

Policy change is difficult to achieve, and more so during a short project. Progress against this outcome has been slow, but has picked up significantly after the project Midterm Review. Overall, 3 policy briefs were written “and will be mainstreamed into the revised national environmental policy (which influences a wide range of other natural resource management policies)” (TE p.40). In addition, project lessons have contributed to the national dialogue on SLM and fed into the Tanzania Integrated Investment Framework for SLM. Finally, the project also shaped local policy by being integrated into the District Development Plans. This meets the target for this outcome, and it is therefore assessed to have been satisfactorily achieved.

2. Markets support expansion of livelihood options in Kilimanjaro to reduce pressure on agriculture and natural resources, and increase income.

Several targets for this outcome have been met and surpassed. For example, “the targets for the number of new agri-businesses developed have been met, with significant increases in earnings derived from honey, poultry and mushroom enterprises. In addition, the project has established a honey-processing plant and mushroom-processing facilities for value addition in these agribusinesses” (TE p.39). Other targets for this indicator have not been met as specified in the results framework, but have been very successful nonetheless. For example, “the target for the percentage increase in the number of farmers marketing their coffee as speciality coffee has not been met regionally, but it has been exceeded in two of the main coffee-growing Districts” (TE p.39). Overall, very good progress was made towards the achievement of this outcome.

3. Institutions with capacities and skills to increase knowledge, skills, technologies and change in attitude for adoption and adaptation of SLM.

The project has achieved this outcome quite successfully, with most components in compliance with the results framework. Here again, some of the targets were exceeded. For example, 50% of land users were trained (much above the 9% target), and 50% of land users adopted SLM practices (much above the target 28%). On the other hand, some targets were only partially met. The target for ‘farmers using up-to-date information from weather stations has not been achieved, and the percentage of technical officers trained in SLM fell 2% short of its 56% target. Overall, progress against this outcome was very good.

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

The TER rates efficiency as satisfactory. This TE also rates efficiency as satisfactory due to the demonstrated ability of the project team to adapt to difficult circumstances and keep the project on track, as well as the sound financial management of the project.

The project faced a large number early challenges relating to “systemic administrative inefficiencies, problematic procurement, and staff changes, as well as various externalities that impacted on compliance with progress and financial reporting” (TE P.8). The project was virtually un-operational until 2012. Some of the challenges encountered are summarized here:

- Early problems associated with use of the new government financial system: it took a while to receive the first payment from the Tanzanian Ministry of Finance, which delayed the start of project implementation.
- Inefficiencies in procurement: the government procurement was bureaucratic and rather slow, which slowed down project implementation.
- Recruitment problems: it took a long time to recruit the National Project Coordinator
- Political circumstances: the presidential election that took place soon after project approval caused an important disruption

Despite all those challenges, the project team was able “to put corrective action in place when inefficiencies have emerged. This has been achieved by adaptive management (enhanced by timely and appropriate support from the GEF Implementing Agency) and by focussing on activities that generate maximum social and environmental returns for the smallest possible investment. The project turnaround and, ultimately, the satisfactory achievement of most outcomes shows the efficiency of the project team.

In addition to successfully solving implementation problems, the team was also successful at improving cost effectiveness. One of the ways in which they did so was by shifting “from relying on consultancies to promoting collaboration and building working partnerships with other government entities, maximising use of co-finance, harnessing local skills, building social capital in local communities, strengthening governance and enhancing institutional capacity” (TE p.9). Project management costs were kept to 10% of project funds. However, no cost benefit analysis was performed, nor was the project compared to similar projects.

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

The TE rates sustainability as moderately likely. With very positive funding prospects for SLM activities in Tanzania and few risks to project continuation, this TER instead finds sustainability to be likely.

Financial risks - Likely

Financial sustainability for this project appears likely. Adequate resources appear to be available to sustain most of the project achievements after project completion. Indeed, already for this project, the bulk of the funding came from the Government of Tanzania. This support for SLM is now part of District Authority budgets, and District Executive Directors report having made provision to keep sustaining some SLM activities going forward. Finally, at the national level, “the Integrated Investment Framework for SLM makes provision for funding the kinds of activities that were initiated through the project and this could provide the avenue through which Districts can access funding to maintain and scale-up SLM. (TE pp.47-48)

Socio-economic risks - Likely

Socio-economic sustainability appears likely as the project has actively tried to ensure that farmers, the primary agents of change, would be in a strong position to maintain and further project achievements. Indeed, the project invested in lowering the barriers to adopt SLM practices, empowered communities by providing training, and mainstreamed project activities into local production systems. In addition, local leaders were involved in all stages of project development, which contributed to community buy-in and ownership. Finally, the project directly benefited local stakeholders, and it is therefore in their interest for project activities to continue (TE p.48).

Institutional risks – Moderately Likely

Institutional risks appear to be well managed. Relevant institutions seem to have a genuine desire to maintain project initiatives, and the project provided strong guidance to inform and strengthen the SLM policy landscape. The project trained important stakeholders such as district officials and community members, ensuring that capacity is in place for the continuation of the project. (TE p.49)

The upcoming General Election of Tanzania may disrupt the SLM agenda, and work may need to be done to raise awareness of new political decision-makers to the importance of land degradation. For this reason, institutional sustainability is rated as moderately likely.

Environmental risks - Likely

Climate changes poses moderate risks to the project’s environmental gains by further reducing water availability and the predictability of rainfall. However, many of the SLM practices promoted as part of the project are climate resilient and will be robust to climate change, and the better weather data availability that has been made possible through the project will help mitigate any adverse impact from climate change. (TE pp.49-50)

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 bulk of the amount expected as co-financing came from the Government of Tanzania has been disbursed. As co-financing represented most of the project funding, it was absolutely essential to achieving 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?

The project faced a large number early challenges relating to “systemic administrative inefficiencies, problematic procurement, and staff changes, as well as various externalities that impacted on compliance with progress and financial reporting” (TE P.8). The project was virtually un-operational until 2012. Some of the challenges encountered are summarized here:

- Early problems associated with use of the new government financial system: it took a while to receive the first payment from the Tanzanian Ministry of Finance, which delayed the start of project implementation.
- Inefficiencies in procurement: the government procurement was bureaucratic and rather slow, which slowed down project implementation.
- Recruitment problems: it took a long time to recruit the National Project Coordinator
- Political circumstances: the presidential election that took place soon after project approval caused an important disruption.

However, the project team was able to put the project back on track and ensure the achievement of all project outcomes using good adaptive management skills.

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 Government of Tanzania demonstrated very strong country ownership as part of this project, first evidenced by the important funding it committed and provided to the project. This ownership was also exemplified by the fact that the Vice President's Office was the executing agency for the project, and that District Councils were also involved in project implementation. This strong ownership contributed to the smooth execution of project activities, and made an important difference to the sustainability of the project. For example, the Kilimanjaro Regional

Administration indicated its willingness to co-ordinating the implementation of SLM across the region, and the Government of Tanzania has already developed tools and SLM best practices that will be included as part of the District Development Frameworks.

Without this level of country ownership, project outcomes would not have been as high, and the sustainability of the project surely would not have been as likely.

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: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	--

The TE rates M&E design at entry as moderately satisfactory. This TER agrees with the assessment due to the presence of a comprehensive M&E framework at entry, but recognizing some of the important weaknesses of the original M&E framework and the fact that it had to be updated at Midterm.

The original Strategic Results Framework for the project was complete, but had severe weaknesses. The document included a description of baseline conditions, objectives and outcome-level indicators, roles and timeframes for monitoring and evaluation activities, a description of risks and assumptions, and sufficient budget for M&E activities. However, baseline conditions were not always well established, and indicators did not always meet the SMART criteria. For example, one of the targets was "Changes in sedimentation in the Pangani River system as a measure of decreased soil erosion", but the timeframe of the project was too short to observe changes in soil erosion, a process that takes a long time. Most importantly, the Strategic Results Framework was incredibly ambitious, and was therefore not useful in assessing real project progress and performance.

Following the Midterm Review, the Strategic Results Framework was updated, and about half the indicators and targets were modified to better reflect the objectives and potential of the project.

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as highly satisfactory due to the "skilful and strategic use of the M&E plan in results-based, adaptive management of the project." (TE p.8) This TER rates M&E implementation as satisfactory due to the impressive use of M&E data as part of adaptive project management, but noting that there were some delays with the implementation of the M&E framework.

As mentioned above, the M&E framework at entry suffered from important shortcomings. The project team was able to adequately revise the Strategic Results Framework and transform it into a useful monitoring and evaluation tool. As part of this revision process, academic studies were commissioned to establish better baselines, and the process led to the revision of about half the indicators and targets for the project.

The overall implementation of the M&E system was well managed, with monitoring reports being submitted as planned – albeit with a few delays. The service provided contracted to conduct the baseline study for the participatory M&E framework was found to be ill-suited for the work, and the contract had to be cancelled. This created some delays in the M&E implementation schedule and led to the late submission of some reports.

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 rates project implementation by the UNDP as highly satisfactory. This TER instead rates implementation as satisfactory since UNDP has made mistakes during the project design stage, but provided exceptional support to the project team during project implementation and ensured positive project outcomes.

As discussed above, there were severe delays at the beginning of the project, which caused the project to start approximately two years later than expected. The delay was largely caused by external factors, and UNDP should not be blamed for this delay.

Another important challenge faced by the project is related to the weaknesses in the original project design, as mentioned in the M&E at entry section of this document. Indeed, the Strategic Results Framework for the project was too ambitious, and several of the targets and indicators were unrealistic. The TE describes the issue very well:

“The project set out to implement a wide range of direct SLM interventions, at the same time as addressing issues related to mitigation of carbon emissions, promoting use of energy efficient cooking technologies, restoration of irrigation systems, rehabilitation of degraded

lands, erosion control, and dealing with policy and institutional frameworks and capacity building. This 'broad and shallow' approach (doing a lot of things over a wide geographic area, but having limited resource and time for each of these), is a good model in terms of catalysing action across a wide range of SLM activities, and ensures a good fit with a range of government priorities. However, it meant that the project set out to do too much, especially considering the kinds of distances that needed to be covered in moving between different pilot sites across the Region, and the costs of some of the activities. In some cases (e.g. addressing gully erosion) the project could tackle only a very small part of the problem, thus decreasing the impact that the project has had on alleviating land degradation at a landscape scale. It might have been better to take a 'narrow and deep' approach in which fewer activities were tackled, but greater impact could have been achieved with each of these (with more resources available for each of them). Similarly, it might have been wiser to identify those activities that could realistically be tackled across the whole Region, and those that should have been addressed at only particular locations." (TE p.21).

This represents a failure of the UNDP to ensure that the project design be suitable to the objectives, and that the Strategic Results Framework be a useful guide to project implementation. Another issue with planning is that the project budget was inaccurate in places, making it difficult for the project to implement some of the project activities.

Despite those mistakes made at the planning stage, the UNDP provided excellent support during project implementation. The TE describes the UNDP's role in particularly exceptional terms:

"The UNDP CO has provided timely and unfaltering technical and administrative support to the project implementers. It has played a critically important role in risk management, especially in the early stages of the project when numerous issues arose relating to project governance and management, and early problems relating to use of the new financial system in the Ministry of Finance. The UNDP has demonstrated diligence, efficiency and a high level of professionalism in seeking resolution to the various problems that have arisen, and there were times at the start of the project when, without the skilful facilitation of the UNDP, this project might have failed. Assessment of performance (PIRs) by the UNDP has been timely, detailed, fair and constructive. The UNDP has played an important facilitation role in terms of engagements with the VPO and other institutions (such as the Ministry of Finance, the office of the RAS, the Tanzania Meteorological Agency), and they have assisted with backstopping supervisory missions. Despite the important hands-on role the UNDP CO has had to play with risk management, they have never *interfered* with project management or governance, and have made every effort to empower the project team to overcome difficulties they encountered. When problems have arisen (such as issues relating to weak delivery by some project contractors), the UNDP has provided prompt and appropriate support to the Project Team." (TE p.26)

Overall, UNDP has made mistakes during the project design stage, but provided exceptional support to the project team during project implementation, thereby ensuring positive outcomes.

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

The TE rates project execution as highly satisfactory due to the high level of adaptive management displayed as part of this project. This TER rates it as satisfactory due to overall good management of the project, but realizing that much of the impetus for adaptive project management came from the UNDP, and not from the executing agency.

The executing agency for the project is officially the Office of the Vice President, but responsibility was devolved to the office of the Kilimanjaro Regional Administrative Secretary (RAS). “Early project execution problems were experienced, relating to changes of office bearers within the regional secretariat, and a misunderstanding about the role of the RAS in project governance and implementation” (TE p.26). These issues slowed down project implementation, but were eventually solved.

Once the RAS settled into its position as executing agency, timely, useful and efficient support was provided to the project team. According to the TE, “The current RAS has provided well-reasoned, decisive and prompt support in the area of risk management, which has helped the project team resolve various project management challenges that have emerged over time” (TE p.26). The RAS also provided effective Chairmanship to the Project Steering Committee, and helped the project better connect with the Districts, which has improved project ownership and sustainability. (TE p.26)

Overall, the RAS appears to have fulfilled its role of executing agency adequately.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

The project successfully achieved its objective to provide land users and managers with the enabling environment for SLM adoption. According to the TE, “there is convincing evidence that the project has made a positive and significant contribution to relieving environmental stresses, improving ecological status and enhancing livelihoods at the sites of project intervention” (TE p.10). While it is too early to tell whether this impact will be permanent, the project has adequately put structures in place to ensure the sustainability 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.

According to the TE, “by introducing measures to alleviate land degradation whilst simultaneously promoting sustainable socio-economic development, the project has contributed significantly to improving ecosystem health and soil fertility at the sites of intervention, thereby improving the productivity of the land, increasing earning capacity of farmers and improving human well-being. “ (TE p.8)

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

An important part of the project was related to capacity building of officials and producers about SLM practices. As a result of those activities, these stakeholders are now more aware and better informed of SLM and the issues it addresses. (TE p.41)

b) Governance

No changes in governance were recorded as part of this project.

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

No unintended impacts were recorded as part of this project.

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.

According to the TE, “the project has had a strong catalytic effect. The technologies introduced through the project have been effectively catalysed through demonstration, training and information dissemination, and they are already being replicated and scaled-up outside of the areas of direct project intervention.” (TE pp.9-10)

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 lessons offered in the TE are summarized below.

1. The project was well aligned with national priorities, which made it easier to get buy-in for the intervention.
2. The strategy of the project team was to build a strong sense of ownership for the project amongst stakeholders, and this was instrumental in ensuring project success.
3. The implementation model was firmly embedded in local government institutions and resulted in SLM being incorporated into the daily work plans and budgets of local government institutions.
4. The robust, results-based adaptive management demonstrated by the project team allowed the project to mitigate early delays and ensure success.
5. The project relied on local capacity to achieve the desired results, which helped build ownership, improve cost-effectiveness and promote sustainability.
6. The focus on capacity building and institutional strengthening, which ensured that communities and local authorities were empowered to both catalyse and replicate the SLM measures and approaches promoted by the project, even without direct support from it.
7. The role played by the UNDP has been critical to the success this project has ultimately been able to achieve.

More comprehensive lessons can be found in the TE (pp.57-60).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The Report includes recommendations for improving project design, enhancing sustainability and finalising delivery of project outputs.

Recommendations for strengthening project design include:

- narrowing the spread of activities addressed by projects;
- refining the selection and phrasing of indicators and targets;
- improving the accuracy of budgeting and

- ensuring that project development is concluded within a reasonable time frame.

Recommendations for enhancing sustainability include:

- establishing institutional mechanisms for on-going co-ordination and accountability;
- developing a strategic plan that identifies and prioritises key SLM activities to be pursued (with the activities organised under thematic areas linked to appropriate sources of funding and institutional partners);
- provision of ongoing training and opportunities for knowledge sharing; and strengthening and diversifying working partnerships.

Recommendations for finalising delivery of certain project outputs focus on the delivery of fuel-efficient stoves and concluding the MoU with the Tanzania Meteorological Agency regarding maintenance of weather stations and interpreting weather data.

(TE pp.10-11).

More comprehensive recommendations can be found in the TE (pp.60-64).

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 report clearly assesses all relevant outcomes, impacts and objectives and provides a useful discussion of the accomplishments in each area.	HS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	Ratings are clear and well substantiated and also well summarized. The report is very consistent, but the source of the evidence discussed is not always made clear.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project assesses sustainability and all its components very clearly and usefully.	HS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are very comprehensive and supported by the evidence provided in the report.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides actual projects costs per outcome, but not per activity. Actual co-financing figures are included.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report provides a very thorough discussion of the project M&E systems and a useful analysis of the initial project logical framework's weaknesses.	HS
Overall TE Rating		HS

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

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