

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3468	
GEF Agency project ID		112844	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		World Bank	
Project name		SLEM/CPP: Institutional Coordination, Policy Outreach and M & E Project under Sustainable Land and Ecosystem	
Country/Countries		India	
Executing agencies involved		MOEF, through the Indian Council of Forestry Research and Education, (ICFRE)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		As members of national steering committee	
Private sector involvement		None given	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 28, 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 10 th , 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2013	
Actual date of project completion		December 31 st , 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		.99	.88
Co-financing	IA own	NA	NA
	Government	NA	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	NA	NA
	Private sector	NA	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	NA	NA
Total GEF funding		.99	.88
Total Co-financing		1	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		1.99	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		1/28/2015	
Author of TE		Herbert Acquay	
TER completion date		6/17/2016	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)			

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	Satisfactory	NR	Satisfactory
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	NR	UA
M&E Design	NR	NR	MS
M&E Implementation	NR	NR	UA
Quality of Implementation	NR	NR	UA
Quality of Execution	NR	NR	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	NR	NR	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's global environmental objectives

The project document does not list global environmental objectives, however this project was part of the Sustainable Land and Ecosystem Management (SLEM) program in India, which had as its objective "to promote sustainable land management and use of biodiversity as well as maintain the capacity of ecosystems to deliver goods and services while taking account of climate change." (PIF project 3268 p.1)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project's development objectives were to "enhance the institutional and policy framework for harmonization, coordination and monitoring of interventions in agricultural and natural resource management strategies that promote sustainable land management and enhance agricultural productivity while minimizing environmental impacts." (GRM, p.1)

The project had three components:

- 1) Institutional and Policy Mainstreaming
- 2) Outreach and Knowledge management for scaling up of sustainable land management solutions
- 3) Partnership program management and M&E

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

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
<p>This project fell under the Land Degradation focal area and under GEF-4 strategic program Land Degradation SP1 and 2. It contributes to the long-term impacts of Strategic Objective 2, generating sustainable flows of ecosystem services from forests, including drylands, and through SP4 and SP5 is consistent with SLEM as the concept of payment for ecosystem services will be pursued through linking ecosystem services such as water regulation and protection of pollinating insects to agricultural land and commons. The project is of national relevance because it corresponds with the eleventh five year plan of the Indian government, which placed a high priority on raising agricultural productivity to achieve an annual agricultural growth of more than 4.1 percent.</p>	
4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Satisfactory
<p>The TE rates achievement of the project's three components as satisfactory. This TER rates effectiveness as satisfactory.</p> <p>As part of the project's first component, Institutional Policy and Mainstreaming, an analytical baseline study was completed and published as planned, a National Steering Committee for SLEM policy coordination was created, and a road map for policy and institutional harmonization was created. As part of the second component, technical solutions for SLEM inventoried and dispatched & information database on SLEM established, SLEM best practices were documented and published, and an online database was developed to access the documented best practices. Finally, as part of program management and M&E, an operational manual was prepared and adopted and national indicators were developed for SLEM programmatic outcomes.</p>	
4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unable to Assess
4.4 Sustainability	Rating:

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?

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?

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:

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:
-------------------------	---------

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

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:
---------------------------------------	---------

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

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.

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.

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

b) Governance

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.

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.

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.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

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?	This is not a TE, rather it is the project's final Grant Reporting and Monitoring Report. It contains limited details however they are relevant to tracking the project's progress towards outcomes.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally convincing but not all relevant ratings are provided.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	There is no discussion of project sustainability or exit strategy, only a brief discussion of recommended follow up activities.	U
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	No lessons learned or recommendations are presented.	U
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report provides total GEF funding, but no activity or co-financing figures are provided.	MU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	Part of the project's function is to provide M&E for its program, and this is discussed but monitoring of the project is not.	U
Overall TE Rating		MU

