

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3469	
GEF Agency project ID		4073	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Sustainable Land Management in Shifting Cultivation Areas of Nagaland for Ecological and Livelihood Security (SLEM/CPP)	
Country/Countries		India	
Region		South Asia	
Focal area		Multi-Focal Area	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Land degradation SP1: Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management; SP 2: Supporting Sustainable Forest Management in Production Landscapes. Biodiversity SP4: Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity.	
Executing agencies involved		State Government of Nagaland, Department of Soil and Water Conservation	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None involved	
Private sector involvement		None involved	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 26 th , 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		July 20, 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	-	-
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		3.6	3.6
Co-financing	IA own	-	0.03
	Government	25.42	21.97

	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	-	-
Total GEF funding		3.6	3.6
Total Co-financing		25.42	22.0
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		29.02	25.6
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		March 2016	
Author of TE		Michael J.B. Green & Joy Dasgupta	
TER completion date		January 18, 2017	
TER prepared by		Spandana Battula	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environment Objective of the project is “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” (PD pg 22).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s Develop Objective is “to develop, demonstrate and upscale sustainable land management practices for the conservation of jhum (shifting cultivation) lands in Nagaland through an ecosystem approach” (PD pg 22). The project aimed to achieve its objective through three outcomes, namely (PD pgs 22-23):

Outcome 1: The policy, regulatory and institutional environment supports the integration of sustainable land management practices on jhum lands;

Outcome 2: Options for improving the sustainability of jhum agroforestry systems are developed and demonstrated in selected project sites (70 villages spread over the 3 districts of Mon, Mokokchung and Wokha in Nagaland); and

Outcome 3: Enhanced capacity to replicate the project’s policy reform and field-level experiences in other parts of Nagaland, as well as in other States of India, where shifting cultivation agroforestry systems are prevalent.

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

There were no changes to the objectives or activities during project 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
----------------------	----------------------

The project is consistent with GEF Council's Sustainable Land and Ecosystem Management Country Partnership Program, which was approved in 2007, and it is relevant to GEF's Land Degradation and Biodiversity focal areas. Under the Strategic Objective 1 of land degradation, the project fits well with Strategic Priorities 1 and 2, namely, "Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management; and, Supporting Sustainable Forest Management in Production Landscapes, respectively" (PD pg 22). The project is also consistent with Strategic Priority 4 of "Strengthening the Policy and Regulatory Framework for Mainstreaming Biodiversity" (PD pg 22).

The project is aligned with India's National Action Programme to Combat Desertification (2001) which aims to prevent loss of natural resources and agricultural productivity. As shifting cultivation is "one of the major causes of desertification in the country" (PD pg 29), the project objectives help in improving the management of shifting cultivation and thus, fulfilling India's commitments to UN Convention to Combat Dessertification (PD pgs 29-30).

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

The TE gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to the project's effectiveness and the TER gives the same rating. The project had three outcomes and 11 outputs. It largely delivered its outputs in outcome 1 and 2, but there were some limitations in achieving success due to delays in "establishing an inter-sectoral platform to coordinate project interventions and the provision of technical support services" (TE pg 42). The project was unable to fully deliver outputs in outcome 3 because of shortcomings in establishing a community-based system to monitor changes and delays due to shortage of funding.

Achievements under the planned outcomes are listed below:

Outcome 1: The policy, regulatory and institutional environment supports the integration of sustainable land management practices on jhum lands:

As per the TE, this outcome received moderate to highly satisfactory ratings for delivering its three outputs. To enable a policy environment for integration of sustainable land management practices, the project developed recommendations for strengthening the policy and regulatory environment that affect jhum lands (TE pg 36). The recommendations were found to be suitable by the government at a high level workshop in March 2015. The project also produced Guidelines to integrate land-use planning at the landscape/ village level in English and Konyak. However, the project had difficulties in setting-up an inter-sectoral coordination platform for jhum policies due to frequent change of government officers. The TE notes that the Project Steering Committee placed the project in the office of Agriculture Production Commissioner in August 2015 for effective implementation of action plans (TE pg 36).

Outcome 2: Options for improving the sustainability of jhum agroforestry systems are developed and demonstrated in selected project sites:

This outcome aimed to improve jhum agroforestry systems by piloting and demonstrating options for improvement originally in 70 villages, through five outputs. After the MTE, the target villages were reduced to 40 villages as the targets were not being met. The first two outputs planned to develop agri-silvi-pastoral models and establish linkages for such practices, which the project moderately succeeded in achieving. The project developed the agri-silvi-pastoral models for enhancing alternative sources of livelihood (TE pg 37). To establish linkages, the project had initiatives such as fish ponds, piggeries, and bee-keeping, and also made progress with micro-credit and marketing models. But the TE and MTE raised concerns over the relevance of these alternate income-generating activities to improving degraded land in terms of livelihood and ecological objective of the project (TE pg 37, MTE pg 28). For the output to integrate land use plans on a watershed basis, the project developed land use plans for 37 villages but the “integrated watershed-based approach to land use planning adopted (was) at individual LUP (Land Use Planning) but not watershed level” (TE pg 71). The project also built capacity of farmers, government extension workers and Village Councils but it was poorly documented as there were no means of verifying such as feedback forms (TE pg 37). Lastly, the project identified community biodiversity conservation sites and the TE recommends that the sites should inventory their biodiversity and establish a monitoring program as a conservation measure.

Outcome 3: Enhanced capacity to replicate the project’s policy reform and field-level experiences in other parts of Nagaland, as well as in other States of India, where shifting cultivation agroforestry systems are prevalent:

This outcome originally had four outputs, but, after the MTE, one was dropped because of shortfall in resources. The first output relating to setting up a community-based system for monitoring changes was not realized by the project. Although the Land-Use Planning had a “basic M&E section for monitoring progress with the action plan ... there is little evidence of this being used proactively, nor is there any process for reporting on performance” (TE pg 37). The project also aimed to employ Community Based Impact Assessment and it did assess impact of project’s land use practices on fallow management, soil erosion and agricultural productivity. Even best and worst practices were documented for replicating lessons learnt from the project (TE pg 37). For the output on documenting project experiences with

improved land management techniques, the project was unable to fully document and disseminate the project's experience with jhum improvement. The MTE states that the project "generated fliers on alternative production methods (e.g., broom grass, mushroom, piggery, fish & paddy, azolla)" (MTE pg 34, TE pg 38). Finally, in regard to establishing Centre of Excellence on sustainable jhum, this output was dropped and instead, the project worked on incorporating concepts and practices of improving jhum into the pre-service curriculum of Zubza Training Centre (TE pg 38).

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

The TE rated the project's efficiency as Moderately Satisfactory but noted that the project faced delays because of issues in government funding. Due to the recommendation of MTE, the project took an extension of 18 months to finish its activities. But the extension doubled the management costs resulting in an overspend of US\$ 338,00 (TE pg 30). In terms of cost effectiveness, in first 30 months, the project had disproportionate expenditure of the budget towards activities for outcomes. For example, outcome 1 used 91% from allocated budget and 62% for outcome 2. In addition, the field-level activities did not have baseline data, land use plans and other necessary framework and thus, the activities were not aligned to expected outcomes. However, the TE states that after MTE, "project refocused its efforts on core deliverables while cutting back on ad hoc interventions" (TE pg 43).

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

The TE rated the project's overall sustainability as Moderately Likely and the TER finds it appropriate. Although the project's financial sustainability is high, there are moderate risks involved in sociopolitical, institutional framework and governance, as well as environmental components.

Financial resources: The TE reports that the Government of Nagaland committed approximately US\$ 680,000 "for a follow up phase in 2016 during which efforts will need to focus on securing adequate resources to transition from piloting to mainstreaming improvements in jhum agroforestry through an ecosystem approach" (TE pg 41). For sustaining the progress, the project also has funds available from North Eastern Council and Compensatory Afforestation Management Project Authority (CAMPA), while there are also other financial options such as REDD+ and North Eastern Electric Power Corporation (NEEPCO) (TE pg 41). Thus, the financial risks seem low and sustainability to be likely.

Sociopolitical: The MTE notes that the project was "promoting a shift away from jhum agriculture and towards more sedentary and monetized production systems without safeguards" (MTE pg 35) which could deprive the people from their traditional land base. Without the safeguards to protect the lands, "there is a very real danger that the policies being pursued under this project will result in substantial and negative social impacts" (MTE pg 35, TE pg 41). However, in terms of political sustainability, the stakeholder ownership of the project had been very impressive as the state government and village communities equally participated in the implementation (TE pg 36). In fact, the

project created a dedicated coordination function on “Policy and Institutional Reform for Mainstreaming and Up-scaling SLEM in India” for sustaining the benefits for the future (TE pg 43). Considering both the social risks and political willingness, the TER gives a Moderately Likely rating.

Institutional framework and governance: The project submitted recommendations for strengthening agroforestry policies that affect jhum lands which were well-received by the government, but, the amendments had not been formally approved by state government (TE pg 42 & 36). However, the project had gained support “at district and community development block levels by multi-sectoral coordinating groups for jhum policies and management” (TE pg 41). As the project is still in the process of strengthening institutional capacities and needs approvals of policies from government for sustaining the benefits, the TER gives a Moderately Likely rating.

Environmental: The TE considered the environmental sustainability was high if participatory land use planning was used to upscale Sustainable Land and Ecosystem Management for jhum conservation. The conservation efforts could lengthen jhum cycles, thereby enhancing vegetation cover. Protection of community forests could increase forest cover and protect water bodies. Also, the land use planning could “provide protection of cultivated jhum and fallow from livestock grazing, as required; chemical fertilizer free and pesticide free jhum lands producing ‘safe’” (TE pg 41). However, as environmental sustainability is linked to institutional and governance framework, the TER gives a Moderately Likely rating due to lack of official policies in places.

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 actual co-financing of \$21,998,076 was lesser than the expected co-financing amount of \$25,416,612 because the materialized government funding did not match the amount promised at the CEO endorsement stage. The TE notes that the shortage and release of government funding led to delay in project implementation in 2015. This affected outcome 3 as there was very limited time left for implementing land use planning (TE pgs 31 & 34).

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 multiple delays and slow-downs. It took a year for the “project to become operational on the field” and the TE noted a “lack of commencement of work on some key outputs” (TE pg 35). At the recommendation of MTE, the project took a no-cost extension of 18 months as there was very little time left for substantial work to be done (MTE pg 8, TE pg 7). In 2015, it faced additional six-month delay

in implementation because of issues in disbursement of funds from the government. The TE states that the delay “undermined consolidation on various fronts and especially with respect to Outcome 3” (TE pg 33).

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

The project had strong ownership and support from the national and state government. In fact, the SLEM programme was implemented as a joint initiative of the Government of India and GEF. The programme set-up a medium-size project for up-scaling called Policy and Institutional Reform for Mainstreaming and Up-scaling SLEM in India (TE pg 43). The state government of Nagaland showed support in financial front by committing US\$ 480,000 in 2015 and US\$ 730,000 for a follow up stage of the project in 2016. At the district level, the district project management unit “engaged with target villages and coordinated inputs from line departments” (TE pg 35).

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 gave a Moderately Satisfactory rating to the project’s M&E design at entry. The project provides a baseline scenario and information for every outcome. It also has provision for inception workshop and report, periodic monitoring and quarterly reports, project implementation review and terminal evaluation (PD pgs 34-35). However, the indicators in log frame have “no coherent relationship with the project outputs” and some of them are poorly defined (TE pg 39). For example, the indicator on “no change in primary forest cover in project sites” fails to define primary forests and at what level forest cover need to be measured (TE pg 20). There are also many inconsistencies in the text and log frame within the project document (TE pg 39).

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

The TE gave a Moderately Unsatisfactory rating to the project’s M&E implementation and the TER agrees. The project submitted quarterly and annual reports and held meetings regularly, but the indicators and other parts of the log frame were never revised to correct the inconsistencies that were pointed in the inception and MTE phase (TE pg 32). Also, the project had many delays and hold-ups that

could have been avoided with regular monitoring and follow-up mechanisms. It seems the project management unit did not effectively utilize the M&E tools to link budget and impact reporting to the log frame (TE pg 31).

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

The TE gave Moderately Satisfactory rating to UNDP's implementation of the project. The UNDP along with the executing agency established the land use planning mechanism addressing jhum cultivation under the village council. The mechanism included members such as women, who in fact don't have land holding rights, thereby empowering them to contribute in decision-making process (TE pg 32). However, UNDP's implementation process did not work towards properly aligning and prioritizing interventions, refining M&E strategy, and utilizing the logical framework (TE pg 33).

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

The project's executing agency was Department of Soil & Water Conservation (DSWC) and the TE gave it a Moderately Satisfactory rating. The DSWC showed high-level village commitment "to the extent that many outputs have been and are continuing to be delivered with considerable success" (TE pg 33). The agency established not only established the land use planning mechanism, but also the multisector coordination platforms at district levels. However, there were some weaknesses in execution such as the slow implementation of the project in 2015 because of the funding shortage. There were also "difficulties in communication between village LUCs and line departments through the district administrations" (TE pg 33).

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 immediate environmental impacts from the project were minimal, for instance, the forest cover on jhum land had improved on only 2% of the total area of Nagaland. The project had also applied better fallow management practices as well as soil/water conservation measures but only to 1.7% of the total area of the state.

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.

The project made substantial alternative-livelihood contributions by “technically supporting livelihood and income generating activities within 40 target villages” (TE pg 45). It also developed agri-silvi-pastoral models for enhancing alternative sources of livelihoods. Feedback from villagers indicates that initiatives such as introduction of cash crops and horticulture crops in jhum areas were successful for income generation (TE pg 78).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. “Capacities” include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. “Governance” refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities: The TE states that there were capacity building efforts for farmers, extension workers, Village Councils and land use committees, however, the project poorly documented it (TE pg 37).

b) Governance: The project submitted recommendations for strengthening the existing forest and agricultural policies that affect jhum lands, however, state government had to take action to amend the policies (TE pg 42). The project also produced guidelines for integrated and participatory land-use planning at the village level (TE pg 36).

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 project's establishment of land use committees required women to be members of the committees. "For the first time, women, who have no land holding rights in the State and cannot participate in Village Council meetings, have been empowered to contribute to decision-making processes within the community" (TE pg 39).

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 TE does not report of adoption of any GEF initiatives.

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.

Lessons learnt that are key for follow-up process are: (TE pgs 51-52):

- a) Develop an overarching approach that would secure diversity of agriculture and wildlife alongside sustainable land use management;
- b) Apply consistent, transparent and criteria-based approach when selecting interventions for the project. However, no resources should be spent on "activities concerned with the development of settled cultivation" (TE pg 51);
- c) Maintain environmentally sustainable management of jhum lands such as producing organic or safe food which could provide niche marketing opportunity for Nagaland to sell organic products;
- d) Include a research and monitoring role within farm schools which would inform jhum practices through scientific way;
- e) Return agricultural household waste to jhum areas for sustainable productivity;
- f) Utilize the log frame for effective monitoring and evaluation and ensure changes made during MTR and the inception phase is reflected in the framework;
- g) Ensure multi-stakeholder cooperation and multi-sector platform is available for natural resource management; and

- h) Ensure project planning is holistic in the development of land use planning to avoid wildlife conflicts.

Best and worst practices are (TE pgs 52-53):

- a) The bottom-up approach used to anchor the project within local governance system “increases opportunities for securing future resources through village, block and district level budgets, reducing reliance on more distant funding from state and central governments” (TE pg 52);
- b) The multi-sectoral platforms have helped in coordinating regularly with village communities involved in jhum cultivations;
- c) The project left the jhum lands free from chemical fertilizers and pesticides, thereby, creating a niche market for safe and organic products for Nagaland jhumias;
- d) The project benefited in establishing demonstration farms to promote improved jhum agroforestry which could be used to widen the scope to include monitoring and research;
- e) The worst practice of the project was “its failure to follow the Project Document from the outset of implementation” which resulted in “project interventions implemented by mid-term that did not address project outputs and outcomes in any strategic manner, by which time 58% of the budget had been spent” (TE pg 53).

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provided recommendations for the transition phase and mainstreaming (TE pgs 48-51):

- a) Provide technical support to the target villages “to enable them to monitor and deliver their LUPs and action plans” (TE pg 48);
- b) Fast-track the process of establishing policy and regulatory framework in support of jhum agroforestry so that the policy environment is in place for mainstreaming;
- c) Along with establishing multi-sector district platforms, “establish equivalent platforms at the level of Community Development Blocks on which LUCs are to be represented” (TE pg 48);
- d) Document project experience providing guidelines, policies and practices on jhum agroforestry systems;
- e) Include monitoring and research in the selected farm schools per district so that the research will help in enhancing agroforestry practices;
- f) To focus on high potential for marketing, pilot the organisation of producer companies in each district;
- g) Enable participatory approach in monitoring systems for jhum village areas and make them compatible with land use planning and actions;
- h) “Pilot sustainable, community-based tourism that features agri-, eco- and cultural aspects of tourism” (TE pg 49);
- i) Collaborate with projects such as the KFW-funded biodiversity project to develop synergies;
- j) Work with institutional and organization partners such as the Nagaland University, and community youth organizations to document knowledge and facilitate management;

- k) Institutionalize the project's future initiatives by registering it as a society;
- l) Mainstream the scaling up of jhum agroforestry and not divert funds into supporting settled agriculture;
- m) Mainstreaming of the jhum agroforestry will be through establishment of infrastructure and supported by districts through multisector platforms;
- n) Develop State Landscape Strategy with the mainstreaming provide an overarching spatial framework for conservation and embrace agri-cultural practices;
- o) Maintain GIS database based on participatory monitoring of land use planning which will be accessible via programme's website;
- p) With assistance from Ministry of Horticulture and Small Farmers Agribusiness Consortium, establish Farmer Producer Organisations and also engage with organic certification programmes to link farmers directly to markets; and
- q) "Introduce sustainable waste management into communities that manage jhum lands based on the principle that all agricultural and organic household waste should be returned (recycled) to jhum lands" (TE pg 51);

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains detailed examination of outcomes but the assessment of impacts is poorly done. The report only had evaluation of environmental stress/reduction.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is quite consistent with evidence and ratings given and the report has substantial details except for the section on impacts.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project does not have an exit strategy as it has a replication and scaling up strategy post-the project. The sustainability section is properly assessed.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learnt are well substantiated with evidence and the report also provides a list of best and worst practices.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report consists of actual co-financing amounts and also costs per activity.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report assessed and gave appropriate ratings for M&E design and implementation.	S
Overall TE Rating		S

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

The TER did not use any other additional sources.