

## GEF IEO Terminal Evaluation Review form (retrofitting of APR2004 cohort)

This form is for retrofitting of the TERs prepared for APR2004. While several topics covered in this form had already been covered in the earlier form, this revised form adds several other performance and impact related concerns.

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		351	
GEF Agency project ID		236	
GEF Replenishment Phase		Pilot Phase	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		A Dynamic Farmer-Based Approach to the Conservation of African Plant Genetic Resources	
Country/Countries		Ethiopia	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP-1 Arid and Semi-Arid Zone Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Natural Resources Development and Environmental Protection	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		No	
Private sector involvement		through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		8/31/1994	
Effectiveness date / project start		8/31/1994	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		9/1/1997	
Actual date of project completion		1/1/2002	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.46	2.46
Co-financing	IA/EA own		
	Government	0.25	0.25
	Other*		
Total GEF funding		2.46	2.46
Total Co-financing		0.25	0.25
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.71	2.71
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		9/1/2002	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Dr. Dionyious K. Kiambi	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) preparer		Baastel	
Original GEF IEO TER (2004) reviewer		Antonio Del Monaco	
Revised TER (2014) completion date		10/04/2014	
Revised TER (2014) prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER GEF IEO peer review (2014)		Joshua Schneck	

\*Includes contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development, cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector, and beneficiaries.

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S	N/A	N/A	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	L	N/A	N/A	L
M&E Design	N/A	N/A	N/A	MS
M&E Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU
Quality of Implementation	N/A	N/A	N/A	UA
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			N/A	MU

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

According to the previous TER, the global environment objective of this project is the conservation of genetic resources of indigenous crop varieties maintained by farmers in dynamic agro-systems found in Ethiopia.

As stated in the PD, this is a biodiversity conservation project that addresses indigenous crop varieties maintained by farmers in dynamic agro-ecosystems Ethiopia. Past efforts to conserve crop diversity have focused on maintaining genetic diversity in static *ex situ* gene banks. Through a novel method of establishing Community Gene Banks this project links farm communities and their landraces with existing genetic resource conservation efforts of the Plant Genetic Center/Ethiopia (PGRC/E). Strengthening of Ethiopian capacity for research and extension supports conservation and will allow a sustainable expansion of this program to other regions of the country.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

According to the previous TER, the development objective of this project is to develop a sustained capacity within Ethiopia to conserve biodiversity of crop landraces together with their associated farmer knowledge.

The last PIR states the five outcomes of the project:

- (1) Strengthen the institutional capacity for planning and implementing *in situ* conservation. Establish community support for in situ conservation in 8 districts and establish community gene banks in 6 of those districts.
- (2) Established in-situ conservation areas and constructed Community Gene Banks
- (3) Select and train farmer conservators to curate and manage the community gene banks.
- (4) Improved extension agent training in districts with community gene banks.
- (5) Identification by PGRC/E and consultants/NGO of market products that utilize landraces and their potential market.

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

There has been no change in the objectives and activities of this project during implementation.

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

There is no information on relevance in the previous TER, and in the TE; Information comes from the PD.

The relevance of this project is satisfactory.

The objectives of the project are relevant to the two main policies developed by the country; a policy on plant genetic resources (both wild and domesticated) that clears the way for a strategy on the conservation and sustainable use of plant genetic resources in Ethiopia, and a second national policy that supports landrace genetic conservation and utilization. Ethiopia is tackling the policy issues of the conservation and enhanced utilization of landraces, but the scientific and technological capability is low. The GEF support is therefore relevant, since this project was designed to conserve and effectively utilize landraces by expanding the informal strategies for genetic resource conservation that are currently in effect. According to the PD, "by incorporating the informal sector into the international network, an overall, integrated strategy for genetic resource conservation can emerge, involving farmers, farming communities, scientists, and extension workers. This process will provide for a reciprocal exchange of information, materials and benefits between these two sectors that have, to date, remained largely divorced from one another" (PD, pg.11).

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

According to the previous TER, the Project is unique and considered as the pioneer in promoting farmer-based landraces conservation and enhancement both in the country and elsewhere. The project has clearly demonstrated that on farm conservation is a practical, viable and effective mechanism for maintenance of plant genetic resources by farmers in their traditional farming systems and settings.

The creation of the Community Gene Banks (CGBs) and the Community Conservation Associations (CCAs) models and concepts is a very practical approach to the conservation and use of plant genetic resources at the community level as it links farm communities and their landrace with existing genetic conservation efforts. This approach is highly replicable in other parts of the country and around the world if modified appropriately to suit the socio-cultural conditions of the rural communities.

The following are the major project's achievements described in the TE:

- (1) The institutional capacity of IBCR to manage on-farm conservation initiatives strengthened
- (2) The molecular laboratory established and ex situ conservation gene bank well equipped
- (3) Project vehicles, office and field equipments procured and in use.
- (4) On-farm conservation, research and development activities initiated in six project sites
- (5) Numerous publications including 2 papers in scientific journals, 6 MSc Thesis, 3 PhD Thesis and several technical papers, workshop proceedings and reports
- (6) 4 PhDs, 6 MScs, 7 BScs and 13 Diplomas trained in different technical fields
- (7) 48 DAs, 44 Certificates and 3883 farmer conservators trained and engaged in on farm conservation
- (8) 12 CCAs with a membership of 3359 farmer conservators established and functioning
- (9) 400 farmer varieties comprising 22 crops conserved on rotational basis in 49 conservation sites in six districts
- (10) 12 well equipped Community Gene Banks with an annual turnover of 136,942 Kg of farmer varieties established and functioning in six project sites
- (11) Linkages with private sector established resulting in contracts for farmers to supply 1,000 tons of durum wheat annually
- (12) 2 National workshops held – one on ecogeographic surveys and the other on presentation of project results and planning for the follow-on project.

However, some of the project's achievements were mitigated by shortcomings including:

- (1) Inadequate participation of women in conservation and training activities.
- (2) Lack of a clear strategy in the establishment of botanical gardens and consequently this component of the project is incomplete in several sites including Ada'a, South Wolo and Tigray.
- (3) Lack of efforts to establish institutional linkages and specialized and interdisciplinary networks. In the implementation of activities IBCR has largely adopted a unilateral approach with inadequate involvement of key partners in the research component, which is necessarily complex and multidisciplinary in nature. The CCAs are therefore not legalized and their sustainability is on slippery grounds.
- (4) Finally, the research agenda didn't benefit from an harmonized approach based on an overall institutional implementation strategy. There seems to be little cross-fertilization, synergy and horizontal transfer of experiences and technologies between sites.

Overall, the effectiveness can be rated as satisfactory.

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

No detailed information on efficiency is given in the TE.

The only information is that the project was scheduled to end in 1998 but terminated four years behind targeted completion date (no explanations stated in the TE for the delays). In addition, the TE also mentioned a lack of timeliness in delivery of material and monetary provisions to Development Assistants (DAs). According to the TE, “the project has largely taken a unilateral approach in implementation of its activities with only marginal involvement of key stakeholders primarily due to shortage of funds and time”.

As shown in the last PIR, the project appeared to have stayed on budget. No detailed information is given, but the budget seems to have been respected.

Overall, the efficiency is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

<b>4.4 Sustainability</b>	Rating: <b>Likely</b>
---------------------------	-----------------------

According to the previous TER, the conservation of plant genetic resources on farm is an ecologically sound approach that allows for continuity of evolutionary processes of diversity through the gradual adaptation of crops to biotic and abiotic pressures while at the same time sustaining livelihoods and providing a source of genetic material that sustains agricultural production. The government, through IBCR, is putting in place sustainability mechanisms through provision of funds to meet the major running costs of the Community Gene Banks (CGBs) including the Development Assistants (DAs) salaries. The project has stopped the cash compensation system and has strengthened the more sustainable revolving seed loan schemes, which have to a large extent provided incentives to farmers. The milling companies used to import the wheat variety but are now contracting farmers to supply the grain, with an estimated annual demand of 10,000 quintals (1,000 tons).

The project has also created awareness and raised the national profile of plant genetic resources among scientists, the public and the policy makers. The heightened profile on biodiversity, leading to the Presidential Proclamation on the Institute of Biodiversity Conservation and Research (IBCR’s) new mandate and the pronouncement of National Policy on Biodiversity Conservation and Research may partly be attributed to the work of the project. The project also contributed to increasing the awareness and participation of local farmers in the national plant genetic resources conservation. Because they rely on landrace for subsistence agriculture and are the beholders of the associated traditional knowledge their participation allowed for a reciprocal exchange of information, materials and benefits and therefore enhances crop conservation. The farmers’ commitment to genetic resources conservation will allow the project benefits to be sustained.

The project has contributed significantly to the development of a sustained capacity within Ethiopia to conserve biodiversity of crop landraces through strengthening of farmer organizations: 12 CCAs are established and functional. Most CCAs have annual general meetings and, have adopted management framework. In addition more than 3883 conservators joined the CCAs. Twelve Community Gene Banks are now constructed, operational and there is a good community participation in their running. The numerous publications emanating from the project's research work will inform policy, scientific community and the population in Ethiopia and elsewhere in the world of the immense opportunities that exist in the sustenance of agricultural productivity without necessarily compromising conservation imperatives.

On the other hand, a closer collaboration with other institutions would have made use of their comparative advantages in accordance to their institutional mandates and mission statements especially in the social sciences and anthropological fields. CCAs rules and regulations are in place. However there is low women participation and CCAs are not yet legalized. There is a policy disconnect between promotion of farmer varieties as mandated to IBCR (through the Presidential Proclamation No.120/1998 the National Policy on Plant Genetic Resources) and the evident promotion of improved varieties and other inputs by Ethiopian Agriculture Research Organization (EARO) in response to the government's agricultural policy on increasing production. There is therefore an additional need to review and analyse the existing policies in relation to the nature and scope of policy and institutional support for in situ/on farm conservation programmes in order to enhance sustainability of farmer variety conservation. Devolution of power, more strengthened relationships with and greater involvement of regional organizations in the running of the CCAs would further enhance the sustainability of the project, which is an issue of concern to farmers since the necessary management capabilities have not yet been developed in some sites.

The CGBs have served the intended purpose but did not blend very well with the community physical environment. For instance, the CGBs had to be fumigated to deal with problems of grain storage pests and this could have been avoided by better integration of traditional post harvest seed storage methods based on documentation and application of indigenous knowledge. TE points out that it is not yet clear how the high calibre of trained personnel will be strategically deployed and used in the furtherance of the project's goals

## **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?

No information on co financing is given in the previous TER and in the TE.

The last PIR only mentions that in this project there was no emphasis on additional finance leveraging. However, UNDP – seeing the linkages from the project to food security issues at local level added

another 0.135 million US \$ as co-finance to increase impact and dissemination of findings. Additionally, IBCR is seeking a follow-on project and has identified Irish and French willingness to co-finance an agro-biodiversity project in the future.

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?

According to the previous TER, the project was scheduled to end in 1998 but terminated four years behind targeted completion date (no explanations stated in the TE for the delays). In addition, the TE also mentioned a lack of timeliness in delivery of material and monetary provisions to Development Assistants (DAs), but no reason are given.

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:

According to the previous TER, during the implementation of activities, the Institute of Biodiversity Conservation and Research (IBCR) has largely adopted a unilateral approach with inadequate involvement of key partners in the research component, which is necessarily complex and multidisciplinary in nature. Greater efforts could have been made to involve the key partners in a more meaningful way through joint project planning meetings and establishment of a consultative process that would have ensured more interactions at the planning, implementation and internal monitoring levels.

## 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: <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
-------------------------	--

As envisaged in the project document, a Project Coordinating Committee (PCC) comprising extension agents, a farmer representative, University/EARO researchers, and local government agents assisted the Project Co-ordinator. In addition, a Project Advisory and Overseeing Committee (PAOC) made up of four prominent national and three international experts drawn from relevant disciplines provided technical oversight in the project's implementation. The PAOC's envisaged responsibility was to oversee, monitor and evaluate the project's activities and provide guidance throughout its life.

Two evaluation missions were planned. The first of these was the mid-term review (MTR), which is an expectation under the NEX guidelines. The objective of the MTR was to report to IBCR and UNDP on the progress made in achieving the project objectives and offer suggestions for future planning. According to the TE, the MTR was to compile “a report on the status of the project using the project document and focus on the concept of the project design as well as inputs and outputs and also focus on the implementation, results and lessons learned”. The second was the independent technical selective review undertaken by the Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel (STAP) of the Global Environment Facility (GEF) with the aim of assessing the scientific and technical soundness of the project and make recommendations as necessary.

Although the Project document did not present a Logical Framework Analysis, the TE provided one which lists performance indicators against which the TE does an assessment. However this assessment makes no reference to baseline conditions. Moreover, according to the previous TER, most of the indicators are not appropriate to assess project outcomes and focus on whether project activities have been realized.

Therefore the M&E design at entry is rated as Moderately Satisfactory.

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

According to the previous TER, the M&E implementation is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory.

Based on recommendations made through The MTR, some efforts were made in implementing recommendations on policy analysis and incentive measures particularly through the commissioning of consultants’ reports on policy and marketing aspects and the linking of farmers with the milling industries. However, failure to fully implement recommendations from PAOC, STAP, MTR and other studies appears to be one of the main weaknesses of the project. For instance MTR key recommendations on strengthening institutional linkages and improving project monitoring were not implemented. In addition the STAP recommendations to broaden the spectrum of collaborating scientists and partner institutions and also build inter-disciplinary networks involving social scientists, anthropologists, sociologists and economists were not effectively addressed. According to the TE, this absence of follow up has mitigated project’s achievements.

## **7. Assessment of project implementation and execution**

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.



<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Unable to Assess</b>
--	---------------------------------

There is no information on the quality of project implementation in the previous TER and in the TE. Therefore, it is not possible to assess the quality of UNDP implementation.

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

According to the previous TER, quality of execution is moderately unsatisfactory.

The main executing agency was Institute of Biodiversity Conservation and Research (IBCR). Other executing partners were Plant Genetic Resources Centre, Ministry of Natural Resources Development and Environment Protection (MNRDEP), and International Plant Genetic Resource Institute (IPGRI).

In the implementation of activities IBCR has largely adopted a unilateral approach with inadequate involvement of key partners in the research component, which is necessarily complex and multidisciplinary in nature.

Insufficient policy support for in situ conservation from Ministry of Agriculture was one of the main challenges. Ministry of Agriculture was preoccupied with High Yielding Varieties as an immediate input to crop and Food Security. The sectoral nature of the Ethiopia Government, with the executing agency IBCR being in “Ministry of Science” does not allow easy collaboration and it took time for policy lessons to filter into other Ministries. Additionally, frequent turnover of qualified staff and lack of motivating incentives is one of the challenges faced both at institute and project operation level – especially in the field.

## **8. Assessment of Project Impacts**

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 last TER, this innovative pilot project greatly contributed to the intended goal of conserving the genetic resources of indigenous crop varieties by: establishing 6 in-situ conservation sites, 12 community gene banks, conserving on farm 400 farmer varieties comprising 22 crops with annual turnover of 136,942 Kg of seeds. Some farmer varieties that were lost have now been re-introduced in the project sites and interest and demand for these varieties has increased.

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 community conservation associations/ community gene banks model has proved quite successful in providing seed security to farmers and cushioning them against crop failure as was proved in Ejere the year before the TE was undertaken. As a result of the model's success, there was a steady growth of the amount of farmer variety seeds supplied and the number of farmer conservators (beneficiaries) joining the project in the period 1997-2002. In one of the site for example, the amount of wheat and legumes seed supplied to farmers increased from 24,000-339,000Kg while the total number of farmer beneficiaries rose from 156 to 1302 in the same period. As a result, there is an increase in awareness of the importance of on farm conservation

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 last PIR, the project has made significant contributions in building scientific and research capacities within IBCR. It helped to raise awareness and strengthened the profile of conservation work in the country. The conservation model has shown signs of good potential for replication in other ecological zones within the country and elsewhere in Africa. (PIR)

The TE also mentions that the project has contributed significantly to capacity building to the National Herbarium of the Addis Ababa University and the project has successfully initiated and implemented a broad range of research in two broad thematic areas, ethno botanical research and, population and conservation biology. The research outputs comprise publications that include scientific papers in refereed journals, postgraduate Thesis, papers presented in workshops, technical reports and booklets.

Finally, the project has created awareness and raised the national profile of plant genetic resources among scientists, the public and the policy makers. The heightened profile of biodiversity, leading to the Presidential Proclamation on IBCR's new mandate and the pronouncement of National Policy on Biodiversity Conservation and Research may partly be attributed to the work of the project.

#### b) Governance

According to the last PIR, the project has contributed to preparation of the new draft agricultural policy i.e. farmer varieties utilization in marginal areas has been included in the new draft policy as an extension package.

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.

According to the TE, “the project has to a large extent served as a model and a learning process from which the country and the rest of the world can draw lessons for up-scaling, replication and informing policy”. For example, if well documented, the concepts of CCAs and CGBs could serve as models with a high potential for replication within the country and elsewhere in the world.

## **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 following lessons are mentioned in the previous TER:

- (1) Conservation of plant genetic resources on farm is a complex and multi-faceted undertaking that requires integrated strategies of institutional strengthening, research and training at different levels. It also requires a multidisciplinary approach that ought to draw skills and expertise from a wide range of institutions through establishment of strategic institutional linkages.
- (2) On farm conservation of crop genetic resources at the community level is a dynamic interplay of political, economic and socio-cultural factors. It requires an integrated farming systems approach that ought to enhance food security, increased agricultural productivity and farmers income, while maintaining diversity and contributing to the overall environmental health.
- (3) The conservation of plant genetic resources on farm is an ecologically sound approach that allows for continuity of evolutionary processes of diversity through the gradual adaptation of crops to biotic and abiotic pressures while at the same time sustaining livelihoods and providing a source of genetic material that sustains agricultural production.

- (4) The CCA-CGB model and concept is a very practical approach to the conservation and use of plant genetic resources at the community level. It is highly replicable in other parts of the country and the world at large but has to be modified appropriately to suit the socio-cultural conditions of the rural communities.
- (5) Policy disconnects between promotion of conservation imperatives such as maintenance of farmer varieties and the introduction of improved varieties for increased production on the other hand could be a great impediment, as farmers receive conflicting messages

## 9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following recommendations are described in the previous TER:

- (1) Building effective interdisciplinary networks involving scientists, including anthropologists, sociologists and economics as well as natural scientists such as population geneticists and biometricians would enhance the ethno botanical research component of the project.
- (2) A lot of experience and insights in community-based approaches to biodiversity conservation have been accrued in the project and these could be very useful in the development of a conceptual framework and implementation of a follow-on project.
- (3) A lot of value could be added to the project's achievements by a clearer demonstration of the impact of its activities on income generation, food security and linkage to health and nutrition.

## 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 provides an incomplete assessment of the project outcomes and impacts. Training and research activities undertaken are described in details but while the TE points out that it is not yet clear how the high caliber of trained personnel will be strategically deployed and used in the furtherance of the project's goals, the way in which research findings have been and will be used to rationalize in-situ conservation program is not discussed.	<b>MU</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	TE appears to be internally consistent, however some of the affirmations made are not well supported by examples or details. For instance, TE mentioned that the CGBs were too costly but it is not clear by what standards and the implications are not discussed. TE was also unable to assess the great difference in CCA membership between the various project sites. The TE, also did not give any ratings. A lot of information is missing.	<b>U</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE provides valuable insights on sustainability mechanisms established and points out some shortcomings of the approaches that could limit sustainability of project benefits (particularly at the institutional level).	<b>S</b>
To what extent are the lessons	Lessons learned presented are comprehensive and well	<b>S</b>

learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	supported by evidences discussed in the report.	
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE neither includes the actual project cost nor actual co-financing information. There is no analysis of cost efficiency of the project.	<b>HU</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is very briefly described, and apart from the MTR and STAP recommendations there is no other information and analysis.	<b>U</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MU</b>

**Overall TE Rating:  $0.3 * (3+2) + .1 * (5+5+1+2) = 1.5 + 1.3 = 2.8 = MU$**

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