

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3567	
GEF Agency project ID		GEF-FSP-18 BF)	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-3	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Sustainable Land Management in the Watersheds of the North Central Plateau	
Country/Countries		Burkina Faso	
Region		West and Central Africa	
Focal area		Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SP 1 on placing sustainable land management in the mainstream of development policy and practice at the local level	
Executing agencies involved		Burkina Faso Ministry of Agriculture, Water and Fisheries (MOAWF)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Producer organizations: through consultations	
Private sector involvement		--	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		May 2008	
Effectiveness date / project start		January 2009	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		January 2014	
Actual date of project completion		N/A	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0	N/A
	Co-financing	0	N/A
GEF Project Grant			
Co-financing	IA own	16.03	N/A
	Government	3.31	N/A
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	6.73	N/A
	Private sector	0	N/A
	NGOs/CSOs*	1.76	N/A
Total GEF funding		2.016	1.39
Total Co-financing		27.82	N/A
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		29.83	N/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		N/A	
Author of TE		N/A – IFAD West and Central Africa Division	
TER completion date		December 6, 2015	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

*In-kind contributions from beneficiaries

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

This project (often referred to as “the sub-program”) is one of four regional sub-programs financed by the GEF as part of Burkina Faso’s pilot Country Partnership Programme (CPP) on Sustainable Land Management (SLM). The project focuses on the Northern Plateau regions and shares the same three main objectives as the broader Burkina Faso CPP:

- “contributing to the development of a partnership platform and coordinated approach to sustainable and equitable land management, [SEP]”
- promoting the institutional and policy contexts to support better mainstreaming of SLM,
- promoting integrated and equitable SLM practices based on innovative modalities and [SEP] local knowledge.”

(Project Document (PD), p.30)

The general goal of the program, which comprises both environment and economic/development components, is to “improve the potential for production by rural populations while preserving the global environment, in particular the agro-ecosystems, natural habitats and biotopes of biodiversity of the northern watersheds” (PD p.30).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

This GEF project is part of the IFAD-funded Sustainable Rural Development Programme (SRDP), an important objective of which is to ensure the sustainable economic development of the region and improve the livelihoods of the local population. Although this is not a key objective of the GEF project, “as an integral part of the SRDP, the GEF project also will play a role in improving the livelihoods and living conditions of the rural populations, thus advancing objectives of the GoBF’s Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP).”

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

There are no reported changes to the objectives of planned activities 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 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
----------------------	-----------------------------

The TE does not rate the relevance of this project. This TER rates the relevance of this project as Satisfactory as it is well aligned with the objectives of the GEF, Government of Burkina Faso and Implementing Agency IFAD.

The project is consistent with the objectives of the GEF-4's focal area on Land Degradation. This project's aim is to combat deforestation and desertification by promoting sustainable land management practices, which puts it in line with SO 1 and OP15 of the Land Degradation Focal Area. As a matter of fact, "The project recognizes the close link between combating desertification and achieving sustainable rural development as a means towards poverty alleviation, which converges with the main objective of the focal area (...) To this end, the project addresses the underlying causes of land degradation and desertification, as well as those of food insecurity and poverty, in the watershed ecosystems of the north central plateau of Burkina Faso. " (PD p.51)

The project is also highly consistent with the priorities of the Government of Burkina Faso (GoBF). The GOBF already has a strong policy framework to combat deforestation and desertification, which this project directly supports and helps advance. Some of the national initiatives in place include the National Action Programme to Combat Desertification (NAP/CD), the National Environmental Action Plan (NEAP), the Rural Development Strategy (RDS), the Action Plan for Integrated Management of Water Resources (APIMWR), the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan and the National Strategy on Climate Change. (PD pp. 17-18)

Finally, this project is also highly relevant to IFAD, as it adds a strong environmental component to its ongoing Sustainable Rural Development Programme in Burkina Faso, the objectives of which are to "strengthen local capacity for participatory management, improve the security of land tenure, support local development initiatives and provide basic rural infrastructure" (PD p.19). The GEF component of

the Sustainable Rural Development Programme will enhance the environmental objectives of the project and ensure its greater sustainability.

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

The TE does not rate the effectiveness of the project. This TER rates the effectiveness of the project as satisfactory, as most planned activities have taken place. However, it must be noted that the TE provides very limited evidence on the extent to which those activities supported the outcomes intended for this project.

The sub-programme was divided into the following three components:

1. Participatory Decision-Making and Environmental Planning

This TER assesses this component as satisfactory.

Under this component, the main objective was to “promote the integration of critical environmental aspects (especially improved management of common resources and degraded lands) into the socio-institutional activities of the rural development programme financed by the SRDP” (PD p.38). The specific outcomes expected from this component were:

- “enhanced mechanisms for dialogue and consultation at provincial and local level to ensure effective participation of stakeholders (including an SLM platform for coordination and harmonization at the provincial/local level) [SEP]
- reinforced individual and institutional capacities for planning and sustainable management of the lands, soils and resources of the fragile watershed ecosystems [SEP]
- improved incentive structures for the adoption of sustainable land management practices in watershed ecosystems [SEP]
- sustainable land use and natural resources management techniques based on local know-how and innovative practices promoted and diffused”

(PD p.39)

Most activities planned under this component have taken place, albeit somewhat later than expected during the project cycle. Training activities were successful, slightly surpassing their target numbers of people or communities trained. Certain components have seen higher than expected outcomes. For example, the objective was for 20 micro-project investments to be funded. At the end of the project, 47 such micro-projects had been funded. (TE p.9) The 2014 PIR and TE do not assess the extent to which those activities contributed to the outcomes expected.

2. Land Tenure Security and Sustainable Land Management Investment Incentives ^[L]_[SEP]

This TER assesses this component as moderately unsatisfactory. This component's main objective was to "provide added value in promoting the testing and validation of innovative mechanisms for preventing and resolving land tenure conflicts that threaten the management of critical communal resources" (PD p.40). The specific outcomes expected from this component were:

- "reinforced individual and institutional capacities for sustainable management of the lands, soils and resources of the fragile watershed ecosystems ^[L]_[SEP]
- sustainable land use and natural resources management techniques based on local know-how and innovative practices promoted and diffused ^[L]_[SEP]
- innovative mechanisms for preventing and resolving land tenure conflicts identified and tested ^[L]_[SEP]

(PD p.41)

This is the least successful component of the project, with only 71.9% of its stated targets met (TE p.11). The SLM aspect of this component was successful, with most planned activities having taken place. However, the land tenure aspect of the component was largely unsuccessful due to the complexity of land tenure issues in Burkina Faso, and the reluctance of certain actors to engage in the project (PD p.11). Nonetheless, some progress has been made towards the achievement of the land tenure objectives listed above. The 2014 PIR and TE do not assess the extent to which those activities contributed to the outcomes expected.

3. Ecological Integrity and Sustainable Management of Selected Watershed Ecosystems ^[L]_[SEP]

This TER assesses this component as satisfactory. Under this component, the main objective was to "undertake an ecosystem, holistic approach, focusing especially on the common pool resources neglected under the Sustainable Rural Development Programme's village/inter-village area management approach" (PD p.42). The specific outcomes expected from this component were:

- "reinforced individual and institutional capacities for sustainable management of the lands, soils and resources of the fragile watershed ecosystems ^[L]_[SEP]
- sustainable land use and natural resources management techniques based on local know-how and innovative practices promoted and diffused ^[L]_[SEP]
- sustainable land and natural resources management practices adopted and replicated on a ecosystem scale, improving the ecological integrity, economic productivity and services of the lands in the rehabilitated watersheds and pastoral zone."

(PD pp.42-43)

Most activities planned under this component seem to have taken place, albeit somewhat later than expected during the project cycle. For example, as planned, management plans were created for six watershed and pastoral zones. However, certain targets were not met. For example, only three (instead of six) local environmental management plans were realized. Overall, most planned activities appear to have been accomplished to a certain extent, if not enough to meet the initial targets. The 2014 PIR and TE do not assess the extent to which those activities contributed to the outcomes expected.

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

The TE does not rate the efficiency of this project. This TER assesses efficiency as moderately satisfactory given the overall effective project management, but the recognition that management costs have been much higher than expected and that there have been important project implementation delays.

The PD (p.59-60) describes the efforts made to ensure the technologies selected for project investments were as cost-effective as possible. While the TE does not discuss efficiency or cost-effectiveness specifically, we can infer from the fact that most planned activities did take place, and that those activities were selected on the base of their cost-effectiveness, that the project was overall cost effective.

The project was affected by important delays due to issues with IFAD and the executing agency. It also generated very high programme management costs (36% of all project spending was on management), largely due to the need to recruit staff members not originally planned for (TE p.14).

Despite those issues, the TE (p.17) reports that the project management was overall effective.

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

The TE does not rate the sustainability of this project. This TER gives a rating of Moderately Likely. This TER proposes the following ratings:

Financial Risks – Moderately Likely TER SEP

Financial sustainability is not discussed in the TE. This project is a GEF pilot, which the GEF has the intention of scaling up and replicating after project completion. To date, a follow-up project has not yet been secured. However, the fact that the zone “Cône d’épandage de Banh” has in 2009 been designated as a Wetland of International Importance makes it more likely that funding will be available to protect the region.

This project heavily relied on IFAD for co-financing and for funding of management expenses; it will be important to either renew this agreement or develop an alternative project funding mechanism going forward.

Socio-political Risks – Moderately Likely

First, the government's active participation in the project design and implementation, and the relevance of the project to its own (ongoing) objectives, largely reduces the likelihood of political risks.

Second, the project document shows awareness of the importance of promoting community ownership in order to ensure the sustainability of this project: "From the outset, sub-programme interventions will define clear limits of project versus community responsibility, promote community leadership for long-term ownership and recognize realistic timeframes for full assumption of responsibility by local communities" (PDp.31). However, the various project M&E documents, including the TE, only provide cursory evidence that those community ownership strategies were put in place. Examples mentioned include environmental education in schools, the participation of communities in project activities, the ongoing capacity-building of producers throughout the project (TE p.16). Due to the positive but weak evidence of efforts made to mitigate the risks related to weak community ownership, this TER assesses socio-political risks as moderately likely.

Environmental Risks – N/A

Not applicable

Institutional Risks – Moderately Unlikely

There is no formal system of land tenure in Burkina Faso, which is something the project tried to address. The lack of land tenure systems makes it more difficult and less likely for people and communities to make Sustainable Land Management investments. Unfortunately, the land tenure component of the project was not very successful and the lack of a better land tenure policy still threatens Sustainable Land Management in the northern region of Burkina Faso. On the upside, land tenure is an issue that will continue to be addressed by the GoBF and through future phases of this project.

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?

Expected co-financing for this project was \$27,82m, and realized co-financing is unclear due to the lack of reliable figures in the TE, which appears to have aggregated the figures for this project together with the project 'National Coordination' (project 3884), also funded by the GEF in Burkina Faso. For the two projects aggregated, co-financing was very close to the expected level. The TE, MTR and PIR documents do not mention any problem related to co-financing.

This project heavily relied on IFAD and other co-financers for co-financing and the funding of management expenses, and this project could not have taken place without the co-financing provided.

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?

There were substantial delays in starting the implementation of the main project activities. According to the TE (p.9), "the complexity of the process related to the signature of the GEF agreement, the consideration of legislative and regulatory texts, the carrying out of several studies and the involvement of several actors for the implementation of activities related to financing have not allowed for a proper and timely execution of the project." It appears that substantial implementation delays took place, which resulted in a much lower project spend than expected – \$1.39m instead of the planned \$2.02m.

In addition, the MTR mentions problems on IFAD's side, which resulted in slower than expected project spending and implementation. Those problems are related to the Sustainable Rural Development Programme's Work Plan and Annual Budget, which took a long time to get approved by IFAD. This caused delays in project implementation and in making the IFAD co-financing available. (MTR pp.5-6)

Those delays resulted in lower GEF spending than expected, the accomplishment of fewer project activities than planned, and ultimately less satisfactory project outcomes.

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:

Country ownership for the project appears to have been relatively strong, with the Government of Burkina Faso providing a strong implementation team for the project. The TE does not mention any specific ways in which country ownership affected outcomes or sustainability, other than the Government of Burkina Faso stepped up to cover more of the Sustainable Rural Development Programme's operating costs after unexpected cost increases took place (TE p.14).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE did not assign a rating to the project’s M&E Design. This TER gives a rating of satisfactory to M&E Design at entry due to the adequacy of the M&E plan set up.

This project being implemented and managed by IFAD, it was decided that M&E activities would also be integrated “into the overall monitoring information system implemented by the Sustainable Rural Development Programme for monitoring implementation progress as well as the environmental and socio-economic impacts of programme activities” (PD p.44). This decision was made to avoid duplication of efforts. The M&E specialist assigned to the GEF component of the Sustainable Rural Development Programme works with the Project Management Unit and is in charge of ensuring the integration of the M&E data collected to the GEF systems.

The Project Document (pp.36-37) features a very clear logical framework including specific outcomes, outputs and objectives for the project, as well as clear and relevant indicators for tracking progress. The PD also includes a timeline of planned M&E activities, and the project budget includes a cost center for M&E activities. Overall, the M&E design for this project appears to have followed good practice guidelines.

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

The TE did not assign a rating to the project’s M&E implementation. This TER rates M&E implementation as moderately satisfactory due to the evidence of good monitoring and evaluation having taken place during the project, but acknowledging the [severe gaps in the terminal evaluation report.limited information provided on this topic by the TE.](#)

Little information is provided about M&E implementation in the MTR and TE. The only piece of information mentioned is that “an effort was made to monitor and evaluate various accomplishments as part of the SRDP. However, for the M&E needs of the GEF component, more attention should have been paid to indicators allowing to inform environmental outcomes to demonstrate the impact of GEF activities compared to baseline.” (TE p.14, MTR p.7) While this might be true, this TER notes that up until the MTR, progress against all the project indicators had been tracked. This TER also notes that planned baseline studies did take place.

Given the limited M&E information provided in the TE, this TER relies on a broader document review to rate M&E implementation. It is noted that PIRs have been produced every year, and the mid-term and final evaluation of the project did take place as planned, [although the final evaluation report is unsatisfactory. -The final evaluation is unfortunately very incomplete. Among other issues, it does not report against the indicators defined in the Project Document for this project, but instead presents the logical framework for the SRDP. It also does not assess various components of the project \(efficiency, implementation, M&E\) and fails to present lessons and recommendations.](#)

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 does not provide a rating for project implementation. This TER assesses project implementation to have been moderately satisfactory, recognizing some of the implementation issues caused by IFAD, but acknowledging the overall functional implementation of the project.

This sub-programme was implemented by IFAD as it was a component of the Sustainable Rural Development Programme, a larger IFAD project. The TE and MTR mentions several problems encountered during the early phase of the project, which could be attributed to IFAD. Among others, there were problems related to the SRDP's Work Plan and Annual Budget, which took a long time to get approved by IFAD. This caused delays in project implementation and in making the IFAD co-financing available. This resulted in slower than expected project spending and implementation (MTR pp.5-6). However, the TE mentions that, despite the problems encountered, implementation remained satisfactory and the implementation partnership was functional at all stages of the project (TE p.14).

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

The TE does not provide a rating for project execution. This TER assesses project execution to have been moderately unsatisfactory due to the number of problems that arose during execution, and the lack of priority given to the project by PMCU staff.

This project was "directly integrated into the rural development activities financed by IFAD's SRDP" (PD p.33), and consequently directly implemented by the staff in charge of implemented the Sustainable Rural Development Programme. "Under the SRDP, the MOAWF established a Project Management and Coordination Unit (PMCU) (...). The PMCU is responsible for general management and coordination of the SRDP, as well as its monitoring and evaluation, financial management, accounting and auditing functions" (PD p.60). The GEF also financed "a dedicated environmental/GEF team (two professionals) to ensure the management and coordination of the sub-programme" (PD p.44). In addition, the Ministry of Environment was in charge of overseeing "the ecological aspects of sub-programme activities,

ensuring that the desired outcomes result in the local, national and global benefits identified for the sub-programme. The MOE will also see that relevant information generated by the sub-programme feeds back into the CPP national lands inventory (and the CPP website), as well as into the national GIS database on land use. At the regional and provincial levels, the governors and high commissioners will have a role in supervision of activities within their jurisdictions. At the communal level, project supervision at pilot sites will be undertaken by the municipal councils, with technical functions delegated to specialized communal bodies" (PD.45). This paragraph demonstrates well the complexity of the execution teams and the challenges involved in coordinating all actors.

According to the TE (p.13), there were a number of problems that came up during project execution and that led to project implementation delays. First, procurement procedures for goods and services were reported to be really slow. Second, the Government of Burkina Faso did not make its co-financing available on time. Third, the PMCU fund requests to IFAD were of poor quality and led to payment delays.

Another problem that hindered the accomplishment of the project's objectives is that the PMCU had "the tendency to de-prioritize GEF activities in favor of core SRDP activities" (MTR p.4). Indeed, the MTR (p.4) reports that GEF activities appeared to be "drowned into those of the SRDP, with several execution partners not having good knowledge of the GEF project". Overall, several PMCU staff members appeared to consider the purpose of the GEF funds as 'general support' for the SRDP rather than a project of its own (MTR p.14; PIR 2014 p.15).

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 TE's Annex 4 (Impact on the Environment) reports on the environmental impact of the project. It shows evidence that the land where project interventions (erosion-control vegetative cover techniques) took place saw a substantial agricultural productivity increase compared to land where no interventions took place. On lands where intervention took place, sorghum production was of between 960 and 1185 kg per hectare, compared to 538 kg on comparison land. The success of the interventions made them popular with the beneficiaries, who are now feeling invested in continuing to use those techniques (TE p.27).

The TE mentions that two good indicators have been selected to assess the environmental impact of the project as a whole: vegetative cover rate, and soil degradation rate. The TER provides figures for those indicators, but no baseline, and is therefore unable to comment on the extent to which the project contributed to positive environmental change. (TE p.28)

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.

As a result of the TE, land has become less degraded and more productive, thereby improving the livelihoods of agricultural producers in the area. The magnitude of the impact has not been documented in the TE.

The TE mentions that an impact evaluation was done for the SRDP program as a whole, which revealed that the program (of which the GEF project was a component) contributed to “reducing poverty by 12% and extreme poverty by 15% between 2007 and 2013, with a clear positive impact on literacy, food security, livelihood, household goods, agricultural goods and savings” (TE p.14).

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 capacity and knowledge of agricultural producers in the area have improved. SLM training workshops were organized in six communities (TE p.10). It is hoped that those new SLM capacities will be shared with more producers over time and contribute to improving land conditions going forward.

b) Governance

Not applicable

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

The TE and the PIRs do not list any unintended impact for 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.

Not applicable

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE does not propose any key lessons, good practices or approaches that could have applications for other GEF projects.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE does not make any recommendations.

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 contains an assessment of impact, but does not always provide the necessary supporting evidence. It also reports the overall impact of the SRDP program, without zooming in on the GEF component of the project.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is well structured and internally consistent. However, it does not provide any rating or clear assessment of project components (very descriptive rather than analytical), and there are important data gaps.	U
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report discusses sustainability and some of its components, including environmental sustainability, socio-political risks and capacity building.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE does not include lessons learned or recommendations.	HU
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE includes summary financial figures, but they are not correct.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE briefly mentions the existence of an M&E system, but does not evaluate its quality, discuss its implementation or assess its strengths and weaknesses.	U
Overall TE Rating		MU

Formula used: $0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3(4+3) + 0.1(5+1+2+2) = 2.1 + 1 = 3.1$

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

This TER did not use any additional source of information for the preparation of this TER.