

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

### 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3628	
GEF Agency project ID			
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Cross-cutting Monitoring and Evaluation and Knowledge Management for Integrated Natural Resource Management	
Country/Countries		Regional (Iran, Jordan, Yemen, Tunisia, Algeria, Morocco)	
Region		MENA	
Focal area		Land Degradation; International Waters; Biodiversity; Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF's Focal Areas: LD, IW, CC,SP; GEF Strategic Programs: LD-SP1;IW-SP3;CC-SP6;BD-SP3;SP4, SP5	
Executing agencies involved		ICARDA (International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Lead executing agency (ICARDA); Beneficiary (target of capacity building)	
Private sector involvement		N/A (No Involvement)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		07/06/2009 (PIR 2012, p.1)	
Effectiveness date / project start		05/18/2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		01/2014 (05/26/09, MSP CEO endorsement II)	
Actual date of project completion		06/30/2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M) (TE,p.5)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.06	
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		0.667	N/A
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		0.025
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		0.826
Total GEF funding		0.727	N/A
Total Co-financing		1.6	1 .01 (TE, p.38, actual co-financing)
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.267	N/A
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		09/30/2015	
Author of TE		Lamia Mansour	
TER completion date		12/11/2015	
TER prepared by		Chenhao Liu	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	S( each component received a S, but no overall rating is available)	MU	NR	MU (3)
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	U	NR	U
M&E Design	NR	S	NR	S
M&E Implementation	NR	MU	NR	MU
Quality of Implementation	S	NR	NR	MS
Quality of Execution	NR	NR	NR	MU
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	MS (4.4)

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Project's goal is as follows: "to establish an integrated knowledge-based approach through cross-cutting Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) functions and Knowledge management (KM) for INRM (Integrated National Resource Management) within the MENARID (Middle East and the North Africa Region) programme framework". (TE, p.6)

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project aims at providing timely and useful information on progress being made on INRM across MENARID projects portfolio through a results-based cross-cutting M&E system. This information will be channeled to key decision-makers involved in individual projects, the overall MENARID programme, and the broader INRM agenda. The results-based M&E system provides a tool that will generate a basis for investment and programme improvement, mutual learning, accountability purposes, and will enhance stakeholder participation. (TE, p.6)

The goal was further delineated into 2 specific objectives which are the following:

- Objective 1: Generate tools for systematic cross-cutting & aligned M&E functions throughout the MENARID framework.
- Objective 2: Develop a user-friendly knowledge management (KM) platform, information dissemination, and harmonization & dissemination mechanisms of INRM best practices throughout the MENARID portfolio linked to existing networks. (TE, p.13)

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

There are no changes in Global Environment Objective/Development objectives or related activities throughout project 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
---------------	----------------------

**Relevance. Were project outcomes consistent with the focal area/operational program strategies and country priorities? Explain.**

In a 6-point scale, the TE rated the project's outcome relevance as "Moderately Satisfactory". In a binary scale (Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory), this TER will rate it as "Satisfactory". The project is in line with GEF's strategic priorities and partly consistent with the needs at project/country level.

According to the PD, the project will "contribute to cross-focal area strategies and particularly facilitate linkages between SLM (Sustainable Land Management), integrated water resource management biodiversity and climate change." (PD, p.6) It mainly addresses the GEF focal area of Land Degradation (LD), with linkage to GEF-4 strategic programs IW (International Water), BD (Biodiversity), and CC (Climate Change). (05/26/09, MSP CEO Endorsement Request II, p.1)

As a single project under the umbrella of the MENARID program (which consists of a number of single projects at national level), the first pillar of the project's objective is to "capitalize on existing systems" at project/national level to generate harmonized M&E procedures across the MENARID program. (PD, p.7) In assessing the project's outcome relevance in this area to the needs at country/project level, the TE concludes that "by the time the Project has been initiated, the initial Project design was not aligned with the MENARID projects' needs and the project's implementation strategy has not been able to adapt the Project's intervention strategy to respond to the evolving M&E context and needs." (TE, p.27) "However, for KM aspects, although the Project did not develop a strategic framework for the establishment and operation of its KM Platform, the tools and activities developed by the Project were found relevant by the MENARID stakeholders." (TE, p.27)

The second pillar of the project objective is the development of "user-friendly knowledge management (KM) platform, information dissemination, harmonization & dissemination mechanisms of INRM best practices throughout the MENARID portfolio linked to existing networks". (TE, p.13) In assessing the outcome relevance of the KM part, the TE concluded that although the Project did not develop a strategic framework for the establishment and operation of its KM Platform, the tools and activities developed by the Project were found relevant by the MENARID stakeholders. (TE, p.27)

<b>4.2 Effectiveness</b>	<b>Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
--------------------------	--

The TE rated the project's outcome effectiveness as "Moderately Unsatisfactory". This TER will adopt the same rating, as overall, for the 3 outcome components, only the second was achieved. Therefore, a rating of "Moderately Unsatisfactory" for the project's outcome effectiveness is justified. This rating is based on the evidence presented by the TE and a follow-up analysis as per below:

The project's expected outcomes are divided into three components: (Based on TE, p.18-24)

#### **Outcome Component 1. Tools and approaches for streamlined M&E functions for Integrated National Resource Management (INRM) within the MENARID framework**

##### **Expected Outputs:**

##### **1.1. Harmonized MENARID M&E tools**

% of projects that follow MENARID's M&E requirements systematically (at least 90 % by PY4) **(Not Reached)**;

A set of core indicators & MENARID indicators database & tracking system developed with good quality **(Reached)**

Best practices guidelines for INRM M&E developed in good quality (guidelines were prepared in PY 14, **partly reached**)

##### **1.2. Aligned M&E approaches & processes**

Extent of annual increase of involvement of MENARID's relevant stakeholders in project M&E functions (at least 70 % of involvement rate by PY2) **(Not Reached)**

##### **1.3. Systematic M&E data aggregation and analysis**

% of required data covered and managed properly through M&E approaches (at least 70%by PY3) **(Not Reached)**; A number of reports reflecting proper data analysis on cross-sectoral basis (project impacts, focal areas, ecosystems ... etc) were developed in good quality (completing at least 70 % of work by PY3) **(Not Reached)**;

##### **Actual Achievements**

The "MENARID M&E Matrix" including a set of indicators, measurement and monitoring methodology and mean of verification, was developed based on a consultative approach with MENARID partners and was finalized in December 2013 (PY3). Based on the "MENARID M&E Matrix", a common M&E and KM Platform, including a set of indicators, database, analytical tools, and reporting formats for INRM projects was made operational by PY4 on the MENARID website. Capacity building support in M&E was provided to MENARID projects, including the use of the online platform, trainings in RBM, RBB and M&E, in order to extend the M&E system to all stakeholders. A publication on "Adopting Results-Based Management in Integrated Natural Resources Management: Experience from the IFAD/MENARID projects" was prepared in PY4. An assessment of the M&E operations in MENARID projects was conducted by ICARDA in PY4.

**It is clear from the above comparison that all of the preset outputs of component 1 except the establishment of MENARID indicators database & tracking system have not been fully achieved.**

#### **Outcome Component 2. Tools and approaches for streamlined KM platform for INRM within the MENARID framework**

##### **Expected Outputs**

##### **2.1. Operational knowledge management platform**

% of INRM projects that follow KM requirements systematically (60 % by PY3) **(Reached)**

Distribution, extent of use & quality of KM portal for serving MENARID projects (70 % by PY3) **(Reached)**  
Availability & quality of best practices guidelines for INRM KM approaches **(Reached)**  
Number & extent of projects showing coherent performance following KM platform requirements (at least 40 % by PY3) **(Reached)**

## **2.2. Updated information on INRM in MENA region**

Distribution, extent of use & quality of data available in guidelines, fact sheets & formats on INRM themes in MENARID **(Reached)**

## **2.3. Increased knowledge flow between MENARID projects**

Stakeholders use and exchange relevant information in the MENARID framework by PY2 and PY4 **(Reached)**

MENARID GEF project managers/stakeholders participate in bi-annual meetings (not clear, but with current evidence it is able to rate **Partly Achieved**); Support provided to KM systems of relevant to INRM projects in MENARID framework **(Reached)**

## **Actual Achievements**

The “MENARID Knowledge Management Platform” was launched in December 2012 and continues to be fully operational. A system development team was formed by ICARDA’s IT group and professional consultants to develop the system requirements and create this KM portal. All MENARID stakeholders received training on operating the portal during the MENARID learning workshop on managed aquifer recharge, Amman, December 2012. A “user manual” is available online in French and English (refer to details below); eight face-to-face meetings have been organized for MENARID projects to support KM on INRM best practices across MENARID projects, and these have been collected and uploaded on the website. An “innovation sharing” section allows users to fill a template, and to create additional knowledge fact sheets (refer to details below); Nineteen Knowledge Fact Sheets were developed and are available online, in English and French. These Fact Sheets were summarized in a Working Paper “Capturing and disseminating lessons learned from INRM projects in the MENA region” and in a user-friendly brochure “Stories of success”; Four 1-minute and one 4-minute videos produced on specific technologies developed by the MENARID projects.

**From the above comparison between expected project outputs and actual achievements, it is able to conclude that the project outcome component 2 has been achieved. “Through this component, the Project has been able to mobilize all the MENARID projects (with the exception of the Algeria project) in contributing and exchanging on the KM Platform” (TE, p.22)**

## **Outcome Component 3. Strategy for disseminating best & successful INRM practices in the MENA region**

### **Expected Outputs**

#### **3.1. Developing regional dissemination and technology transfer and diffusion strategies for INRM**

a regional strategy for disseminating best practices developed in good quality by PY2 (**partly reached**); A number of regional seminars conducted on local knowledge for INRM & adaptation for climate change with sufficient geographical coverage (**Unable to assess, Not Reached**); there are sizable and high-level participants from MENARID countries in the regional seminars (**Unable to assess, Not Reached**);

#### **3.2. Identifying and disseminating best practices for INRM**

Extent & quality of monitoring the implementation & up-scaling of best practices (at least 40 % by PY3) (**Unable to assess, Not reached**); Extent of geographic coverage of best practices both within & outside the MENARID countries (at least 60 % by PY3) (**Unable to assess, Not Reached**);

#### **3.3. Identifying and disseminating innovative practices for INRM**

A number of seminars conducted with sufficient geographical coverage on lessons learned on use of innovative approaches & techniques (**Unable to assess, Not Reached**); There are sizable, high-level stakeholders participating the seminars By PY2 and PY4, representing diverse MENARID projects (**Unable to assess, Not Reached**).

#### **Actual Achievements**

A regional communication strategy for MENARID projects has been established based on the key elements: the website, and regular face-to-face meetings. ICARDA's communication department included MENARID-related topics in its newsletter sent to decision makers, scientists and NGOs. An exchange between MENARID projects was established, namely the IFAD/MENARID projects in Morocco and Jordan on the Vallerani technology, and the IFAD/MENARID project in Jordan and the UNDP/MENARID project in Iran to plan an "exposure visit". The project conducted outreach to the local communities, using the KM tools provided to MENARID stakeholders in hard copies (e.g., working paper, stories for success document, knowledge fact sheets); Linkages between "ICARDA's learning alliances" and the Morocco MENARID project were established. Knowledge products of MENARID have been disseminated in key events, such as: i. The "International Conference on Water and Food Security in Dry Areas" organized by the ICARDA in June 2013, ii. The "Land and Water Days" in Amman organized by the FAO, December 2013; Linkages with WB's MENA DELP initiative have been established; Collaboration with GEF and UNESCO on the regional seminars, notably the series of water-related learning workshops, offered an opportunity to discuss INRM best practices.

**The above information listed regarding the actual achievement of outcome component 3 attests to the conclusion of TE: Despite the approach adopted for KM, the KM processes adopted were not based on a strategic approach for the dissemination of relevant information as well as monitoring of the impacts of such dissemination efforts. (TE. P.24). Thus the outcome component 3 was not achieved.**

Overall, for the 3 outcome components, only no. 2 is achieved. Therefore, a rating of "Moderately Unsatisfactory" for the project's outcome effectiveness is justified.

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

The TE rated the project's outcome efficiency as "Satisfactory", and this TER will adopt the same rating. The project has been efficient in reaching its desired outcomes, but with minor shortcomings.

According to the TE "The Project has efficiently established an M&E and KM Platform which has been well received by all stakeholders and was accompanied with needed guidelines and training for its use. The Project was also efficient in linking up with the UNESCO-HIP office and plan jointly regional workshop, which permitted major savings and allowed the planning of a large number of regional workshops despite the limited Project budget. However, the "timely launching of the M&E Platform is questioned as well as the timely deployment of needed M&E technical assistance such as conducting an assessment of the M&E needs of the MENARID projects, provision of guidance on Results-Based Management and the implementation of other technical assistance for supporting the M&E system as all of this support was only deployed on the last year of the project." (TE, p.29)

“The KM Platform was more timely as it was launched in 2012 and could be used throughout the duration of the Project by the different stakeholders.” (TE,p.29)

Overall, a rating of “Satisfactory” for the project’s outcome efficiency is justified.

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

The TE rated the project’s outcome sustainability as “Unlikely”, and this TER will adopt the same rating. This rating is in large part determined by institutional risks, as the project didn’t create strong and sustainable institutional linkages with related projects/stakeholders that may support the project’s sustainability, or has carried out any related activities which may enable the project’s sustainability. The overall rating of outcome sustainability can be also reached through assessing the four sub-categories of sustainability, as follow:

#### **Financial Resource Sustainability- Unable to assess**

No solid financial commitment has been in place for any immediate scaling-up based on currently available information from relevant policy documents. This TER is unable to assess this area.

#### **Socio-political Sustainability-Unable to assess**

Relevant policy documents didn’t mention any risks in this regard, therefore it is impossible to assess.

#### **Institutional Sustainability- Unlikely**

Institutional factors have been so far the most important factors determining the project’s sustainability. According to the TE, “the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes is not probable, as the Project did not create strong and sustainable linkages with the implementing agencies as well as with new partners and with new projects, some aspects of the Project can be considered to provide a potential basis for the sustainability of some of the Project’s results and should be considered in future” (TE, p.30)

“Some aspects of the Project have a potential basis for the sustainability but there are no concrete sustainability mechanisms in place, promising sustainability aspects include the M&E Platform has been developed in a user-friendly and with interesting functions which allow processing and report generation depending on the type of users; similarly the KM Platform includes a template to aggregate and analyze best practices in INRM.” (TE, p.7-8)

#### **Environmental Sustainability-Unable to assess**

Relevant policy document didn’t mention any risks in this regard, therefore it is impossible to assess.



## 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 TE assessed the project's co-financing and found "The co-financing mobilized by the Project was adequate and was around 70% of the planned co-financing as the Project was able to mobilize various resources to support the planned activities." (TE, p.8)

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?

No extensions were ever identified by relevant project documents. But "the timely launching of the M&E Platform is questioned as well as the timely deployment of needed M&E technical assistance" which was only deployed on the last year of the Project (TE, p.29), which indicates the attainment of outcome component 2 in a delayed manner, but still within the project's planned timeframe.

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:

As the project is operated under the MENARID, an inter-regional program, it is thus unable to assess country ownership. This topic was also not covered by the TE.

## 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 rated the project's M&E design at entry as "Satisfactory". This TER will adopt the same rating. The TE has explained the rationale supporting this rating with ample evidence, as follows: (TE, p.32)

In the Project's design, the Project was expected to establish an M&E Plan based on the project logical framework and in line with GEF's and IFAD M&E guidelines. The key M&E activities were planned in the Project Document to include the following: (TE, p.32)



- consolidation and monitoring of benchmark and baseline data at project inception;
- half-yearly data collection and reporting of activity and output targets and achievements;
- annual project implementation reviews (PIRs);
- a mid-term review; and a final completion assessment.

The Project's M&E design also called upon engaging the implementing agencies of the different MENARID projects as well as regional and national partner institutions and beneficiaries in the M&E plan of the Project whom will provide guidance on the project's M&E activities. The M&E plan of the Project was expected to be linked to the project rationale, logical framework, annual work plans and budget as well as to the MENARID umbrella program M&E plan. (PD, p.16)

The Project has been accompanied by a logical framework which provided indicators at the level of its goal, objectives, and outputs. Each project outcome/objective/goal is measured by a number of expected outputs which are also measured by a number of indicators. The Indicators are in line with the SMART principle. For example, output 2.1 "Establishment of Operational Knowledge Management platform" is measured by "percentage of INRM projects that follow Knowledge Management requirements systematically (60 % by PY3.)" (PD, p.21)

The PD also indicated the planned budget for M&E was \$52,000, i.e. around 8% of the total GEF financing of \$667,000 for the Project. (TE, p.32)

In the end, the TE concluded that "The M&E design can thus be considered as a comprehensive and adequate one and have taken into account the specificity of the project as an umbrella Project, serving the M&E requirements of the different MENARID projects and at the same time having to respond to GEF's and the implementing agency (IFAD in this case) requirements. Based on the above (information), and as requested by GEF and IFAD, the rating for the evaluation criteria of the Project's Likelihood of the M&E design is Satisfactory (S)." (TE, p.32)

Overall, a rating of "Satisfactory" for the project's M&E design is justified.

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

Despite a well-designed M&E plan, the actual implementation didn't follow a desired path as designed. The TE rated two areas related to the M&E Implementation: M&E plan implementation (Moderately Unsatisfactory); Budgeting and Financing for M&E activities (Moderately Satisfactory). This TER will rate the project's overall implementation as "Moderately Unsatisfactory". The M&E plan set up at the baseline has not been systematically implemented as expected.

According to relevant information from the TE, the project "did not establish the requested M&E plan as called upon in the Project design" at its inception phase. (TE, p.32) For specific examples: " (TE, p.33)

- With regards to consolidation and monitoring of benchmark and baseline data at project inception: this was not done in a systematic manner based on a clear set of indicators.

- With regards to half-yearly data collection and reporting of activity and output targets and achievements: reporting was made at outputs level and was not related to indicators.
- With regards to a mid-term review: this was not conducted and can be justifiable as an MSP, this is not a GEF requirement.
- With regards to a final completion assessment: the TE was conducted 1 year after the completion of the Project.”

“ (The project’s) M&E implementation was therefore not in line with the M&E plan designed as part of the Project and was not delivering required information to allow adequate monitoring of the Project’s activities” (TE, p.33)

Based on evidence from the PIR 2012 and 2013, the project’s logic framework, especially its outcomes (including sub-components), has been utilized for M&E purpose. Comparison of ratings for each expected outcomes through the years was made, to monitor the project’s progress toward achieving its goals. This fact verifies that an important part of the original M&E design has been put into place. (PIR 2012, PIR 2013)

For the budgeting and financing for M&E activities, the TE concluded that, due to the aberration of the project’s actual M&E from its original plan, “not more than 50% of the initially planned budget for the internal M&E system of the Project were allocated by the end of the Project’s life.”(TE, p.34)

Overall, evidence above has clearly shown that the M&E plan has not been implemented in as expected, and a rating of “Moderately Unsatisfactory” is well justified.

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

The TE didn’t rate the quality of project implementation. Considering the role and activities of IFAD as the chief implementing agency, this TER will rate the quality of project implementation as “Moderately Satisfactory” based on the evidence and findings presented by the TE:

Although the TE didn’t give an explicit rating, it incorporated a dedicated section discussing the IFAD’s supervision and backstopping. Through identifying “IFAD’s support to the Project which has been deployed through the guidance and participation to the various regional meetings as well as through

bilateral meetings and communications between ICARDA and IFAD” (TE, p.39), the TE concluded that “The Project is implemented by IFAD which has followed up normal procedures in backstopping and support to the project.” (TE, p.39) The TE also noted that “IFAD has aligned the Project with its requirements as well as GEF’s requirements in terms of technical but not for financial reporting. As such, technical reporting has been fulfilled through yearly PIRs submitted by the Project to IFAD in line with the GEF requirements and audited financial reports according to IFAD’s requirements.” (TE, p.39)

Overall, it is clear that the project implementation led by the IFAD has been going smoothly and in line with required procedures, but with some shortcomings. Therefore, a rating of “Moderately Satisfactory” is well justified.

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

The TE didn’t rate quality of project execution. Considering the role and performance of the project’s chief executing agency ICARDA (International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas), the project rated the quality of project execution as “Moderately Unsatisfactory”. The ICARDA’s performance was consistent with requirements to some extent, but its ineffectiveness in execution led to the unsatisfactory attainment of project outcomes.

According to the PD, “Day to day project management and implementation of the project activities as well as some activities related to monitoring and reporting will be the responsibility of ICARDA as described in the M&E Plan.” (PD, p.14) “ICARDA will be the Executing Agency to implement the project and ensure the day to day management of its various components and activities. It will create the necessary knowledge networks linking up all relevant stakeholders and follow up/report on the implementation of all the MSP activities.” (PD, p.14)

Therefore, the actual execution of project, which involves translating financial resources into attainment of expected outcomes, and timely reporting financial of and key M&E indicators, are the main responsibilities of ICARDA. For the financial reporting, “ICARDA has presented yearly audited financial statements, according to the requirements of IFAD.” (TE, p.36). However, as noted in the M&E implementation section, the project has undergone a significant aberration from its original execution and M&E plan, which leads to moderately unsatisfactory achievement of project outcomes and incomplete execution of M&E. These results can be traced back to the problems of ICARDA in fulfilling its role. For example, “ICARDA has assumed that the different MENARID projects should be able to use the M&E Matrix once the indicators have been agreed upon, but did not ensure that this was the case” (TE, p.19), which is a fact directly contributing to unsatisfactory attainment of the project’s outcome component 1: “(Establishing) Tools and approaches for streamlined M&E functions for INRM within the MENARID framework.”

Overall, a rating of “Moderately Unsatisfactory” for the project’s execution is justified.

## 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.

No environment changes were brought about as the result of the project.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No socio-economic changes were brought about as the result of the project.

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 “MENARID M&E Matrix” including a set of indicators, measurement and monitoring methodology and mean of verification, was developed based on a consultative approach with MENARID partners was finalized in December 2013 (PY3); Based on the “MENARID M&E Matrix”, a common M&E and KM Platform, including a set of indicators, database, analytical tools, and reporting formats for INRM projects was made operational by PY4 on the MENARID website; A publication on “Adopting Results-Based Management in Integrated Natural Resources Management: Experience from the IFAD/MENARID projects” was prepared in PY4; An assessment of the M&E operations in MENARID projects was conducted by ICARDA in PY4.” (TE, p.18)

“The “MENARID Knowledge Management Platform” was launched in December 2012 and continues to be fully operational. A system development team was formed by ICARDA’s IT group and professional

consultants to develop the system requirements and create this KM portal. All MENARID stakeholders received training on operating the portal during the MENARID learning workshop on managed aquifer recharge, Amman, December 2012. A “user manual” is available online in French and English; eight face-to-face meetings have been organized for MENARID projects to support KM on INRM best practices across MENARID projects, these have been collected and uploaded on the website. An “innovation sharing” section allows users to fill a template, and to create additional knowledge fact sheets (refer to details below); Nineteen Knowledge Fact Sheets developed and available online, in English and French. These Fact Sheets were summarized in a Working Paper “Capturing and disseminating lessons learned from INRM projects in the MENA region” and in a user-friendly brochure “Stories of success”; Four 1-minute and one 4-minute videos produced on specific technologies developed by the MENARID projects.” (TE, p.21)

“A regional communication strategy for MENARID projects has been established; Exchange between MENARID projects was established, namely the IFAD/MENARID projects in Morocco and Jordan on the Vallerani technology, and the IFAD/MENARID project in Jordan and the UNDP/MENARID project in Iran to plan an “exposure visit”; Outreach to the local communities using the KM tools provided to MENARID stakeholders in hard copies (e.g., working paper, stories for success document, knowledge fact sheets); Knowledge products of MENARID have been disseminated in key events, such as: i. ICARDA’s International Conference on Water and Food Security in Dry Areas organized in June 2013, ii. FAO’s Land and Water Days in Amman, December 2013.” (TE, p.23)

#### b) Governance

“Linkages between “ICARDA’s learning alliances” and the Morocco MENARID project were established; Linkages with WB’s MENA DELP initiative have been established; Collaboration with GEF and UNESCO on the regional seminars, notably the series of water-related learning workshops, offered an opportunity to discuss INRM best practices.” (TE, p.23)

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

No information was provided in this regard by relevant project documents.

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.

No replication or immediate scale-up was reported by relevant project documents.

## 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 rolls out the following lessons learned through this project: (TE, p.43-46)

### Lessons Learned

- Project design: a rigorous but ambitious framework

“While the Project design is strategic and clearly aligned with the MENARID program, its objectives and budget do not match, especially with ambitious targets it has set at the level of its different components.” (TE, p.43) “It would have been possible to conceive such a program with a total value of around 5% of the total MENARID program budget given an economy of scale for M&E in such a case which would not require 10% of the budget to be allocated to M&E.” (TE, p.43)

“As such, had this Project been allocated a budget of around \$2.5 million, chances would have been higher for it to reach its objectives. This being said, the Project design provides a very coherent and solid structure and can be used as a model for future similar activities.” (TE, p.43)

- Adaptive management: key shortcomings in Project implementation

“Given the challenging nature of the Project in term of financial constraints to meet its ambitious objectives and the difficulties faced by IARDA in mobilizing the Project’s stakeholders to contribute to the Project’s activities and their follow up, an adaptive management approach was required to respond to the various challenges facing the Project.” (TE, p.44) “The TE has indicated that the Project was a very ambitious one and that by the time it was initiated, some aspects of the initial Project design were not relevant to the MENARID projects. However, given the lack of an adaptive management approach in the Project’s implementation strategy, the Project has not been able to realign the Project’s intervention strategy to respond to the evolving M&E and KM context and needs.” (TE, p.44)

- The MENARID M&E & KM Platform: an innovative and promising tool

“The MENARID partners have confirmed that the web-based M&E & KM Platform under the MENARID Gateway can provide a practical tool for enhancing M&E systems within projects and can support project’s management and reporting requirements. Moreover, and despite difficulties to mobilize stakeholders in the Project’s activities, it was also possible to engage all MENARID projects in the development of KM tools to populate the Platform. (TE p.45)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE gave the following recommendations learning for this project: (TE, p.9-10)

### “Recommendations

The recommendations of the TER build upon the main shortcomings and successes of the Project which were identified in the “Lessons Learned” and provide suggestions for future action based on the Project’s experience and deliverables and include the following:

### **1. Developing strategic and operational frameworks for M&E and KM needs**

The Project’s stakeholders have all confirmed the importance of the project’s concept and support it provide from its interventions, M&E and KM constitute a recurrent challenge to development projects as a whole and in terms of prioritization of the planning and implementation of such activities in specific. The TE has flagged the disconnection between the Project’s M&E interventions and the actual support needed by the MENARID projects for M&E. The TER has concluded that support to M&E should be aligned with the latest approaches and guidelines of the GEF and the implementing agencies and it should build upon the specific tools used by the projects to develop and implement their M&E systems.

**The TER indicated that the M&E Platform has been developed in a user-friendly and with interesting functions which allow processing and report generation depending on the type of users. This Platform can be further developed to include in addition to the current indicators and functions available within the existing M&E Matrix, additional functions can be added as needed and can be developed in a way they can respond to the specific M&E projects needs.**

The TER also indicated that the KM Platform has provided Fact Sheets building upon the MENARID projects and developed a template to aggregate and analyze best practices in INRM and simplifies the collection of stories (in the form of innovations, good practices, technologies) from INRM projects. This is a model which can be used in other projects to identify key factors for consolidating innovations and best practices related to INRM. This guideline document is available online, and can be further used in future projects.

### **2. Sustaining the MENARID Gateway to strengthen the M&E and KM needs for INRM**

The TER indicated that GEF and the GEF implementing agencies can benefit from sustaining the MENARID Gateway to strengthen the M&E and KM requirements within programs or projects related to INRM. While ICARDA can continue to act as administrator of the MENARID Gateway, given its mandate and capacity to maintain and support this facility, other modalities could be identified for integrating the Platform within on-going initiatives and programs in light of further developing and operating such a facility.

**As such, The TER recommended to mobilize needed resources though the GEF implementing agencies for identifying a group of projects or programs which could benefit from the MENARID Gateway in view of restructuring the M&E and KM systems proposed within the Platform.**

**This could be particularly applicable to the case of IFAD which has established a long-term cooperation with ICARDA, in view of linking research activities currently funded by IFAD through ICARDA to the IFAD-funded projects and more specifically the M&E systems of these projects.**

**This can also be further investigated based on the emerging experience from on-going initiatives which confirm this potential and importance of similar activities such as the WOCAT (through GIZ/UNCCD), CACILM (through IFAD/ICARDA) and MENA-DELP (through WB/GEF).**

### **3. MENARID M&E experience to enhance the IFAD RIMS’s Second-level indicators**



The TER has presented IFAD's progress in RBM and related M&E systems for INRM activities and has identified that some of the RIMS Second-level indicators are reflecting "Results at Output-level" as opposed to "Results at Outcome-level". As such, the TER recommended to build upon the MENARID experience to identify more specific approaches for measuring results at Outcomes level in line with more recent experience in GEF and IFAD funded projects.

The TER has provided examples of common Results-Based Indicators which can be adopted in the context of IFAD projects related to INRM and which can be used as part of the RIMS list of Second-level indicators to enhance Outcome monitoring. The proposed indicators are structured according to the GEF Focal Areas for easy reference but could also be adopted as an integral part of any cross-sectoral project with a focus on INRM. The detailed list of indicators is provided in the Project's publication: "Adoption of Results-Based Management (RBM) in Integrated Natural resources Management (INRM): Experience from IFAD-MENARID projects. ICARDA, 2014. Unpublished". The proposed outcome indicators were identified in the following Focal Areas:

- **SLM and Biodiversity conservation**
- **Water management**
- **Economic improvements and market transformation through INRM**
- **Adaptation to Climate Change**
- **Capacity development for INRM**

The TER also provided examples and case studies from the MENARID projects or the establishment of a baseline studies related to the different Focal Areas and which could be used to provide examples for establishing the baseline and targets for indicators and to measure results at outcome level."

## 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 TE compared in detail the targeted project outcomes and actual achievements of these outcomes, but it didn't discuss the project's impacts	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings are well substantiated. However more information substantiating its ratings, and more areas covered in assessment will be preferable	<b>Satisfactory</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report discussed the project sustainability with thorough evidence, but it will be preferable if it can incorporate a risk analysis. It mentioned the non-existence of project exit strategy	<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are well-documented, but not very clear-cut	<b>Satisfactory</b>

Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE reported information on project costs, but not in an easily comprehensible approach. Total/per activity cost not specified, actual co-financing used unclear	<b>Unsatisfactory</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE's evaluation of the project's M&E system is thorough.	<b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
		<b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>

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

In the preparation of this TER, no additional documents were referred to as the source of information apart from PIRs, TE, and PD.