Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3689	
GEF Agency project ID		00058205/ 00072197, 3942	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Adaptation to the effects of climate variability and change in agro-ecological regions I and II in Zambia (CCAP)	
Country/Countries		Zambia	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		LCDF	
Executing agencies involved		Zambia Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		NA	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 2009	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2013	
Actual date of project completion		June 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.1	0
	Co-financing	0.1	0
GEF Project Grant		3.80	3.77
Co-financing	IA own	0.18	0.77
	Government	3.1	0
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	6.52	0
	Private sector	0	0
	NGOs/CSOs	0	0
Total GEF funding		3.9	3.77
Total Co-financing		9.9	0.77
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		13.8	4.37
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		December 9, 2015	
Author of TE		Eduardo R. Quiroga	
TER completion date		January 12, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
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	MS	--	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	NR	MS	--	MU
M&E Design	NR	MU	--	S
M&E Implementation	NR	MU	--	S
Quality of Implementation	NR	MS	--	S
Quality of Execution	NR	MS	--	UA
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	--	--	--	MU

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

Not applicable

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective for this project is "to develop adaptive capacity of subsistence farmers and rural communities to withstand climate change in Zambia" (PD p.24).

The objective supports an overarching goal for the project ""to improve food security through enhanced adaptive capacity to respond to the risks posed by the effects of climate change (including variability) in AER I and II of Zambia" (PD p.24).

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

There were no changes in the objectives 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 **Relevance**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates relevance as satisfactory, a rating that this TER agrees with. Indeed, the project was important, strategically relevant and well aligned with both Zambian and GEF priorities.

As part of the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) a fund managed by the GEF that finances the preparation and implementation of National Adaption Programs of Action (NAPAS), this project was naturally well aligned with GEF priorities. Part of the climate change focal area and the LCDF operational program, this project came out of the 2007 submission by the Zambian Government of the National Adaptation Programme of Action, which identified urgent priority project profiles related to climate change adaptation.

Zambia has, on its own, limited resources to mitigate the risks climate change poses to its population. Nonetheless, Zambia created a Climate Change Facilitation Unit (CCFU), ratified the UNFCC and the Kyoto Protocol, and undertook a comprehensive national climate change awareness campaign. Zambia's NAPA was submitted in 2007 and highlighted urgent adaptation interventions requiring implementation in Zambia. The NAPA being a participatory process over which the Zambian Government had a high level of ownership, and this project being a direct answer to the NAPA, the project is naturally very well aligned with Zambian priorities.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE submitted does not feature an evaluation of project outcomes. Indeed, outcome assessment is described as 'Work in progress' in the TE submitted for the purpose of this TER (TE p.83). The terminal evaluation consultant nonetheless collected data and tried to analyze the influence of the project in agricultural productivity. According to him, the "evidence points in the direction that there has been an initial spurt of technological uptake which has made an early positive impact in the food security conditions among Project beneficiaries" (TE p.97). Based on the 2014 PIR submitted, this TER assesses effectiveness as satisfactory due to most project targets having been achieved or being on track to be achieved by project end.

The four outcomes that were meant to be achieved as part of the project are:

1. Climate change risks integrated into critical decision-making processes for agricultural management at the local, sub-national and national levels
2. Agricultural productivity in the pilot sites made resilient to the anticipated impacts of climate change
3. National fiscal, regulatory and development policy revised to promote adaptation responses in the agricultural sector
4. Knowledge and lessons learned to support implementation of adaptation measures compiled and disseminated

The TE unfortunately provides no systematic discussion of achievements under these outcomes, but points out that outcome 2 is the most important to the achievement of the project objective. According

to the TE, outcome 2 “is the Project’s cornerstone—not only because the cardinal activities “on the ground” were implemented under outcome 2 (and had clear repercussions on yields, cropping patterns and ensuing farm revenue) but because it also used more than half of the total estimated cost” (TE p.22). Hence, the TE assesses that outcome 2 was somewhat successful, and rates effectiveness as Moderately Satisfactory as a result. Unfortunately, the TE does not assess outcomes 1, 3 and 4. This lack of comprehensive assessment is also criticized in the TE Report Audit 2 (July 2015), as included in the TE p. 159.

Despite the lack of comprehensive discussion of outcomes in the TE and the lack of a 2015 PIR, this TER has gathered enough evidence from the 2014 PIR to make a preliminary assessment of project effectiveness. The 2014 PIR reports that, as of June 2014, 900 farmers had adopted at least one adaptation measure, which represented 90% of the project target. It was also predicted that “the 2454 farmers who are practicing are likely to adopt these technologies before the end of the project” (PIR 2014, p.6). In addition, as of June 2014, “climate resilient agriculture has been integrated in the revised Agriculture Policy, Climate Change Policy, revised Forest Policy and Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and Forest Degradation (REDD) Strategy” (PIR 2014, p.8). Several policies were under review, and the Kazungula district had mainstreamed climate change into its development plan. 12 lessons related to climate change had been documented and disseminated to the district. Those are the main achievements towards the project objectives. Specific targets for the four outcomes appeared to have already been achieved or on track to be achieved. Overall, in June 2014, progress appeared satisfactory.

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The TE rates efficiency as moderately satisfactory, but does not provide a satisfactory rationale for this rating.

It is clear from the Project Document that cost effectiveness was seriously considered for the selection of the project activities. Despite this effort, the TE determined “that the execution modality used, i.e. joint design- implementation, is not cost effective (…)The evidence shows that the joint design-implementation modality is questionable economically, as it does not deliver development results, in general, and as a result does not deliver agricultural results (TE P.48). It is still difficult to assess the cost effectiveness of climate change adaptation programs as they are relatively new, and cost benchmarks have not yet been set. The TE also does not provide cost figures per activity, and this TER is therefore unable to evaluate the cost of various project components. Finally, apart from a few minor delays with financial disbursements, the TE describes the project financial management as having run smoothly.

Overall, too little detail is provided to make an adequate assessment of efficiency.

4.4 **Sustainability**	Rating: **Moderately Unlikely**

The TE rates overall sustainability as moderately satisfactory "based on the preliminary results showing that targets are attainable [and that] there is a potential for sustainability if the trend continues to grow" (TE p.52).

An exit strategy as a way to ensure sustainability for the project appears to have been discussed and agreed. The agreed prerequisites for sustainability were defined as the following:

1. The first deals with transitional actions that need to be taken to ensure the sustainability of an exit process.
2. The second relates to a framework for continuous institution building which needs to be established; and,
3. Finally, the Project's technology transfer process needs to be embedded in the operational plans of ministries for the purpose of mainstreaming.

(TE p.24)

While unclear about this topic, the TE appears to suggest that none of those prerequisites had yet been fulfilled at the time the TE was written. This suggests that the project was completed without having implemented its exit strategy. Other aspects of sustainability are discussed below.

Financial Risks - Sustainability Moderately Unlikely

The TE describes financial sustainability as moderately satisfactory. However, agricultural inputs and animals have so far been distributed for free, even though this was never intended. An agreement must therefore be made between traditional leaders, project authorities and beneficiaries about repayment. Without an agreement, the distribution of resources will not be sustainable.

A second financial risk, and probably the most important one is that there is currently "no alternative sources of financing the necessary inputs for the continuous application of the fundamental techniques adopted" (TE p.53). Indeed, based on the TE, there appears to be no planned project continuation, no government commitment for continued funding, and no external funds to pursue project activities. That being said, Zambian climate change adaptation activities will be able to continue being funded as part of the LCDF. As a result, this TER rates financial sustainability as moderately unlikely.

Socio-Political Risks – Unable to Assess

The TE describes socio-political sustainability as satisfactory, but does not adequately substantiate its score. It substantiates the rating on the grounds that interview farmers "exhibited continuous experimenting and informed decision-making about the new crops and techniques proposed" (TE p.52). This TER would have liked to read more about government intentions with regards to the project's

future, and the likelihood that project activities will be continued by the executing agency. Lacking this information, this TER is unable to assess socio-political risks.

Institutional Risks – Unable to Assess

The TE describes institutional risks as moderately satisfactory because "there is promising potential for the organized collective action in response to the leadership of the management organizations currently operating in each pilot site. The MSC data has shown preliminary evidence of managers, male and female, already in the process of organizing the community for the reception and delivery of the Project's outputs." (TE p.52)

This TER appreciates the potential for some of the activities at pilot site level to be continued, but would have liked to read more about institutional risks to the achievement of outcomes other than outcome 2. Institutional risks can therefore not be assessed for the project as a whole.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

The TE describes environmental sustainability as moderately satisfactory due to the few environmental risks. According to the TE, the main risks pertain to the distribution of fertilizers and herbicides as part of the project, which could have an effect on the environment. (TE p.52) However, this is only a minor risk, and environmental sustainability is rated as likely.

Summary

Overall, despite this TER's inability to assess all aspects of sustainability, the fact that the exit strategy has not been implemented, and that no funding is available for the continuation of project activities outside of the LCDF is enough to assess overall sustainability as moderately unlikely.

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?

> Planned co-financing from the UNDP was higher than expected and was used "to finance the incorporation of additional beneficiaries in the Project. These additional UNDP funds also covered supplementary transportation needs that were identified during Project implementation, as well as a saddle dam to avoid flooding in downstream communities." (TE p.45)
>
> In the co-financing table (TE p.80), the TE reports that no co-financing was received from the Government of Zambia. However, on p.81, it describes that "the Government contribution in-kind was mostly dedicated to office spaces and their maintenance, and officers' emoluments who were supporting the Project in regional, provincial, and national levels." The worth of this in-kind contribution is not reported.

Finally, the TE does not assess co-financing as a factor having influenced project outcomes.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project's original starting date was 1 January 2010, but it only effectively started in August 2012. It was expected to conclude on 31 December 2013, but was extended until 30 June 2015 largely due to the late start. The TE does not explain the reasons for this delay. The PIR 2011 mentions that "since its approval in January 2010, the project has faced serious implementation challenges including the lack of staff fully dedicated to the project."

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 mentioned in the TE, "the Project is country driven to an important degree, as national organizations, sub national organizations and those involved in the implementation all identified with the project's objectives and overall goal." (TE p.45) However, the TE does not describe the extent of country support during implementation, simply focusing on the alignment between country and project objectives in the design stage. Country ownership is therefore difficult to assess.

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 rates the M&E design at entry as moderately unsatisfactory because the "M&E framework did not measure agriculture activity and performance including output value [and because] baseline information was not completed" (TE p.36). This TER rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory due to the overall completeness of its strategic results framework.

The Strategic Results (PD p.71) for the project provides a list of indicators for the four main outcomes of the project, as well as baseline values, targets, sources of verification and relevant risks. The Project Document very thoroughly describes the planned monitoring and evaluation outputs for the project, as

well as responsibility and timeline for their production. The PD (p.88) clearly states the plan to hire an M&E expert as part of the project, and the importance of using M&E findings for adaptive management.

The TE downgrades M&E at entry for having a weak set of indicators to monitor Outcome 2, which were insufficient "to measure progress and performance of the agricultural interventions. This gap made the measurement of progress and achievement of expected results difficult." (TE pp.139-140) More fundamentally, the TE faults the project design for not taking "into consideration the complexity of agricultural development projects" and for not having "in place a monitoring system for agriculture transformation." (TE p.46)

Some of the indicators for outcome 2 were indeed more closely related to outputs than outcomes (1 – "number of interventions in selected pilot sites implemented" and 3 – "Number of women involved in interventions in the pilot sites"), but one of the indicators was closely related to outcomes (2 – "Percentage increase in agricultural incomes in the pilot sites"). While this is clearly a proxy for agricultural productivity, this indicator nonetheless captures an important aspect of agricultural transformation – probably the aspect that is most relevant to local populations. For this reason, this TER judges that the TE's criticism of the M&E system at entry is not founded, and might be due to the TE team leader's bias as a professional agricultural economist.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE rates M&E implementation as moderately unsatisfactory due to the inability of the indicators to adequately track progress in agricultural productivity. This TER takes a wider view of M&E implementation and rates it as satisfactory due to its having overall conducted M&E activities as planned.

The TE provides very little information about M&E implementation other than the fact that "M&E data was collected following the framework of UNDP procedures". The TE's author is very adamant that more project and M&E focus emphasis should have been put on agricultural transformation and, as a result, focuses his discussion of M&E implementation on the issue of lacking indicators to adequately measure agricultural transformation. According to him, because "the monitoring was not focused on the performance of agricultural outputs and outcomes, had little or no potential to be used for adaptive management" (TE p.35).

As a result of the TE's focus on outcome 2, the TE does not mention the extent to which monitoring data was collected or used for adaptive management for other outcomes. Based on the PIRs, which were submitted every year, it appears that monitoring data was collected as planned.

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: **Satisfactory**

The implementing agency for this project was UNDP, the performance of which the TE rates as moderately satisfactory. This TER rates UNDP performance as implementing agency as satisfactory due to the overall ability of the UNDP to manage this overall complex project and its general appreciation from stakeholders.

The TE mostly has praise to offer for UNDP:

> "In this context, the UNDP has displayed sound operational efficiency in mobilizing, disbursing and accounting for the use of funds. Within the UNDP framework, the systems in place for the planning, monitoring and evaluation processes are sound, including the reporting of results. The planning and review processes both internally between various UNDP units, and externally with programme partners and stakeholders, are structured and systematic and are undergoing continuous improvements. The bulk of the stakeholders operating in Zambia appreciate the UNDP's responsiveness to local needs and flexibility in their programming approach that allows their partnership with the UNDP to readily accommodate their emerging needs." (TE p.25)

However, as mentioned before, the TE is skeptical of the strategy of the project and claims that more emphasis should have been put on Outcome 2, and in particular on agricultural productivity as it is the 'lynchpin' of the project. In addition, the TE deplored the implementing strategy which, according to the TE, "promoted a silo approach among all of the participating agencies" (TE p.30) and "did not take into consideration the necessary planning process required in an agricultural project". Indeed, the TE claims that "the disappointing project achievement are due to a weak project design" (TE p.48). However, "there was no way to ascertain how robust the project design was when implementation began" (TE p.30). This TER notes that it could not assess whether or not the project achievements were indeed disappointing and, as a result, cannot ascertain whether project design was indeed weak.

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Unable to Assess**

The executing agency for this project was the Zambia Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, the performance of which the TE rates as moderately satisfactory. According to the TE, the MAL staff working on the project had the right expertise to deliver the various project initiatives (TE p.35). In addition, MAL staff "appeared motivated" and their engagement was "robust" (TE p.41). However, the TE criticizes their ability to deliver technological packages, claiming that greater coordination is vital. Little is said about project execution as the TE mostly focuses on criticizing the design of the execution arrangements rather than the way the project was executed. The PIRs do not provide additional information regarding the performance of the MAL. As a result, this TE cannot assign a rating.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

No environmental change has been recorded as part of this 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.

There is evidence of agricultural income having increased as part of the project, although this is not described in the TE. The 2014 PIR reports that "for the small-scale farmers in the project sites, the baseline in 2010 on the income from maize production was zero (0); with the practicing of conservation farming the income from maize has been over US$500 in 2014 translating to an income of more than 100%. The increase in income has contributed to communities paying for their children's education apart from meeting other social amenities such as making improvements to their houses and buying agriculture inputs. For women in particular, the increase in income has also led to increased social status. For example, before the project women were discriminated against signing up for the agricultural input grants as they

had limited confidence in putting up their cases as women who would be capable of signing for the grants and be able to effectively use it to improve their productivity." (PIR 2014, pp. 19-20).

Presumably, upon project end in June 2015, the impact was even greater.

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

No change in capacities was recorded in the TE. The 2014 PIR reports the following impact from the project's capacity-building activities:

- "Capacity building of women and girls in taking up adaptation measures to climate change has taken centre stage resulting in 50% participation of women in climate change activities." (PIR 2014 p.21)
- "Capacity building programs have resulted in women and girls taking up adaptation measures to climate change which has further resulted in the increase in productivity from less than 1 ton per hectare to 3.2 tons per hectare of maize." (PIR 2014 p.47)
- "The capacity building supported by the project has led to the trained small-scale farmers to practice conservation agriculture, crop diversification, seed multiplication, small livestock production, beekeeping, mushroom growing and fish farming. This in turn has led to food security among the small-scale farmers and the surplus produce for sale." (PIR 2014 p.5)

b) Governance

No changes in governance were recorded in the TE or the 2014 PIR.

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 unintended consequences were recorded 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.

The TE or the 2014 PIR provide no evidence that project activities have been replicated, mainstreamed or scaled up.

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 offers the following lessons:

1. ***Unadvised Planning-Implementing Procedure.***

"The Project's implementing modality [simultaneous execution of planning and implementation procedures] was defective for the adaptation/mitigation to climate change of the agricultural sector of Zambia, with special reference to small landholders. The evidence indicates that this modality was ineffective for activity implementation and, in particular, for complex activities requiring the completion of one activity before the second activity could occur and be completed. Specifically, in the context of outcome- two, the most significant shortfall was the ineffective planning and preparation for the execution of complex water infrastructure works. Another consequence of this faulty modality was that the Project's farmers were deprived of the anticipated improvement of access to the market, either to sell their produce or to purchase inputs." (TE p.12)

2. Appraisal Review of Agricultural Development Projects.

"Often one useful and standard procedure for complex projects used by IFAD, WB and others, especially agricultural projects where irrigation development is a component, has been to have an independent organization appraise the total project design. The appraisal process seeks to ensure that all technological, economic, environmental, marketing, and other relevant issues are properly addressed to warrant successful implementation. Using the benefit of hindsight, the Project could have used an appraisal review conducted by an independent team composed of an agro-economist, an agronomist and an irrigation engineer. The overall purpose would be to establish the feasibility of the project design at the technical, economic, social and environmental levels." (TE p.12)

3. M&E Framework for Agricultural Outcomes Based on Existing Framework.

"The standard approach within the framework of UNDP M&E procedures, in addition to dealing adequately with administrative issues, focuses on capacity development for institutional transformation. Although agricultural development does require institutional reform and

alignment, the technical elements of output production [crops, trees, and animals including fish] are paramount in the agricultural transformation process. " (TE p.13)

4. In-Depth Mid Term Review.

"When agricultural/livestock production is partially or entirely an ingredient of a climate change outcome, an in-depth MTR can be productive, especially in reference to baseline information and indicators. The key purpose of the MTR would be to identify corrective actions either at the level of final targets or baseline measurements. The upshot from this Project is that, unsurprisingly, it is not possible to measure any change without a baseline."

5. Sharing Climate Change Data Across Ministries, Donor Agencies and NGOs

Climate-related data can be collected through primary methods, however this is a resource-intensive effort. It could also duplicate ongoing efforts, as many donors and agencies often work in the same regions, sometimes simultaneously. One option is for all stakeholders concerned to jointly gather baseline information and monitoring data. This initiative would be similar to the one being led by the General Global Donor Platform Rural Development [GDPRD], FAO and the World Bank concerning tracking results in agriculture and rural development in less-than-ideal conditions. The idea is to select a core set of standard climate change indicators, with the recommendation that they should be regularly compiled by all agencies, both national and international, in Zambia. These "priority indicators" should be the same as in all climate change programs to allow for comparisons, and to facilitate the monitoring of climate change programs and goals at the national level. "(TE p. 13)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE (pp.10-12) offers the following recommendations:

1. **Carry out outstanding actions so that the Project exits implementation mode and enters into ascale up mode. To this end, within the legal and administrative procedures of the relevant GRZ ministries, three prerequisites are essential:**
    a. Critical technical and legal actions include:
        i. developing technical manuals for district staff related to the technology transfer process;
        ii. guidelines for inputting revolving funds;
        iii. registration of cooperatives, associations and business enterprises in the current operation;
        iv. developing business plans, and financial and business systems for the cooperatives, associations and business enterprises;
        v. establishing business plans, and financial and business systems for the cooperatives, associations and communities by project staff; and

vi. wider use of ICT applied to the pilot sites, i.e. utilization of iPads, smart phones, etc

b. A framework for continuous institution building is needed and includes:
    i. arranging district planning of climate change activities;
    ii. arranging district reporting and coordination meetings;
    iii. beginning the capacity building of district staff;
    iv. aligning partnerships with district stakeholders;
    v. organizing on-going training and monitoring of farmer groups and sub-committees by district staff;
    vi. arranging management procedures for revolving funds by the sub-committee;
    vii. arranging the implementation of business plans by the boards and management of the established cooperatives, associations , business enterprises and trusts.
c. Embedding the Project technology transfer process in the operational plans of ministries. To this end, the following Project guidelines and manuals must be published and disseminated:
    i. entrepreneurship manual;
    ii. technical production manuals;
    iii. iPad/ video on different climate change topics;
    iv. inputting a revolving fund manual;
    v. goat pass-on system [& other inputs] manual;
    vi. community nurseries and seed bank manual;
    vii. honey and rice marketing and market analysis;
    viii. business plans for honey, rice, and cooking oil;
    ix. eight [8] district sustainability plans; and others as required

2. **Consolidating the Agronomic and Livelihood Operations, which aims to lay the foundations to attain the outcomes throughout the process and end-results of the Project.**

Conduct a stocktaking of what has been achieved in terms of:

a. the amount of ha incorporated by the Project in each pilot site, separated by gender;
b. the composition of cropping patterns with special reference to yields achieved with the Project;
c. the number of participants in livelihood operations proposed by the Project, including performance rates of number of animals received, sales, home consumption, etc.
d. reaching an agreement between local traditional leaders, project authorities and beneficiaries on the repayment rate of agricultural inputs and animals distributed during the early phase;
e. those individuals from each of the eight sites who agree to the repayment terms, and reveal their preference to continue with the learning curve with the Project's agronomic interventions and/or livelihoods in operation on a repayment basis [pass-on system] constitute the indicative list of potential participants for scaling up

3. **Value-Chain Analysis to the Service of Small Landholding Farmers**

Under the conditions pervasive in the pilot sites selected,

a. Identify the set of crops for value-chain analysis;
b. set up an integrated bundle of interventions targeting the whole value chain from final consumer to producer and all the required supporting services.
c. Organize a value-chain analysis carried out by national agencies, parastatals, NGOs and donors;
d. to avoid duplication of activities, articulate a division of labor around specific comparative advantages
e. Identify actions to ensure that production and marketing processes is environmentally-friendly. To the extent possible production intensification should use IPM and ecological agriculture so that the use of agro-chemicals will be minimized in the marketing process

4. **Nutrition Planning as an Intermediate Strategy**
    a. Identify the farm family unit's consumption preference as a starting point for enhancing nutrition. To this end, as the strategic entry point is to incorporate nutritious crops into current cropping patterns, review cropping patterns in each pilot site.
    b. In relevant pilot sites, enable the programming of community-based initiatives designed to promote the production of a variety of vegetables and fruits for home consumption. The participating families should have incentives to enhance their quality of living conditions by learning about new varieties of vegetable crops
    c. Through the Community Based programming induce a demand-pull of staple crops, vegetables, and fruits across all smallholding farmers. This would be generated by [1] virtue of farm families improving their own diets with different varieties of vegetables and fruits, and [2] farm families getting involved in livelihood opportunities as restaurant owners and/or suppliers to restaurants.
5. **Water Resources Development and Management**

Within the watershed[s] where the sites are situated,

a. Conduct the collection of the dataset needed for the design of an irrigation system including climate data, water resources, water drainage, soil conditions and topography, as well as adaptation methods and crops to deal with climate change.
b. Subsequently, assess the technical/socio-economic/environmental feasibility of a potential project [s] within the context of the smallholders' management level currently operating in a given site.
c. This process should be focused on solving water scarcity in a way that is socio-economically acceptable and environmentally sustainable. To this end, and from the standpoint of the sustainable management of natural resources, the use of geological structures for water bodies such as the regeneration of *dambos* must be emphasized throughout this process.
d. Enable so that the planning process focuses on [1] how the farmers enhance their skills to adapt to the proposed operation, and [2] how the servicing institutions reduce the risks involved in the process to enable the small farmers to successfully uptake the

technology. The services should enable irrigated agriculture to be economically worthwhile for the producer, the consumers, and for the overall process to be sustainable. The produce must be marketed to ensure the economic return necessary to cover operation and maintenance costs so that the irrigation scheme is financially sustainable.

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 does not contain an assessment of any of the relevant outcomes as they are all listed as 'work in progress'. The report, when describing achievements, focuses on outcome 2 only. No assessment is made of the extent to which objectives have been attained.	**U**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is internally consistent, but the evidence presented only pertains to outcome 2. Ratings are not always well substantiated. The report is often unclear and confusing.	**MU**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report presents a short assessment of project sustainability, but again mostly focuses on outcome 2. The project exit strategy is discussed.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The evidence presented supports the lessons learned. They do not appear particularly comprehensive as, once again, they mostly pertain to outcome 2	**MS**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual total costs, but not costs per activity. Actual co-financing figures are provided but inconsistent across the report.	**MU**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of the M&E system is biased against the author's idea that the project's M&E should have been more strongly geared towards monitoring and evaluating outcome 2. It does not assess the extent to which the actual M&E framework was implemented.	**U**
Overall TE Rating		**MU**

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

No additional sources were used in the preparation of this terminal evaluation report.