

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3704	
GEF Agency project ID		4047	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Integrated Adaptation Programme to Combat the Effects of Climate Change on Agricultural Production and Food Security in Benin	
Country/Countries		Benin	
Region		West Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Climate Change Adaptation	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection (MENP)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Yes – local communities are key beneficiaries	
Private sector involvement		NA	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		January 2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		April 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		December 2014	
Actual date of project completion		December 2015	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.08	0.08
	Co-financing	0.08	0.08
GEF Project Grant		3.41	NA
Co-financing	IA own	0.5	NA
	Government	7.4	NA
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0	NA
	Private sector	0	NA
	NGOs/CSOs	0	NA
Total GEF funding		3.49	NA
Total Co-financing		7.98	NA
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		11.47	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		October 2015	
Author of TE		Alexandre Borde, Eustache Bonaventure	
TER completion date		December 30, 2016	
TER prepared by		Caroline Laroche	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Watts	

Note: The Terminal Evaluation (TE) for this project was written in French. The author of this TER interpreted and translated the TE to the best of her knowledge, but no official translation services were used. Small discrepancies might be present between the original sentence in French and the translated quotes provided in this TER.

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

In Benin, climate change threatens rural livelihoods and food security. The country has made a commitment to better prepare for climate change. As part of this commitment, this project has the global environmental objective “to contribute to Climate Change Resilient Agricultural Production and Food Security in Benin” (PD p.25). Indeed, this project is executed as part of Benin’s National Adaptation Programme of Action (NAPA), which was completed in 2008 (PD p.6).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective as stated in the Project Document (PD p.25) is ‘to strengthen capacities of agricultural demonstration communities in selected Communes to adapt to extreme event and climate change in four vulnerable agro-ecological zones in Benin’. This project, carried out through the Least Developed Countries Fund (LCDF), pilots adaptation activities in four agro-ecological zones of Benin and builds national level capacity to respond to climate change in the agricultural sector. More specifically, the project focuses on the following outcomes:

1. Capacity to plan for and respond to climate change in the agricultural sector improved
2. Risk of climate induced impacts on agricultural productivity reduced at the community level
3. Lessons learned and best practices from pilot activities, capacity development initiatives and policy changes disseminated

(PD pp.25-31)

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

There were no changes in objectives or planned activities during project implementation.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE rates relevance as highly satisfactory. This TER rates it as satisfactory as the project was well aligned with Benin's national priorities in terms of climate change adaptation, and with GEF priorities as part of the LCDP. As part of this TER, the rating of 'satisfactory' is the highest rating that can be granted to project relevance.

Benin completed its first NAPA in 2008, which noted that "Benin is at risk to climate change, and that all natural resource-based productive sectors, including agriculture, fisheries, water resources, forestry, and overall food security will be adversely affected by climate change" (PD p.6). As a result of the NAPA, the government of Benin decided to make climate change a more central element of its national development plan, as well as of its sectoral policies including the national agricultural strategy.

The project was "prepared fully in line with guidance provided by GEF and the LCDP Trust Fund" (PD p.23) and, as a LCDP project, is directly relevant to the GEF climate change focal area. Indeed, the project aims to improve the adaptive capacities in four agro-ecological zones of Benin, build local community adaptation capacity, and generally improve the national capacity to deal with climate change in the agricultural sector by conducting targeted interventions at the policy, planning and budgeting levels (PD p.23).

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

The TE rates effectiveness as satisfactory, ~~and overall project outcomes as highly satisfactory~~. This TER ~~confirms this rating rates effectiveness as satisfactory~~ due to the fact that the project appears to have successfully achieved the outcomes it was set to achieve. Indeed, according to the TE, "the terminal evaluation shows that global project results have all been achieved. Project activities were very effectively implemented and have led to very satisfactory results" (TE p.9). Unfortunately, the TE does not present the results achieved under each outcome, nor does it assess the project's realizations against its logical

framework. However, the PIR 2015 document demonstrates that the project has met all of its objectives, and enables this TER to rate effectiveness as satisfactory.

According to the TE, the pilot projects in all 9 villages were very effective, and successfully transferred climate change adaption know-how and new technologies to the local communities (TE p.9). Among other realizations, the project supported the acquisition and installation of 4 agro-meteorological stations, the development of experimental fishing zones with 25hp engine boats, as well as the provision of equipment and tools to support fish farms. Those will enhance the livelihood of and support the development of alternative income generating activities for local populations. No assessment is made of the extent to which the project successfully contributed to building the national capacity to plan for and respond to climate change in the agricultural sector, or how the lessons learned as part of the pilot projects have been disseminated.

The last PIR for the project (2015) provides more information regarding project achievements. It reveals that, as of June 2015 – 6 months before project end – several project activities had been successfully completed. A ‘Methodological Guide for the Integration of Adaptation to Climate Change in the Local Development Planning’ had been developed and was available. Annual adaptation action plans were developed in all 9 demonstration villages, and NGOs had been recruited to support municipalities to proceed with the integration of considerations related to climate change in municipal development plans. At the national level, there had been new initiatives, including a decree establishing the national committee of economic modeling and integration of climate change in the general budget of the State, as well as the development of a Climate-Smart Agriculture Strategy within the framework of the West African Alliance. (PIR 2015, pp.2-4)

Overall, the PIR 2015 provides good evidence that climate change adaption capacity in Benin was strengthened at all levels as a result of the project. Effectiveness is therefore rated as satisfactory.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unable to Assess
----------------	---------------------------------

The TE rates efficiency as satisfactory due to the satisfactory results achieved by the project (TE p.87), but without providing a more detailed assessment of efficiency. This TER does not have sufficient information to rate efficiency, but notes that there is no mention in the TER of financial mismanagement or inadequate use of funds.

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

The TE rates project sustainability as highly satisfactory largely due to the success of the pilot projects and the high likelihood that pilot project communities will continue benefiting from the project following completion. However, the TE does not discuss the financial, institutional and environmental risks to the project. This TER rates sustainability as moderately likely due to the lack of information regarding the

financial future of the initiatives developed as part of the project, and the unknown level of political support.

Financial Risks – Sustainability Unlikely

Despite not directly addressing financial risks, the TE mentions it will be important for project advantages to “be maintained after external financial support is no longer available” (TE p.89). The TE does not relate any clear commitment from the government of Benin, the GEF or the UNDP to maintain their financial support towards related activities after project completion. Additional financial support following project end will be necessary to ensure pilot projects are replicated and more communities benefit from the initiatives developed.

Socio-political Risks – Sustainability Moderately Likely.

According to the TE, local communities involved in the pilots “will continue to support the project” (TE p.30) and will continue project activities as they were ‘motivated’ by them (TE p.89). Political support for the replication of the pilot projects developed is however unknown.

Institutional Risks – Sustainability Likely

As mentioned above, the project was instrumental in driving the national decree establishing the national committee of economic modeling and integration of climate change in the general budget of the State, as well as the development of a Climate-Smart Agriculture Strategy within the framework of the West African Alliance (PIR 2015, pp.2-4). Those examples demonstrate that the institutions supporting climate change adaptation are stronger as a result of the project.

Environmental Risks – Sustainability Likely

There are no reported or known environmental risks to this project, which in fact aims to alleviate the impact of environmental risks. Environmental sustainability is therefore rated as likely.

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?

Co-financing, in particular the large contributions made by local governments, were essential to the achievement of the project’s objectives. The TE relates that the expected co-financing came through, but does not describe how it affected 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 was expected to start in March 2010 and to end in December 2014. After the signature of project documents in January 2010, unexpected events postponed the start of project activities until April 2011. Indeed, the UNDP took longer than expected to recruit the project management unit (PMU) as it wanted to do so in full accordance with GEF and UNDP procedures. As a result of initial delays, the project was extended until December 2015, and the TE reports that project outcomes were not affected. (TE p.19)

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

The TE reports a very high level of country and local ownership over the project. Indeed, important decisions were all taken in agreement with the local authorities and the Government of Benin. "The close collaboration with the government has enabled the project to be appropriated by the government institutions at all levels, and therefore to ensure sustainability; it also allowed to integrate climate change adaptation components into the project, even through local beneficiaries were principally concerned with the improvement of their livelihood" (TE p.10).

Local communities and authorities have supported the project at all stages, and were very involved. National government authorities were regularly in touch with the PMU, keeping abreast of progress and new developments (TE p.10).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates M&E design at entry as satisfactory. Instead, this TER rates M&E design as moderately satisfactory as the project lacks a comprehensive strategic results framework to guide its work.

While the Project Document presents a set of key indicators to measure the project's success (PD p.32), indicators are only set at objective and outcome levels. Project outputs are not defined, nor are output-level indicators. As a result, the M&E plan described in the PD only focuses on part of the project's logical

framework, and fails to monitor the very activities and outputs that ultimately generate outcomes and contribute to project impact.

The project's M&E plan defined in the Project Document (p.47) features all standard M&E components, including a project inception workshop, quarterly reporting, annual project reviews, project implementation reports, site visits, mid-term and final evaluations. It also describes the way in which local communities will contribute to the project using participatory M&E. Finally, the budget assigned to the project's M&E activities is \$92,000, excluding staff time and travel expenses. According to the TE, this budget is adequate for the scale of this project (TE p.8).

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

The TE rates M&E implementation for the project as satisfactory. As all M&E activities appear to have been conducted as planned, this TER agrees with this rating and rates M&E implementation as satisfactory.

The TE reports that “the execution of M&E plan has been satisfactory” (TE p.8). The recommendations made as part of the mid-term evaluation were relevant and were adopted by the project management unit (PMU). Indeed, the PMU appears to have used the data and recommendations coming out of the M&E process in order to improve the project and make better strategic decisions regarding its management. PIRs were reportedly produced very carefully, and used as an opportunity to strengthen the project during the course of implementation (TE p.31). Overall, the TE presents the picture of a project in which M&E activities were regularly and carefully conducted, and frequently used as part of the decision-making process.

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: Highly Satisfactory
--	------------------------------------

The implementing agency for this project was the UNDP. In the TE, the UNDP's quality of implementation for this project is rated as highly satisfactory. This TER also rates it as highly satisfactory as the UNDP appears to have adequately supported and supervised the project at all stages, and took action to ensure project sustainability and to further its impact.

The TE reports that “the UNDP’s implementation, facilitation and supervision work was perfectly adapted to the needs of the project. The project design and implementation in Benin have been adequate, and the UNDP had an important role in ensuring this adequacy” (TE pp.8-9).

In addition to supporting project implementation, the UNDP also ensured that national authorities in Benin kept in touch with the project, developed ownership over it and improved their capacity to manage climate change adaptation activities (TE p.36). The UNDP “was also active in promoting synergies with other relevant projects being implemented in Benin, as well as in ensuring the development of an exit strategy for the project “ (TE p.36).

Overall the UNDP appears to have fulfilled its role of implementing agency very well, and was a key driver of success for the project.

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

The executing agency for this project was the Benin Ministry of Environment and Nature Protection (MENP). In the TE, the MENP’s quality of execution for this project is rated as highly satisfactory. This TER instead rates it as satisfactory as little information is provided about the MENP’s performance as executing agency, but the TE provides evidence that it adequately managed and executed the project.

The TE reports that the MENP “fully played its role as executing agency, providing officers and personnel for the whole duration of the project, as well as adequate and appropriate political and technical supervision of the project” (TE p.9). The MENP and the UNDP collaborated well, but an internal restructuring of the MENP in 2013 caused a few delays in the project. However, those were overall inconsequential to the project’s outcomes (TE p.9). The PMU is also said to have developed strong and useful partnerships that allowed for the strengthening of technical and institutional capacity, and to have rigorously respected the terms of those partnerships (TE p.31).

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 was observed as a 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.

In the pilot communities, the project had very positive repercussions. In total, 2,210 individuals, including 720 women, benefited from the project (TE p.8). In all 9 demonstration villages, new technical expertise and know-how was made available, including new income-generating activities. The TE reports a 30% increase in income in those villages (TE p.10).

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 pilot projects in all 9 villages were very effective, and successfully transferred climate change adaption know-how and new technologies to the local communities (TE p.9). Among other realizations, the project supported the development of alternative income-generating activities in those villages; this know-how will remain following project end.

In addition, a ‘Methodological Guide for the Integration of Adaptation to Climate Change in the Local Development Planning’ has been developed at the national level and was available. Annual adaptation action plans were developed in all 9 demonstration villages, and NGOs have been recruited to support municipalities to proceed with the integration of considerations related to climate change in municipal development plans. (PIR 2015, pp. 2-3)

b) Governance

A decree was made establishing the national committee of economic modeling and integration of climate change in the general budget of Benin. In addition, the project contributed to the development of a Climate-Smart Agriculture Strategy. (PIR 2015, p.3)

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.

Not unintended impacts were reported as part of the 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 pilot projects have not yet been replicated outside the demonstration villages.

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 report doesn't present any lessons learned outside of those incorporated in the recommendations listed in the section below.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The report makes the following recommendations:

1. The positive results accomplished as part of the project must be valued and replicated to a larger scale, as asked by the Government (...). The partnerships with research organizations and other technical partners will have to be strengthened for future projects. More globally, coordinating with funding organizations and other development and climate actors in Benin should be continued, scaled up and expanded to new actors such as the Green Climate Fund. It is recommended for the project to formulate a concept note for around \$50 million to scale up the project across Benin.
2. The cooperation between the UNDP and the national and local authorities must be continued, in particular regarding access to water. Another related project should be planned. A concept note to that effect should be submitted to the GEF.
3. In the framework of the next program cycle, it is recommended to focus on the broad themes of water, rural electrification using renewables, and the health aspect of climate change adaptation.

(TE p.93)

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report contains a good assessment of one outcome, but fails to assess the other two project outcomes. The TE focuses too much on the success of the pilot initiatives, and not enough on other project components.	U
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, but the evidence provided is not complete. Some of the ratings are not particularly well substantiated.	MU
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report discusses certain aspects of sustainability and mentions the presence of an exit strategy, but does not describe appropriately all aspects of sustainability and of the exit strategy.	MU
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	There were not lessons learned, and the recommendations were very brief and not comprehensive.	U
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report does not include actual project costs or co-financing used.	HU
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report presents an adequate assessment of M&E activities, but provides very little detail.	MS
Overall TE Rating		U

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

No additional sources of information were used in the preparation of this TER.