

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

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3728	
GEF Agency project ID		LDL/00386	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF 4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNEP	
Project name		Strengthening of the Gambia's Climate Change Early Warning Systems	
Country/Countries		Gambia	
Region		AFR	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Climate Change Adaptation, LDCF Objective 1 (Reducing Vulnerability) and Objective 2 (Increasing Adaptive Capacity)	
Executing agencies involved		Gambia Department of Water Resources (DWR)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Yes. NGOs engaged in project activities	
Private sector involvement		Yes. Consultative forum held with private sector partners in tourism and hospitality sector	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) / Approval date (MSP)		March 24, 2011	
Effectiveness date / project start		August 1, 2011	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 30, 2015	
Actual date of project completion		December 31, 2014	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.03	0.03
	Co-financing	0.05	0.05
GEF Project Grant		1.028	1.028
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	1.56	0.97
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		1.058	1.058
Total Co-financing		1.61	1.02
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.668	2.078
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		September 2015	
Author of TE		Gilbert Ong'isa Ouma	
TER completion date		11/5/2015	
TER prepared by		Molly Watts	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Neeraj Negi	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

## 3. Project Objectives

### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As stated in the project document (PD) The project's global environmental objective is to adapt national development in the face of climate variability and change.(p.53) The Gambia is suffering negative impacts of climate change including irregular rainfall patterns, and predicted future sea-level rise. Valuable ecosystems and resources along the Gambian coastline, as well as UNESCO World Heritage sites are under threat from wave erosion and submergence.

### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The projects development objective as stated in the project document is "to enhance adaptive capacity and reduce vulnerability to climate change through a strengthened early warning and information sharing mechanism for a better informed decision making by government and affected population." (p.53) This would be achieved by implementing the second NAPA priority for the Gambia, strengthening the Nations Early Warning System, focusing on three aspects in particular (p.4) -

- 1) Enhanced capacity of hydro-meteorological services and networks for predicting climate change events and risk factors.
- 2) More effective, efficient and targeted delivery of climate information including early warnings.
- 3) Improved and timely preparedness and responses of various stakeholders to climate linked risks and vulnerabilities forecasts.

The project document outlines three components as follows:

**Component 1 Climate change information, monitoring and early warning systems.** This project component focuses on rehabilitating a number of hydro-meteorological stations with repairs, installation of new equipment, and development of human resources. It would include developing the capacity of personnel to archive and digitize historical data, as well as to collect and use socio-economic data to enrich climate information for development of targeted and

useful early warning messages. This component would also support vulnerability mapping and climate based modeling applications, including crop models in areas of climate risk. (TE p.53-55)

**Component 2 Climate change information dissemination and communication to end users.**

This component focuses on developing information and communication capacities at the National Meteorology and Hydrological Services. To package and share weather forecasts and early warning messages in ways that capture the interest and attention of specific and targeted stakeholders. This would including finding the best media outlets for messages, and a consideration of how to frame messages effectively. The component will include collecting feedback from community end-users on the usefulness of messages and advice, in order to develop a communication awareness strategy (CAS). (TE p.57-60)

**Component 3 Institutional capacity for climate change policies and protocols.** This component focuses on integrating climate change into national development planning. Under this component the project would produce climate hazard maps, sectoral risks and vulnerability maps including relevant socio-economic data for sensitization purposes, recommendations for the creation of an ad hoc climate change coordination group, and the training of such an ad hoc group. The project would create an inter-ministerial coordination mechanism, and would create a consultative forum with private sector partners, as well as training to private sector partners on coastal vulnerability and adaptation. (Te p.61-65)

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

There were no changes in project design listed in the TER. However there were two budget revisions, the first in April 2013 and the second in April 2014. There was also a legal amendment to provide for an extension of six months until June 30, 2015.

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

The TE gives a rating of Highly Satisfactory for relevance, and this TE reviews gives a rating of **Satisfactory** for relevance. The project outcomes are consistent with the GEF's Climate Change

focal area, and contribute to achievement of the GEF strategic priorities and targets in adaptation. As stated in the TE- “Implementation of the project yields results that contribute directly to the strengthening of EWS within the Gambia and contributes to the LDCF Objective 1 (reducing vulnerability) and Objective 2 (increasing adaptive capacity.) In particular, the project contributes to Outcome 1.1-Mainstreamed adaptation in broader development frameworks at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas, as well as Outcome 2.1-Increased knowledge and understanding of climate variability and change-induced threats at country level and in targeted vulnerable areas through project focus on strengthening the national network capacity to formulate early warning message and improving their relevance and dissemination to target groups.” (TE P.31)

The project is consistent with the Gambia’s priorities at the time. Specifically, the project addresses the second priority of the Gambia’s National Adaptation Program of Action, improving the country’s national early warning system in order to inform farmers and communities as well as other stakeholders on climate change and its impacts on economic sectors and livelihoods systems. The project is also aligned with national policy instruments including the Poverty Reduction Strategy Program and the Gambia Environmental Action Plan, which calls for delivering immediate adaptation benefits, and contributing to building local and national adaptive capacities, as well as building foundations for maximizing long term adaptation benefits. It also addresses Priority area 1 of the country’s UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) on Poverty Reduction and Social Protection, the main outcome of which is “Poverty reduction and social protection strategies and systems are established that enable the poor, women, and youth to increase their productive capacities and generate sustainable livelihoods while protecting the environment.”(TE p.33)

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for achievement of outcomes, and this TE review concurs with that rating. Although the project did not successfully collect data on all outcome indicators, there is enough evidence to conclude that the project succeeded in putting in place the core technical elements for an effective Early Warning System, improving delivery of climate information and early warnings to users, and enhancing the preparedness of government to respond to climate risks and vulnerabilities.

Progress towards the projects objective and three outcome are detailed in the table below. (Prodoc appendix 4 p.107 & TE p.34-42, 117-120)

Objective/Component	Expected Results	TE Results
PDO to enhance adaptive capacity and reduce vulnerability to climate change	20% increase in the Vulnerability Rapid Assessment score	The endline vulnerability rapid assessment score was not collected. However, the TE finds that the objective and main outcome was to a

Objective/Component	Expected Results	TE Results
through a strengthened early warning and information sharing mechanism for a better informed decision making by government and affected population		greater extent achieved due to the high rates of project activity completion. There is increased access and use of early warning messages and climate information by farming and fishing communities in their daily activities.
<b>Immediate Outcome 1</b> Capacity of hydro-meteorological services and networks enhanced to predict climate events, identify the associated risks and issue early warnings	<p>A total of 8 network stations operational by end of project</p> <p>A total of 5 surface water level networks operational by end of project</p> <p>2 additional ground water level stations especially in areas with no networks by end of project</p> <p>100% of optimum needs determined after assessment during the inception phase are met</p> <p>Training target for technical staff fully met, 30% additional professional staff at end of project</p> <p>At least a 25% increase in climate data collection and analysis outputs of the Gambia Department of Water Resources during project period, compared to performance during immediate pre-project period</p> <p>Vulnerability maps have been developed for The Gambia</p>	<p>All 10 meteorological stations in Gambia were fully equipped with instruments to measure and record all weather elements by the time of the TE</p> <p>Water level recorder was installed in one hydrological station, and six observation boreholes were drilled and data loggers supplied to measure groundwater level</p> <p>Four Cadet Meteorologists were recruited and trained, one of whom resigned while the other three of whom have been absorbed in the public service pay roll. Seven meteorological technicians and six computer and data analysis technicians were trained locally on enhancing national climate services ENACTs, and two Meteorological and Hydrological Instrument Technicians were trained on the installation operation and maintenance of AWS.</p> <p>A total of 150 participants were trained on rainfall measurement and phonological observations, and 120 members of the Radio Listening Groups were trained on operations of recorders. Agreements were signed between the PMU and the Community Radios in NBR and WCR, and the forecast office provides climate early warning products through the internet.</p> <p>The project generated climate change projections and risk maps, provision of</p>

Objective/Component	Expected Results	TE Results
		<p>climate data and early warning information to users, policy briefings, training on integration of climate change into policies, and identification of policies for integration. GIS maps of projected temperature and rainfall were produced based on three GCMs.</p> <p>Climate vulnerability risk maps were not generated because data was old. Under the governments Third National Communication process newer data will be generated and used to produce the maps.</p>
<p><b>Immediate Outcome 2</b> Improvement in the delivery of climate information, including early warnings, to various users for effective adaptation decision making</p>	<p>At least 2 different types of appropriate communication media used to deliver messages to end users</p> <p>At least 50% of the population living in the 5 project sites express preference for and usefulness of communication media developed and used by the project to deliver weather related messages, and early warnings</p> <p>At least 50% of farmers in project sites respond to weather forecast and EW by planting crops better suited to climate change related weather forecasts</p>	<p>The project conducted a study to determine effective channels of communication of climate early warning information from providers to users. The project identifies community radios, Radio Listening Groups and Multidisciplinary Facilitation Teams as the most effective channels of communication. Participants were trained in communication of early warning information to end users, and equipment and tools were provided.</p> <p>Partnerships were established between the Project Management Unit, Radio Listener Groups and Community Radios to communicate warnings. Radio Listener Groups were established in NBR and WCR, and trained in providing feedback on climate impacts. 300 members of the general public were trained, as well as 45 media agents who were trained in climate and climate science, risks, impacts, and responses, types of alerts and forecasts, and reporting on climate change issues in their media outlets.</p> <p>92% of respondents in a survey conducted at the end of the project reported receiving early warning messages, while 8% had not. 53% received alerts consistently for all</p>

Objective/Component	Expected Results	TE Results
		events and 23% received alerts in extreme events with little warning.
<b>Immediate Outcome</b> <b>3</b> Enhanced preparedness of communities and government to respond to climate risks and vulnerabilities	<p>By the end of the project at least one plan has been modified to integrate climate risk and its implementation has started</p> <p>A functional inter-ministerial adhoc committee on climate change is established</p> <p>By the end of the project 30% of the 40% of decision makers are aware of climate change and its impacts</p>	<p>The Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy, the Forest Policy and the Fisheries Strategic Action Plan were reviewed and analyzed to determine their sensitivity to climate change. A training workshop was also conducted and sectoral staff worked to integrate climate change issues into policy documents. Climate change was integrated into the Agricultural and Natural Resources and Forest Policies, and the Fisheries Strategic Action Plan was undertaken.</p> <p>Establishment of an inter-ministerial data coordination mechanism and metadata system is at an advanced stage. The project established a network for the recording, transmission, reception, analysis, storage and archiving of climate data from all collection points of the MNHS in Gambia Department of Water Resources.</p> <p>Data and information on the vulnerability of the Gambian Economy has been included in the briefing of 13 Policy Makers, and the training of 40 Media Agents, 56 Private and Business Sector Entities and 39 sectoral personal on Integration of Climate Change.</p> <p>Policymakers were briefed on climate change and on the process to integrate climate change into development frameworks.</p> <p>The government website is being regularly updated as per project progress and outputs and all project reports are uploaded. Additionally 45 Media Agents participated in a Training Session reporting climate change issues in the media.</p>

Objective/Component	Expected Results	TE Results
		The project engaged the Private Sector through collaboration with the Gambia Chamber of Commerce and Industry, and through sensitization and training of about 65 private and business sector entities organized at the premises of the GCCI. This project also supported the institutionalization of the Private Sector Forum as a conduit to access funds from the Private Sector Facility of the GCF.

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

The TE gives this project an efficiency rating of **Highly Satisfactory**, and this TE review gives the project an efficiency rating of **Satisfactory**. The evaluation concludes that on the whole the project was cost effective. A number of measures to promote cost-efficiency were identified in the project document and adopted during implementation. These include using the comparative advantage of partners, strategic site selection where partners and government were already conducting relevant projects and programs, engaging local communities and building on past and ongoing programs of partners and utilization of existing information equipment and data sets. The project was completed within budget and largely on time, as the final PIR indicates that the main project activities were completed by July 31, 2014. A few activities remained to be completed.

However, a separate rating is also given in the TE for financial planning and management, and this is rated **moderately unsatisfactory**, as there was no finance officer within the Project Management Unit, and the project relied instead on the Finance systems and accounts officers at the Department of Water Resources, who was thus overwhelmed with both government and project work. This led to some delays in payments. There were additional delays caused when the accounting software at the Treasury Department under the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs was migrated to a new system. Additionally, procurement of equipment and consultancies was managed by the contracts committee of the Ministry of Fisheries and Water Resources, and the TE reports that government bureaucracy did delay procurement of essential hydro-meteorological equipment, though not enough to significantly affect achievement of project outputs and outcomes.



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

The TE rates sustainability as **moderately likely**, and this TE review concurs.

#### Financial Resources

This TER finds sustainability of financial resources to be **likely** and this TE review concurs. There are ongoing and planned initiatives in climate change adaptation supported by the Gambian Government and bilateral donors, which provide the opportunity to sustain project outcomes through uptake. Additionally there is the possibility of self-financing through the sale of climate information by the proposed Meteorological Authority. Finally phase two of the project began in April 2015, ensuring availability of financial resources for similar activities beyond the project's pilot sites. Additionally, the TE notes that radio broadcasts with community radios stopped at project end due to lack of support for relay of climate information to communities, but there are indications that the activity will be covered by future government budgets. (TE p. 49, 59)

#### Sociopolitical

The TE rates socio-political sustainability as **likely** and this TE review concurs. The TE states that the socio-political situation and institutional frameworks are currently very conducive to sustaining project outcomes, as the project succeeded in generating political support and buy-in from the national and provincial governments. Representatives of the Personnel Management Office under the Office of the President and the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs led recruitment and training of personnel supported by the project, and these two offices created new positions and allocated funds for them to the Gambia Department of Water Resources.

The project adopted a participatory approach to engaging stakeholders such as community members through radio listening groups, and private sector entities through training. One risk to sustainability is that although climate change was integrated into government policies such as Gambia's Program for Accelerated Growth and Employment, the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy, Forest Policy and the Fisheries Strategic Action plan, no further development of adaptation programs has taken place yet. (TE p.48-49)

#### Institutional framework and governance

The TE rates sustainability of outcomes in institutional framework and governance as **moderately likely** and this TE review concurs. This project strengthened hydro-meteorological services by enhancing security of field equipment and instruments, ensuring that climate information and early warning messages were strengthened during the project. Continuation of project outcomes is dependent on Gambia Department of Water Resources' continued coordination and management in administering, overseeing and implementing project activities, and it is likely that this role will continue as most project activities support the mandate of the National Meteorology and Hydrological Services in the Department of Water Resources.

There are also plans to create two autonomous institutions which would further increase the effectiveness and efficiency of hydro-meteorological services in sustaining an effective EWS. Finally, the EWS and environmental committees put in place at regional and community levels can catalyze policy response at the local level, which can be replicated in other parts of the country. (TE p.49)

### **Environmental Sustainability**

The TE rates environmental sustainability as **likely** and this TE review concurs. As a result of the project early warning systems and environmental committees have been established at regional level and communities, enhancing sustainability and scale up potential of Early Warning Systems beyond the end of the project. (TE p.50)

## **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?

Original expected co-financing was USD \$1,555,000, however by project end only about 60% of that was realized, with final co-financing level at USD \$969,175. Co-financing was provided by the National Water Sector Reform project and the African Climate Policy Centre projects.

Co-financing has been essential to achieving the objectives around capacity development. Co-financing provided by the African Climate Policy Centre (ACPC) allowed for the training of the seven meteorological technicians and six Computer and Data Analysis Technicians by IRI on Enhancing National Climate Services ENACTs, as well as two Meteorological and Hydrological Instruments Technicians were trained in India on the installation, operation and maintenance of AWS. Co-financing also contributed to the training of one hydrologist, seven water resources technicians at the Nigerian Meteorological Agency's Training Institute, and 10 hydrological technicians.

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

There is some inconsistency in the TE in terms of the project end date. In some instances it says a 6 month no-cost extension was granted from 1 July to 31 December 2014, (p. viii) and in others it says the six month extension ran to June 30<sup>th</sup>, 2015 p.23. It seems the project end date is June 30<sup>th</sup> 2015, and that the extension was due to delays in acquiring and clearing land to relocate an Airport Instrument Enclosure containing meteorological instruments to land close to the runway. (p.34)

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

Country ownership in this project was strong throughout the project. The Executing Agency was the country's Department of Water Resources, and the project's focus was consistent with national development priorities, and specifically addressed the one of the priority adaptation programs identified in the Gambia's National Adaptation Program of Action. Additionally the project's co-financing was national.

Aside from one technical expert, an Agro-meteorological Consultant from Mali, all project institutions and technical experts were nationals. A needs assessment was conducted at the beginning of the project and capacity building was based on the needs of stakeholders identified during the assessment, further generating ownership of the project. The evaluation found that the government was fully supportive of the project and was committed to incorporating results into national programs, and all national level stakeholders expressed interest in a second phase. (TE p.58-59)

## 6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>
<p>The TE rates M&amp;E Design as <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>, and this review rates it as <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b>. The ProDoc includes an appendix with project outcome level indicators targets and baseline levels. (ProDoc Appendix 15 p.133) Additionally a baseline study was conducted at the beginning of the project, with a revised log frame and SMART indicators. Examples include: "Number/types of communication products developed and used to deliver messages to end users", and "proportion (%) of targeted population (men and women) receiving weather and climate messages in their preferred mode of communication." (ProDoc p.135) The ProDoc includes an M&amp;E plan which is consistent with both GEF and UNEP M&amp;E Evaluation Policies, and also includes provisions for an independent mid-term evaluation and independent terminal evaluation.</p> <p>However the TE found that that program budget included in the ProDoc for M&amp;E \$62,000 USD, was inadequate to carry out this M&amp;E plan.</p>	

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

The TE rates M&E plan implementation as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**, and this TE review concurs. Though the M&E system was found to be operational, there were serious limitations encountered in ensuring regular monitoring of progress against indicators and reporting. This is because there were no staff dedicated to M&E, and monitoring and reporting were left to the Project Coordinator and the Chief Technical Advisor, who visited project sites to monitor progress. As reported in the June 2013-June 2014 PIR “tracking of indicators was not followed regularly however progress was tracked qualitatively through the PIR process.” (From PIR June 2013-June 2014) Another limitation in M&E implementation was that the mid-term evaluation budgeted for was not conducted, as it was not required by UNEP for a mid-sized project with only three years of duration.

However, despite these limitations a baseline study, a needs assessment study and a climate change awareness study were conducted to provide baseline information which supported monitoring and reporting of progress of implementation of project activities. Additionally the Project Coordinator and the Chief Technical Advisor did collect information to support the M&E system through meeting audits, and visits to project sites, and two peer reviewed consultancy reports were also produced.

## 7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

<b>7.1 Quality of Project Implementation</b>	Rating: <b>Satisfactory</b>
--	-----------------------------

The TE rates UNEP supervision and backstopping as **Satisfactory**, and this TE review concurs with that rating.

A project task manager was designated from UNEP to provide oversight and accountability during the life of the project. The TE reports that the project management team appreciated the support received from UNEP.

As part of its role UNEP monitored project progress and communicated with the executing agency to provide guidance, and also ensured that any challenges were addressed. There was no supervision mission to the project site as the project was performing well. No issues in project implementation were reported in the TE. The project steering committee and Project Management Unit were reported in the TE to have developed a good rapport and mutual trust.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: <b>Highly Satisfactory</b>
----------------------------------	------------------------------------

The TE rates project execution as **highly satisfactory**. This TE agrees that project execution was indeed **Highly Satisfactory**. The TE found that the project management structure was clear and stable, with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood. The role of the project management unit was praised by PSC members during interviews. Additionally the project steering committee performed very well in steering the project towards success in achievement of outputs and outcomes.

## 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.

This project is focused on adaptation rather than environmental change. The terminal evaluation does not report any direct environmental changes, aside from the possibility that a robust early warning system will contribute significantly towards managing potential negative impacts of climate change on ecosystems of global significance along the Gambian Coastline. (TE p.32)

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

The project reports the following changes in human well-being:

95% of survey responses in project pilot sites at the end of projects found early warning messages and climate information useful. (p.45) There is also increased access and use of early warning messages and climate information by farming and fishing communities in their daily activities. (p.47)

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 TE reports the following changes in capacities:

There is upgraded hydro-meteorology networks. All 10 Meteorological stations in Gambia are rehabilitated and fully equipped. Seven weather stations were rehabilitated. There is also the human capacity in place to use these rehabilitated networks, as four meteorologists, 14 meteorological technicians, six computer and data analysis technicians were trained, seven water resources technicians, and 10 hydrological technicians were trained as a result of the project. (TE p.117) Additionally, 300 members of the general public were sensitized and trained, while 45 Media Agents were trained on climate and climate science, risks, impacts and responses. (TE p.119) Local communities were trained on rainfall measurement and phonological observations, and 120 member of Radio Listening Groups were trained on the operations of Recorders and transcriptions of recorded broadcasts of weather forecasts from community radios. (TE p.118)

b) Governance- The TE reports the following changes in Governance:

Policy revisions: The Agricultural and Natural Resources (ANR) Policy, Forest Policy, and the Fisheries Strategic Action Plan were identified in the project document (??) for integration of climate change. Due to efforts made as part of the project (??) climate change has been integrated into these policies. (TE p.119) An inter-ministerial data coordination mechanism and Metadata System is at an advanced stage, and the establishment of a public-private platform for risk management to engage private sector in climate proofing has been initiated. (TE p.119)

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

The Terminal evaluation finds that there were no unforeseeable negative environmental impacts that occurred as a result of the project being scaled-up. (p.50)

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.

Climate change has been integrated into sectoral policies and plans through the Agricultural and Natural Resources (ANR) Policy, Forest Policy, and the Fisheries Strategic Action Plan were identified for integration of climate change. Additionally staff trained by the project are in place. Additionally, during the second phase of the project, up-scaling and replicating the Early Warning System countrywide will take place as part of a partnership between UNEP, UNDP, and the Gambian Government. (TE p.54) Finally, a proposed GOTG/GCF Project to enhance the readiness of the Ministry of Finance and Economic Affairs and the GCCI to serve as National Designated Authority of the GCF in the Gambia will build on the set up of the consultative public-private platform for risk management set up by the project. (TE p.40)

## **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.

As stated in the TE- (TE p.68)

Lesson 1: The TOC approach is a useful tool for articulating drivers and assumptions and explaining the causal relationship between intended actions, outputs, outcomes, intermediate states and impact of projects. In order to depict the causal pathways from outputs to outcomes over intermediate states towards impact, it is ideal that the TOC be envisaged at the project design stage.

Lesson 2: The design of projects in climate change adaptation needs to be realistic in terms of targets, time and resources, mindful of the sequential arrangement where some outputs are dependent on the results of preceding activities and outputs. In addition, a number of factors and uncertainties come into play in project implementation and hence flexibility and adaptability in project design can save it from such risks and uncertainties.

Lesson 3: Alignment of projects with national and local needs and priorities enhances ownership and strong coordination, and should therefore be promoted in design and implementation of projects. Strong coordination at country level enhances ownership and opens channels for future collaboration and knowledge sharing.

Lesson 4: Engagement of a cross-section of stakeholders, including local communities and beneficiaries, is important for the successful implementation of projects in which the long term impact is highly dependent on their actions.

Lesson 5: Learning-by-doing capacity building results in ownership of project results and impact.

Lesson 6: Involvement of key beneficiaries (local communities) at an early stage of project design, selection of pilots and implementation promotes acceptance of project results which increases the likelihood that project outcomes will be sustained.

Lesson 7: Since the impact (increased climate resilience) cannot be attributed to a single intervention (the project), outcome mapping, from project design to implementation and M&E, should not only focus on measuring behavioural changes exhibited by primary and secondary beneficiaries, but also on attribution and contribution of other actors and programmes on behavioural change exhibited by the beneficiaries.

Lesson 8: Projects should take M&E seriously at both project design and implementation. Provision for a full time M&E staff should be made in the project design. In addition Project Management should keep track of targets that are likely to be missed and then appropriately adjust to achievable targets by the end of the project.

Lesson 9: Effective project management that promotes clear and transparent communication are key to creating strong working relationships and avoiding raised expectations resulting in disappointment, loss of hope and mistrust.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

As stated in the TE the recommendations given are as follows: (TE p.69-70)

Recommendation 1: The planned phase two of the project, and other similar interventions in the country, should implement follow-on activities for replicating and up-scaling the project results, and for integration of climate change adaptation into policy, plans, budgets and institutional frameworks.

Recommendation 2: In designing projects of a similar nature as this one, UNEP should ensure that a needs assessment is conducted and that the log-frame is robust and includes 'SMART' indicators, baselines and time-bound targets.

Recommendation 3: The design and implementation of EWS projects should be built in the overall context of adaptation planning and actions at the national, local and community levels. This is because building resilience will more likely accrue if EWS forms not only wider response to climate risks, but incorporates community based adaptation interventions. The government should integrate climate change adaptation into broader development programmes in which the needs of the most vulnerable communities are addressed.

Recommendation 4: There is need to document lessons learned from project implementation, not only to better inform policy processes and planning at national and local level, but also to inform replication and up-scaling processes. UNEP and the Government of Gambia could channel some funds (may be from phase two) to conduct a study on lessons learned in the EWS to inform policy and planning on adaptation.

Recommendation 5: By linking climate information and risks with adaptation options, learning processes could produce useful capacity building outcomes for future adaptation interventions.



Recommendation 6: Implementation of the project's second phase should build on the achievements and partnerships built in the phase one. In particular, climate modelling and prediction (down scaling) should be taken into account. Building the capacity of meteorological services to generate income, as planned in phase two is a sure way ensuring financial sustainability of EWS.

Recommendation 7: In the second phase of the project a Project Finance Officer should be hired and a separate project account opened to enhance efficiency in project implementation.

Recommendation 8: Strengthen M&E at project design and implementation. The M&E position should always be catered for in project design. PMU should ensure that monitoring and reporting activities are adequately facilitated and followed up. Appropriate mechanisms should be put in place to document and share lessons learned.

## 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 reports on all project outcomes, outputs and related indicators for which there is evidence. In the cases where indicator data were not collected the TE provides alternate evidence.	<b>S</b>
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	In general, the report is internally consistent and the ratings are well substantiated. There is a minor discrepancy throughout the report on the project end date, in some cases listed as December 2014 and in others as June 2015.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report presents a detailed assessment of project sustainability, and notes that the pro-doc itself does not include an exit strategy.	<b>S</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons are supported by the evidence.	<b>S</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual project costs, both total and per activity, as well as total co-financing used.	<b>S</b>
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:		<b>S</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>S</b>

**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 the terminal evaluation report.