

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2015

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		3838	
GEF Agency project ID		4109 (UNDP project number)	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP and UNEP	
Project name		Rwanda: Reducing Vulnerability to Climate Change by Establishing Early Warning and Disaster Preparedness Systems and Support for Integrated Watershed Management in Flood Prone Areas	
Country/Countries		Rwanda	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change Adaptation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		GEF-4 Focal Area Strategies: Climate Change/ Land Degradation	
Executing agencies involved		Rwanda Environmental Management Authority (REMA)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Beneficiaries (TE,p.38); through consultation	
Private sector involvement		Beneficiaries (TE, p.38)	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		03/23/2010	
Effectiveness date / project start		10/01/2010 (From TE p.9)	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2014 (From TE p.9)	
Actual date of project completion		06/30/2015 (From TE p.9)	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M) (based on GEF review sheet, 02/18/2010)	At Completion (US \$M) (as of December 31, 2014, TE, p.26)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.15	.15
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		3.48	3.5
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		
Total GEF funding		3.7	3.65
Total Co-financing		12.4	12.4
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		16.0	15.9
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		09/2015	
Author of TE		Revocatus Twinomuhangi and Gilbert Ongi'sa Ouma	
TER completion date		12/04/2015	
TER prepared by		Chenhao Liu	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Molly Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	HS (UNDP PIR 2014)	HS	N/A	S (5)
Sustainability of Outcomes	N/A	L	N/A	L
M&E Design	S (UNEP PIR 2014)	HS	N/A	S
M&E Implementation	S(UNEP PIR 2014)	HS	N/A	S
Quality of Implementation	HS (UNDP PIR 2014)	S	N/A	S
Quality of Execution	N/A	N/A	N/A	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report	-	-	-	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

“The overall Goal of the project is “to contribute to climate change risk and flood disaster preparedness in Rwanda”. The Project Objective is “to reduce the vulnerability of the Gishwati ecosystems and its associated Nile-Congo crest watersheds, and the people that derive their livelihoods from it, to increased floods and droughts due to climate change”.” (PD, p.25)

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project document lays out the development objectives of the project as follows:

“The proposed adaptation project promotes an alternative adaptation scenario which aims to strengthen national and district capacities to deliver a functional early warning and disaster preparedness system that would allow for early warning of vulnerable populations in the Gishwati ecosystem, particularly but not only in terms of flooding. Such a system will allow the development of agricultural planning at the household level (Outcome 1). The project further aims firstly to build capacities for risk responsive planning at district and local levels and secondly to support the implementation of such plans (Outcome 2). The project will promote and engage in ecosystem rehabilitation -designed in such a way to increase the resilience of ecosystems to intense flooding - as a critical part of the management of disaster risk. It will also develop risk maps, land-use plans and settlement plans that focus on increasing ecosystem resilience to climatic shocks (Outcome 3). Lastly, the project will strengthen the national information base on climate change and adaptation through dedicated communication, awareness and training activities and the documentation and sharing of lessons learned (Outcome 4). “(PD,p.2)

Specifically, the interventions in this project are divided into four components, as described in the following: (PD, p.25-32)

Component 1: Climate Risk Assessment And Forecasting

Outcome 1: Early Warning System for climate change risks in Gishwati Ecosystem developed.

Component 2: Climate Change Adaptation Planning And Response Strategies.

Outcome 2: Climate change risks incorporated into Nyabihu district development planning.

Component 3: The Adverse Effects Of Floods And Droughts Reduced In The Nile-Congo Crest Watersheds (Nyabarongo And Sebeya Rivers) And Gishwati Ecosystem.

Outcome 3: The adverse effects of floods and droughts reduced in the Nile-Congo crest watersheds (Nyabarongo and Sebeya rivers) and Gishwati ecosystem.

Component 4: Knowledge Of Good Practices To Reduce Vulnerability To Climate Change Based On The Gishwati Pilot Improved

Outcome 4: Knowledge of good practices to reduce vulnerability to climate change based on the Gishwati pilot improved.

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

There were no change in the project's Global Environment Objectives and Development Objectives. "The project started in October 2010 and had no major revision to the design. The project's log-frame was modified slightly in 2012 to cater for the recommendation of the Mid-Term Review (MTR). Three budget revision/modifications were conducted (for 3 times, TE, p.8), the last being in May 2014. At the time of evaluation, a final budget revision was underway to move funding into 2015, as the project was extended to 30 June 2015." (TE, p.26)

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 rated the project's strategic relevance as "Highly Satisfactory". In a binary scale (Satisfactory/Unsatisfactory), this TER will rate the project's outcome relevance as "Satisfactory". The project was consistent with strategic priorities for development at the national and international level.

According to the TE, "The Project's objectives and implementation were aligned to Rwanda's development and environmental strategies, programmes, needs and priorities documented in the Rwanda Vision 2020 and the Economic Development and Poverty Reduction Strategy (EDPRS). The project addressed the top adaptation priorities identified in the NAPA. The project was also relevant and aligned to the GEF policies and strategies on climate change (GEF-4 Focal Area Strategies: Climate Change/ Land Degradation), and was also aligned to Rwanda's UNDAF and the One UN agenda. For UNEP the project was aligned to the programmatic objectives and expected accomplishments on climate change adaptation in the UNEP Mid Term Strategy (MTS) 2010–2013, and the Bali Strategic Plan for Technology Support and Capacity-building. "(TE,p.10)

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

The TE rated two dimensions related to the project outcome effectiveness of this TER's concern: 1. Achievement of Outputs (Highly Satisfactory) 2. Effectiveness (attainment of project objectives and results) (rated by four project outcomes, all of which received "A"). Following the rating of the TE, this TER will rate the overall project's outcome effectiveness as "Satisfactory. " Based on evidence presented by the relevant project documents, the project's outcome achievements are commensurate with ex-ante expectations.

According to the project logic framework , "project sought to achieve four outcomes (11 outputs) under the principal objective: "to reduce the vulnerability of the Gishwati ecosystem and its associated Nile-Congo crest watersheds and the people that derive their livelihoods from it, to increased floods and droughts due to climate change". (TE, p.37) The following analysis will list in detail the achievement of each outcome/output.

Outcome component 1: Climate risk assessment and forecasting

Output 1.1 - Functional early warning system (EWS) that enhances climate change predictions. This output was fully achieved. (TE, p.37) An integrated EWS was established with the participation & cooperation of multilateral stakeholders, including modern automated weather stations established, developed capacity of relevant stakeholders to interpret, forecast, and communicate meteorological information. (TE, p.37-38)

Output 1.2 - A Gishwati integrated hydro-meteorological logical model system that integrates climate change risk assessment and socio-economic parameters. This output was fully achieved. (TE,p.38) "Seven automatic hydro-meteorological stations were installed and the development of a hydrological database has been initiated at the seven stations." (TE, p.38) "A Gishwati model, including forecast development, EWS information dissemination and outreach, was successfully accomplished."(TE, p.39)

Output 1.3 - A functional data coordination network for EWS developed through inter-agency coordination. This output was almost fully achieved. (TE, p.39) “an early warning communication and dissemination framework was developed that links the climate information producers (METEO-Rwanda) with users at the national level, districts and the communities (TE, p.39), which is supported by relevant capacity-building workshops and procurement of new equipment. (TE, p.39)

Outcome Component 2: Climate Change adaptation planning and response strategy

Output 2.1 - Climate change sensitive disaster management plans in place for Nyabihu District in Gishwati ecosystem and capacity enhanced to implement them. This output was fully achieved (TE, p.38), by the successful development of climate change adaptation guidelines and need assessments for pilot regions, and inclusion of climate change adaptation has been integrated into DDPs in the four pilot districts. (TE, p.40)

Output 2.2 - A robust climate resilient Land-use Master Plan in place and implemented for Gishwati region. This output was fully achieved. (TE, p.41) “A climate change resilient land use master plan was developed through unplanned MINAGRI co-financing.”(TE,p.41)

Outcome Component 3: Reduction in the adverse effects of floods and droughts

Output 3.1- Climate resilient land-use management practices appropriate for Gishwati pilot areas. Achievement of this output is “very good”. (P.41) The land rehabilitation endeavor led to “approximately 1,373.21 hectares of degraded land were rehabilitated against the targeted 1,440 hectares” (TE, p.41), and it is also extended to riverbank protection of other regions. It has also supported the livelihood of vulnerable communities. (TE, p.41-42)

Output 3.2 - Sustainable land use options for Gishwati region (including resettlement) developed through systematic assessment of climate change impacts on land-use practices. To achieve this output, “a study was successfully completed that documents best practices, gender considerations but also to measure the climate change vulnerability index and biophysical indicators.” (TE, p.42)

Output 3.3 - An effective capacity development program for communities and practitioners in Gishwati. Under this output, “Training materials and manuals were developed and produced in Kinyarwanda and the summary in English.” And they were extensively distributed. (TE, p.42)

Outcome Component 4: Knowledge of good practices to reduce vulnerability to climate change based on the Gishwati pilot

Output 4.1 - Communication and Awareness strategy in place. “This output was almost fully achieved.” (TE, p.42) A Climate change website/portal was developed, District Environmental Facilitators (DEFs) were hired and trained, and an SMS platform for communication of forecasts and/or alerts three times was being set up. (TE, p.42)

Output 4.2 - A training plan in place and implemented to enhance uptake of lessons learned and engage stakeholders in the various project components. This output was fully achieved. (TE, p.42) training module was developed based on assessment of stakeholders’ needs, and a beekeeping training manual was developed to enhance the capacity of bee keeping communities.(TE, p.42)

Output 4.3 - Documentation and dissemination of lessons learned to policy makers and communities throughout the project. “This output was also fully achieved.” (TE, p.42) “A study to establish the climate change vulnerability index after project implementation was successfully completed. The project’s impact was assessed and 5000 copies policy briefing materials were distributed.” (TE. 42)

The above analysis clearly and specifically shows that the project's majority outcome achievements have met its preset targets with high satisfaction, but full achievement of output 3.2 and 3.3 is not confirmed. This TER's rating of "Satisfactory" on the project's outcome effectiveness is justified.

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

The TE rated the project's outcome efficiency as "Satisfactory", and this TER will adopt this rating. The project is cost-effective, but with some minor delays throughout the course in fully achieving the project's outcome.

The project has been implemented in a cost-effective manner. A number of cost efficient measures were adopted during implementation, in the process of partnership building, pilot site selection and engagement of local communities (TE, p.62). The cost efficiency resulted in achievement of project results within the planned budget and time frame. (TE, p.75) "The management costs, mainly composed of project staff, travel and administrative support, remained low as compared to the total project budget." (TE, p.63) "Therefore cost efficiency was good which resulted in small cost – big impact, supported by the high level of ownership. "(TE, p.63) At the same time, building on successful experience or lessons learnt from prior projects or representing a scale-up of earlier successful activities are important to the realization of the project's cost-effectiveness. (TE, p.63)

The timeliness of the project is satisfactory in general. The project experienced unnecessary delays in its initial stage (largely institutional and beyond the control of the project, such as setting up the SPIU (Special Program Implementation Unit)), but remedial measures were put in place after the MTR that fast tracked the project implementation to high level success. (TE, p.75) By the expected end date of the project, "almost all the project activities were completed in time" (TE, 76), but the project was extended for 6 month at no cost to finalize a small number of remaining activities. The dual reporting line to each of the two implementing agencies (UNDP and UNEP) during the project's implementation is creating complications and challenges in decision-making. But fortunately, "this complicated reporting structure did not significantly affect the implementation of project activities and achievement of results". (TE, p.66)

Overall, the rating of "Satisfactory" for the project's outcome efficiency is justified.

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

The TE rated the project's overall "Sustainability and Replication" as "Likely". Furthermore, four sub-categories of the project's sustainability were assessed by the TE. Specifically, the TE rated "Socio-political sustainability" as "Highly Likely", "Financial Resource-Sustainability" as "Moderately Likely", "Institutional Framework-Sustainability" as "Likely", and "Environmental Sustainability" as "Highly Likely".

This TER will rate overall the project's overall sustainability as "Likely", based upon the individual assessment of four sub-categories of the project's sustainability: i. Financial Sustainability "Moderate

Likely” ii. Socio-political Sustainability “Highly Likely” iii. Environmental Sustainability “Likely” iv. Institutional Sustainability “Likely”. Detailed analysis is as follows:

Financial Sustainability “Moderate Likely”

This TER will adopt the same rating of “Moderate Likely” as the TE in rating the project’s financial sustainability. The project “succeeded in leveraging additional financial support (co-financing) from REMA, MINAGRI, UNDP TRACK etc) to sustain some its activities” (TE,p.56), and the TE has identified a few prospective financial sources for the project’s further scale-up: Such as climate financing mechanism – FONERWA (Environment and Climate Change Fund, already in place), sales of climate information, government budget, piloted adaptation interventions of (land rehabilitation and livelihood improvement projects, will generate more income for local residents), the SPIU arrangement (a cooperation mechanism enabling the project impact to be sustained by other REMA projects). (TE, p.56-57). Currently, these new financial sources have not been put into place, and their non-existence is by far the most significant risk to the project’s sustainability . Thus, it will be reasonable to conclude that the project’s financial sustainability is moderate likely.

Socio-political Sustainability “Likely”

The TER will rate the project’s socio-political sustainability as “Likely”, while the TE, which uses a different scale, rated Socio-political Sustainability as “Highly Likely”. The project’s success has helped the project harvest substantial support from the country’s political and social front, which has mitigated any relevant risks to the greatest extent. “The project succeeded in generating political support and buy-in of the national and district governments. Consequently, there is a high commitment to up-scale the project achievements in the long-term national and district government actions and budgets.” (TE, p.55) The project was designed, deployed, and implemented in a participatory approach, through which the support of multilateral stakeholders was mobilized (TE, p.55-56). Also, the project’s sustainability is well supported by the country’s enabling policy framework/environment which highlights green growth and climate change adaptation. (TE, p.55-56) Thus, it is clear with the current evidence that the project’s socio-political sustainability is highly likely.

Environmental Sustainability “Likely”

The TE rated the environmental sustainability as “Highly Likely”, but this TER will downgrade to “Likely”. It is reasonable for the TE to give high rating in this regard due to the project’s documented success in both improving the local ecosystem and people’s awareness on climate change adaptation, but it is not advisable to give a perfect rating as “Highly Likely” thereby ignoring a risk clearly pointed out by the TE itself: “threats of increased population growth could create increased pressures on natural resources and ecosystems that could potentially undermine ecological sustainability”. (TE, p.58) Unless there is a well-rounded discussion of the future population growth and the project impact’s resilience to it, a perfect rating of “Highly Likely” in this dimension cannot be justified.

Institutional Sustainability “Likely”

The TE rated the institutional sustainability of the project as “Likely”, and this TER will adopt the same rating. The project’s institutional sustainability is likely due to the foreseen sustainability of the institutional frameworks established through the implementation of the project. “The project was designed with a strong capacity building focus as well as broad stakeholder participation and consultation

so that project activities can be continued beyond the period of LDCF support.” (TE, p.57) In particular, this is achieved through the existence of a long-term partnership and cooperation framework/mechanism across executing/implementing/other government agencies which are given birth through the project.”(TE, p.57-58) And, the TE didn’t identify any significant institutional risks to the project’s sustainability. Thus, a rating of “Likely” is justified.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project’s co-financing was provided by UNDP Track funding, UNDP AAP, REMA, MINIRENA and MINAGRI. (TE, p.60) The TE further specified the level of co-financing and rate of materialization (74% of budgeted co-financing, as of December 31st 2014) (TE, p.69), and concluded “the project succeeded in leveraging additional financial support (co-financing) to sustain some its activities.”(TE, p.75) The lower-than-expected level of co-financing didn’t affect the project to attain a satisfactory outcome achievement.

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 originally intended end date is 12/31/2014, and it was extended to 06/30/2015 to finalize a few activities that are still in progress. By 12/31/2014, 95% of project activities were completed. (TE,p.63)

“The project experienced delays in implementation caused by factors external to the project. Some of the delays were caused by institutional changes in Rwanda (such as setting-up of REMA (Rwanda National Environment Management Authority) ’s SPIU (Single Project Implementation Unit) and recruitment of the team, changes in partnering institutions like Rwanda Agricultural Board) and important delays in setting-up functioning partnerships (with RAB and the NMS) for project execution. Initial delays were also experienced with implementation of component 3 specifically resulting from delays in (i) identifying the project sites, (ii) selecting partner cooperatives according to an agreed criteria, (iii) identifying possible land plots for tree nurseries, and (iv) providing a sufficient quantity of quality checked seeds for agro-forestry and forest trees” (TE, p.64)“The MTR (Mid-Term Review) identified these institutional challenges and the project implemented the MTR recommendations which fast tracked project activities from July 2012. Therefore, the project managed to overcome early delays in the launch of implementation” due to the REMA’s effective and efficient management. (TE, p.64) the MTR’s timely adjustment efforts have “fast tracked the project implementation to high level success. (TE, p.76) And, relevant project document did not identify any linkages between project delays and project outcomes.

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

The TE rated the Country ownership and driven-ness as “Highly Satisfactory”. (TE, p.68) The TE’s evaluation mission and documentation review confirm that the ownership was high because the project is highly relevant to Rwanda’s development priorities and plans. (TE, p.68)” The involvement of national and local stakeholders in the implementation of the project, and building capacity based on the capacity needs of stakeholders, generated ownership of the project by the main stakeholders. Implementation of the project activities was country driven and the identification of pilot sites and beneficiaries was participatory.”(TE, p.68). The high-level country ownership/ driven-ness is highly contributive to the project’s sustainability, as “In fact, all national level stakeholders interviewed (as a part of the TE) expressed interest in a follow up phase/phase.” (TE, p.68)

6. Assessment of project’s Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rated the M&E design at entry as “Highly Satisfactory”, and this TER will rate it as “Satisfactory”. The M&E system is fully commensurate with the UNEP M&E standards, but it could be more complete if it could specify the timeframe of M&E activities. The TE has specified the rationales as follows:

“The Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) is designed according to UNEP’s standard monitoring and evaluation procedure. The project log frame (results framework) included SMART indicators for each expected outcome as well as mid-term and end-of-project targets. These indicators of achievements also had means of verification for the project objective, outcomes and outputs. The indicators were measurable and relevant to the objective, and were achievable within the projects budget and time frame. A work plan is provided in the ProDoc (Project Document) that indicates outputs activities and timelines. The time frame to achieve the ultimate objective would depend very much on the impact drivers and assumptions (such as availability of financial resources for up-scaling/replicating) to move from project outcomes towards project impacts. “(TE, p.70). Besides, the Project document specified in detail the baseline value of each outcome for the convenience of program monitoring (PD, p.25-28)

The Project Document includes an M&E plan and budget (72,000 USD) consistent with GEF, UNEP and UNDP M&E Evaluation Policies. The Project Document also makes provision for independent mid-term evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation (specifically July 2012). A provision was included in

the Project Document for an independent terminal evaluation to be conducted towards the end of the project. Periodic monitoring of progress was conducted through periodic monitoring through site visits and annual progress review reports. The project design had a dedicated M&E staff provided by the SPIU (Single Project Implementation Unit).” (TE, p.70-71)

However, it would be better if the M&E design could include a timeframe for M&E activities, which is lacked based on current evidence presented by relevant project documents.

Overall, a rating of “Satisfactory” for the project’s M&E design is justified.

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

The TE rated the M&E Implementation as “Highly Satisfactory”. This TER will rate the project’s M&E implementation as “Satisfactory”. The M&E implementation was in line with the M&E design at entry and relevant reporting standards of implementing agencies. Also, the timely adjustment of project implementation based on the MTR (Mid-Term Review) so as to ensure the successful project outcome showcased a good example of adaptive management. The rationale for the rating is summarized as follows:

“The M&E system put in place was operational and facilitated timely tracking of results and progress towards project objectives throughout the project implementation period. The SPIU (especially the PM, M&E officer and the CTA) ensured the operationalization of the M&E system. M&E was conducted through PSC meetings, contracts committee meeting, audits, and visits to project sites by project team and inspectors from Meteo Rwanda (Rwanda Meteorology Agency).

A baseline study was undertaken in January 2012. The baseline study provided an assessment of the project results framework and indicators, targets and baselines for each of them. In particular, the baseline study report recommended: (i) adjusted indicators that are “SMART-er” than those originally approved to monitor project progress; (ii) baseline values and data for all indicators; (iii) a detailed methodology for data collection for follow up measurement of individual indicators as well as outlining clear directions for implementing the M&E plan. On the basis of recommendations from the baseline study, the indicators were modified in the adjusted results framework and these remained very relevant and useful and measurable.

A MTR was conducted and successfully completed in September 2012, and it made several recommendations for improvement of project implementation. This evaluation confirms that the MTR recommendations were fully implemented and this put the project back on track to realize high achievement of project outputs and outcomes. The availability of a dedicated M&E staff ensured regular monitoring of progress against indicators and reporting.

Following the end of the project a final project report was prepared and was made available to the evaluators. In some instances the final report does not provide updated information and a few activities are reported as still ongoing. “(TE, p.71)

PIRs were issued under the UNDP/UNEP standard format. Project progress made toward achievement of targeted outcomes in each reporting period was reported in detail and compared with baseline, target, as well as value of last reporting period. Ratings were provided for project outcome, implementation process, and project risks. Highlighted facts/experiences during project implementation, good practices and lessons learned were summarized.

Overall, it was clear the M&E implementation was in general successful and a rating of “Satisfactory” is justified.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory
--	-----------------------------

The TE didn’t distinguish between project implementation (the role and achievement of project implementing agencies) and project execution (the role and achievement of project executing agencies), but it rated the project implementation and management as “Satisfactory”. In addition, relevant to the concept of “project implementation” of this TER, the TE gave a “Highly Satisfactory” rating for the implementing agencies’ (UNDP and UNEP) “supervision, guidance and technical backstopping”. This TER will rate the quality of project implementation as “Satisfactory”. The implementing agencies have fulfilled its duties in line with ex-ante expectations to ensure a successful outcome achievement and project implementation. Challenges in this area still exist, but they didn’t affect the project outcome.

A number of measures have been adopted from the implementing agencies’ side to ensure the effectiveness and efficiency of project implementation. “Under an agreement between REMA and UNDP/UNEP, measures were put in place to ensure effective management of the project including: (i) expenditure tracking, activity based costing, and quarterly progress reporting/planning (ii) weekly meetings between UNDP CO and REMA; (iii) hands on UNDP/UNEP support for development of reports, (iv) assignment of three additional REMA officers to project team; and (v) implementation of GIS based monitoring system. Apart from quarterly progress reporting, these measures were missing in the project document and project preparation.” (TE, p.65) “Both UNEP and UNDP assigned Project Task Managers, who guided project implementation. The Task Managers understood the project well and worked excellently with the REMA/SPIU (Single Project Implementation Unit, an institutional arrangement).

Annual work plans were reviewed and adjusted as needed in consultation with partners to ensure that all activities were completed and outputs achieved. Generally, activities were well-managed, with responsibility and transparency at all levels.” (TE, p.65) There also have been challenges, such as the limited coordination between the UNDP and UNEP with regard to joint decision-making on resource allocation, due to their difference in reporting decision-making mechanisms. And the dual reporting line to each of the two implementing agencies during the project’s implementation is creating complications and challenges. But fortunately, “this complicated reporting structure did not significantly affect the implementation of project activities and achievement of results”. (TE, p.66) Overall, for the project’s implementation, success is more significant than challenges, and the rating “Satisfactory” is well justified.

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

The TE didn’t distinguish between project implementation (the role and achievement of project implementing agencies) and project execution (the role and achievement of project executing agencies), but it rated the project implementation and management as “Satisfactory”. This TER will rate the quality of project execution as “Satisfactory”, based on relevant evidence from the TE.

The project’s chief executing agency is the REMA (Rwanda Environment Management Authority). Under the REMA, “a full time Project Manager (PM) was put in place to manage the project and he reported to the DG (Direct General) REMA and the PSC (Project Steering Committee) on a regular basis. The project management structure was very clear, and management was stable with roles and responsibilities clearly defined and understood. A CTA (Chief Technical Advisor) was hired on a part-time basis.” (TE, p.65). The project was also operated under a Single Project Implementation Unit (SPIU) arrangement within the REMA, which enabled the project to have leverage from other projects and programs in REMA in terms of project staff, Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) and co-financing. (TE, p.12) The Procurement/Contracts Committee of REMA managed procurement in terms of equipment and consultancies, guided by the procurement laws of the GOR. (TE, p.66) A Finance Officer was designated who was dedicated to the project as part of the SPIU arrangement and this greatly assisted financial management. (TE, p.68) “Regular and clear communications between the project team (at the SPIU), IAs (Implementing Agencies), project partners, and beneficiaries ensured that progress was on track.”(TE, p.68) Overall, despite initial delays and management challenges, the evaluation team concludes that “project management was effective and efficient, with no major problems reported by executing partners. Where management challenges were encountered adaptive management and flexibility were applied to bring back the project implementation to course.”(TE, p.66)

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.

As a result of the implementation of climate resilient land use practices in Gishwati region, “a total of 1,373 hectares of degraded land was rehabilitated through tree planting, agro-forestry and establishment of graded and radical terraces. Land rehabilitation was also extended to river banks protection (Nyamukongoro and Sebeya rivers) and watershed upstream of Karago Lake.” (TE, p.10)

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 of “climate resilient land use practices” put in place and demonstrated alternative livelihood projects, including, mushroom production, bee keeping, poultry and piggery implemented through community cooperatives. (TE, p.10) These alternative projects have not only enhanced the climate resilience of local community, but also “generated tangible poverty reduction benefits by addressing food security and livelihood related issues” (TE, p.21) For example, “187 household members are implementing the beekeeping pilot and the first harvest is expected in July-August 2015.” (TE,p.45)

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

“A modern and fully functional early warning system (EWS) was put in place and is already delivering climate information and early warnings. In addition the human (training) and institutional (Meteo Rwanda) capacity was strengthened to effectively utilize the hydro-meteorological network and to conduct climate risk assessment and forecasting.” (TE, p.10) “Climate sensitive landuse plans were developed and District Development Plans (DDPs) of the four pilot districts (Nyabihu, Ngororero, Rubavu and Rustiro districts) were climate proofed. All the 30 districts in Rwanda had climate change adaptation activities integrated in their DDPs. The developed landuse plan was partly implemented through land

rehabilitation under component 3 (outcome component 3). Climate change mainstreaming guidelines were produced for four sectors - agriculture, energy and infrastructure, environment and natural resources, and health sectors.” (TE, p.10)

“Under component 4 (outcome component 4), village leaders, disaster management committees, communities and farmers were trained in climate resilient practices. Training materials and manuals on climate resilient adaptation were developed and produced in Kinyarwanda and the summary produced in English. 5000 copies of the materials were printed and distributed. A climate change website/portal was developed and is live and regularly updated. The portal contains a package of climate change information and serves as platform for sharing information on ongoing climate change activities and lessons learned. A study to establish the climate change vulnerability index after project implementation was successfully completed. The methodology deployed in the study has inspired Rwanda Environment Management Authority (REMA) to develop a study on the national baseline of Climate Change Vulnerability assessment. The project was successful in developing documentary film that documents project achievements for up-scaling and replication.” (TE, p.10)

b) Governance

The multi-stakeholder partnerships built up through the project, among government agencies at various levels (Ministries such as MINIRENA, MIDIMAR, MINAGRI, and local government of pilot areas) and implementing agencies (UNDP and UNEP), as well as the broad stakeholder participation and consultation mechanism established for this project’s implementation, will have a long-term impact on the project’s sustainability. (TE, p.57)

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

The TE didn’t mention any information in this regard.

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.

There isn’t any immediate replication or scale-up activities, despite that the TE has discussed a few potential possibilities in rating the project’s sustainability, such as extending the project to other districts of Rwanda with similar vulnerability, and establishing early EWS at all levels (TE, p.60)

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 gave a list of lessons learned from this project: (TE, p.14-15)”

- **Lesson 1**

The TOC approach is a useful tool for articulating the key 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**

Since the desired impact of increased climate resilience cannot be attributed to one intervention (a single 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 3**

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 4**

‘Learning-by-doing’ capacity building approaches result in greater ownership of project results and impact.

- **Lesson 5**

Implementation of projects with more than one Implementing Agencies, though beneficial, requires harmonization of reporting and financing systems, so that the Executing Agency has a single reporting mechanism to the various Implementing Agencies to ease project management.

- **Lesson 6**

Documentaries (films) with innovative and concrete activities are an effective mechanism for demonstration and transmission of knowledge and good practice to stakeholders of all categories. However they need to be disseminated widely to the public.

- **Lesson 7**

During project implementation, only those planned activities/studies or those that have a direct link to project outcomes and impact should be implemented in an effort towards maximising the efficient use of available resources.”

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE gave a number of recommendations for future improvement based on the lessons learned from running this project: (TE, p.13)”

- Recommendation 1:

There is need for follow up activities to replicate and upscale the project results to the whole country, but this requires a follow-up phase or project. Strengthening the capacity of Meteo Rwanda (meteorological services) to generate income through sale of climate information is one of the avenues of ensuring financial sustainability of Rwanda's EWS.

- Recommendation 2:

The government should integrate community based adaptation into broader development programmes in which the needs of the most vulnerable communities are addressed. Community adaptation projects could be developed by districts, communities and cooperatives, and funding could be got through the FONERWA funding window, the Adaptation Fund and the GCF, since Rwanda is already accredited by the GCF). The private sector could also be encouraged and supported to engage actively in the design and implementation of community based adaptation projects.

- Recommendation 3:

Implementation of follow up projects is very necessary to build on the achievements and partnerships built by the project. Strengthening FONERWA through resource mobilisation and increased financing (from the GCF, AF and other bilateral partners) is one in which Rwanda could finance adaptation projects that increase climate resilience. In addition, mainstreaming EWS and climate change adaptation in sectoral plans, local development plans and budgets could provide national funding to scale up the project results and other adaptation interventions. “

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 listed in detail the targeted outcomes/outputs and compared them with the achieved outcomes/outputs, but it didn't single out a paragraph discussing project impacts	Moderately Satisfactory
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, but certain ratings are not substantiated sufficient evidence, such as the possibly overrated "Highly Satisfactory" rating for the project's outcome effectiveness.	Satisfactory
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE addressed the project sustainability with sufficient information as support; it pointed out the absence of the project's exit strategy and treated it as a shortcoming	Highly Satisfactory
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are sufficiently discussed and supported by ample evidence	Highly Satisfactory
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE specified in detail the estimated/actual project costs(total and per activity) and actual co-financing materialized, but it didn't specify the level of actual co-financing used	Moderately Satisfactory
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE described with sufficient information the key elements, features, and implementation of the project's M&E system, and rated it with substantial evidence	Highly Satisfactory
Overall TE Rating: $0.3 \times (a + b) + 0.1 \times (c + d + e + f) = 0.3 \times (4 + 5) + 0.1 \times (6 + 6 + 4 + 6) = 2.7 + 2.2 = 4.9$		Satisfactory

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

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