

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2018

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4234	
GEF Agency project ID			
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Climate Change adaptation project in the areas of watershed management and water retention (PAFA)	
Country/Countries		Senegal	
Region		Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Climate Change Adaptation (CCA)	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Hydraulics & National Water System, and Ministry of the Environment, Nature Protection, Water Retention and Artificial Lakes	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		None	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		1/26/2012	
Effectiveness date / project start		12/3/2012	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		09/30/2016	
Actual date of project completion		3/31/2016	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.12	0.12
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		5.0	2.37
Co-financing	IA own	8.83	UA
	Government	0.85	0.38
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CSOs	0.5	UA
Total GEF funding		5.12	2.49
Total Co-financing		10.18	0.38
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		15.3	2.875
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		2016	
Author of TE		Not identified	
TER completion date		December 2018	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Spandana Battula	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.2 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Global Environmental Objective of the project was ‘to reduce climate-induced risks of losses on agricultural production to ensure that food security and livelihood diversification objectives are achieved even in a context of increased climatic stress’ (PD, Pg 28).

3.3 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Development Objective of the project is to ‘strengthen the resilience of agricultural production systems and value chains to the impacts of climate change on the water sector of the Peanut Basin Area, by ensuring the supply and availability of water for agricultural use in a scenario of increasing climate change-induced water scarcity’ (PD, Pg 8). The project interventions were designed to focus on water resources management through five components:

Component 1: Capacity building, awareness raising and knowledge management at the national level

Component 2: Water harvesting and watershed management

Component 3: Water conservation and efficient irrigation

Component 4: Monitoring and evaluation

Component 5: Project management.

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

No changes are reported.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE assessed relevance of the project as ‘moderately satisfactory’ taking into account the flaws in the design of the project. But this TER rated relevance of the project as ‘satisfactory’ using the information in the project document to assess how well the project objectives aligned with the national priorities and GEF objectives.

Senegal is signatory of some of the main international environmental conventions such as United Nations Framework Climate Change Convention (UNFCCC) and Kyoto Protocol. In its initial National Communication and the National Adaptation Program of Action submitted to UNFCCC, it recognized water sector as a key priority for adaptation to climate change in the country. It also recognized the adaptation priorities in the project proposal sent to UNFCCC Secretariat in 2009 that also served as basis to develop the current proposal. The Government of Senegal was implementing, with the support of IFAD, a Value Chain Support project that served as baseline and co-financing for the GEF intervention. The peanut basin, where the project was implemented, experienced diminishing crop yield derived from the climate hazards, that the current GEF intervention sought to address.

The Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF), designed to address the special needs of the Least Developed Countries (LDCs) and managed through GEF, supports the world’s most vulnerable countries in their efforts to adapt to the effects of climate change. So, the current project was designed to reduce climate-induced risks of losses on agricultural production and ensure that food security and livelihood diversification objectives were achieved even in a context of increased climatic stress. It aligned with the LDCF objective ‘to increase the resilience of agriculture production systems and associated value chains to climate impacts on the water sector’ (CEO Endorsement, Annex A).

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Unable to assess
--------------------------	---------------------------------

As per the TE, the effectiveness of the project was rated ‘satisfactory’. The project achieved significant results in terms of raising awareness on climate change amongst various stakeholders (national or local institutions, farmers' organizations and producers). The TE reports that some of stakeholders developed new approaches or reinforced existing methods in the field of rural development (design and management techniques, partnership arrangements with beneficiary populations). The project also facilitated implementation of mitigation measures through the dissemination of good practices. The project resulted in promoting agricultural techniques adapted to climate change that were also reported to have very high levels of replication and dissemination. On the other hand, the planned hydro-agricultural structures could only be partially realized (about 15%) and some activities had to be abandoned (aquaculture, beekeeping, etc.). The reason that these activities couldn’t be completed is not clear from the available document. There is not enough information in the summary of the TE and other documents, available for the

preparation of this TER, to assess the effectiveness of the project against all the outputs listed under 5 project components.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Unable to assess
----------------	---------------------------------

The TE noted that the disbursement rate was very low – 43% (47.4% of the GEF grant and 6.4% of the Government contribution) at completion. However, there is no explanation provided for the low disbursement rate, nor the impact it had on the achievement of different outcomes under the project. The TE assigned efficiency of the project as ‘moderately satisfactory’ but the information provided in the available documents is not adequate for this TER to assess this aspect of the project.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Unable to assess
--------------------	---------------------------------

The TE assessed sustainability of the project as ‘satisfactory’. According to the TE, ‘the GEF component introduced innovations (soil phosphating, wet sowing of cereals, integrated market gardening, resilient rice varieties and adapted cultivation techniques, etc.) which spread very quickly and are rapidly scaled up through new IFAD and GEF projects in the area, but also through other projects and Government interventions’ (TE, Pt 8). Moreover, ‘the project also led to the production of documents (good practices guide) and the implementation / improvement of methodologies (integration of climate change in local planning, characterization of valleys / basins) which are now disseminated, as well as capitalization materials (films, reports) that have been produced to promote and disseminate the project’s achievements’ (TE, Pt 8).

But there is not adequate information on different dimensions of sustainability to support the rating, due to which this TER is unable to assess the risk to sustainability for this project.

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?

As per the information in the documents available for this review, the project had a very low disbursement rate, with only \$384,700 of government contribution as against an original commitment of \$850,000. There is no information on the contribution from IFAD component and the impact of availability of co-financing on the project’s outcomes and/or sustainability.

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 no mention of extension or delays encountered during the project.

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

The information in the summary of the TE and other available documents, such as tracking tools and MTR, is not enough to make an assessment of the country ownership of the project.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately satisfactory
Based on the evidence in the Project Document and the English summary of the TE available for this review, the M&E design at entry is rated to be 'moderately unsatisfactory'. According to the TE, 'monitoring and evaluation suffered from the shortcomings of the logical framework and from a lack of clear and consistent guidelines on how to integrate the project within the PAFA programming and monitoring instruments' (TE, Pt 6). The indicators defined in the logical framework in the Project Document were also vague and didn't full fill the criteria of SMART indicators. For instance, '70% of rural communities fully integrated climate risks in their perception and adopted a new climate integrated attitude' is hard to track and monitor (PD, Annex A)).	

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to assess
As per the TE, 'monitoring and evaluation has suffered from the shortcomings of the logical framework and from a lack of clear and consistent guidelines on how to integrate the project within the PAFA programming and monitoring instruments' (TE, Pt 6). However, there is not enough information in the available documents to assess and assign a rating to the M&E implementation.	

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: Unable to assess
--	---------------------------------

The TE rated the quality of project implementation as 'moderately satisfactory'. According to the TE, 'the presence of the IFAD office in the country has ensured regular follow-up and / or support at local level, allowing rapid decisions in collaboration with the project and the government such as adjustments required for the proper functioning of the project' (TE, Pt 16). However, the TE also points out at some of the project design issues But there is not enough information in the summarised version of the TE to provide a comprehensive assessment of the quality of project implementation.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution

Rating: **Unable to assess**

The TE rated the quality of project execution as ‘moderately satisfactory’. According to the TE, ‘a clear vision of the coordinator and the commitment of the team made it possible to adjust and adapt the project management’ (TE, Pt 15). But there is still not enough information in the TE and other available documents to provide a comprehensive assessment of the ‘quality of project execution’.

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.

Some of the environmental changes mentioned in the TE include reforestation, land reclamation and development of strategies and practices for adapting to climate change (enhancement of water retention infrastructure, change of technical itineraries and crop varieties used, diversification with more adapted agricultural activities to climate change, etc). But there is no data to substantiate these findings.

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 TE noted improvement in agricultural productivity and household income that had a direct impact on food security conditions (reduction of the lean season, improvement of food supply) and on household assets (acquisition of goods, access to school and health services). The project also had positive impacts on empowering women and youth, creating jobs and improving the skills of producers, their organizations as well as implementing partners. But the TE doesn’t include data to support these findings.

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

According to the TE, the project achieved very significant results in terms of raising awareness on climate change amongst its various stakeholders at national and local level (national or local institutions, farmers' organizations and producers). The awareness on climate change helped these stakeholders to develop new approaches, or reinforce existing methods in the field of rural development (design and management techniques, partnership arrangements with beneficiary populations). The project has facilitated the implementation of mitigation measures through the dissemination of good practices and the promotion of activities, materials and agricultural techniques more adapted to climate change that were reported to replicated and disseminated widely. However, the summary of the TE doesn't include details/specifics to support this information.

b) Governance

The TE doesn't report on the changes in the governance brought about by the project.

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.

There are no unintended impacts reported in the TE.

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.

As per the TE, 'the GEF component introduced innovations (soil phosphating, wet sowing of cereals, integrated market gardening, resilient rice varieties and adapted cultivation techniques, etc.) which spread very quickly and are rapidly scaled up through new IFAD and GEF projects in the area, but also through other projects and Government interventions. The project enabled the production of documents (good practices guide) and the implementation / improvement of methodologies (integration of climate change in local planning, characterization of valleys / basins) which are now disseminated, as well as capitalization materials (films, reports) that have been produced to promote and disseminate the project's achievements' (TE, Pt 8).

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 main lessons listed in the TE are given below:

Project Management

1. A clear vision of the coordinator and the commitment of the team made it possible to adjust and adapt the project management taking into account the lessons learned throughout the execution of the project to better meet the needs of the target group and market requirements.
2. The presence of the IFAD office in the country has ensured regular follow-up and / or support at local level, allowing rapid decisions in collaboration with the project and the government such as adjustments required for the proper functioning of the project.
3. The good and broad sensitization of the beneficiaries, especially the most vulnerable, and the different partners on the project implementation approach proved to be essential for a good ownership of the project by its key actors.
4. The partnership with the media (RTS, community radios, etc.) played an important role in raising awareness and popularizing project mechanisms and approaches, while contributing to the ownership of the various tools by the beneficiaries.

Project implementation:

1. The involvement and empowerment of farmer organizations and their training is undoubtedly a key factor of success, which explains the rapid dissemination of innovations and good practices introduced by the project.
2. To avoid delays in the construction of works, a better articulation between the GEF grant and the other project financings would have been necessary.
3. The promotion of activities perceived as representative of a modern and efficient agriculture (market gardening with adapted technologies) encourages youth to remain in their villages, or to curb migration.

Innovation and scaling:

1. The political will, the coordination and collaboration at the central level, are necessary conditions to scale up the innovations developed under the GEF component at the national level.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations are listed below:

1. For projects involving construction of large or localized works or infrastructure, anticipate at the project design stage a mechanism for preparing and financing technical and procurement documents so that these elements are available when the project starts.
2. Simplify GEF projects by reducing the areas of intervention and focusing on activities complementary to IFAD projects activities.
3. Pursue the capitalization of the project results to ensure their wide dissemination in Senegal and in countries with similar social and agro-climatic conditions.

4. Promote the investments for sustainable water, land and common resources management, as well as the development of municipal investment plans taking into account climate change and ensure the long-term monitoring of the achievements.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?		UA
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?		UA
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?		UA
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?		UA
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Yes. But it doesn't provide information on the co-financing from IFAD component, which was a significant proportion of the overall co-financing.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:		UA
Overall TE Rating		

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

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