

## 1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4447	
GEF Agency project ID		609906	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF 5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		Food and agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	
Project name		Strengthening climate resilience and reducing disaster risk in agriculture to improve food security in Haiti post earthquake.	
Country/Countries		Haiti	
Region		LAC	
Focal area		Climate Change (CCA) Least Developed Countries fund (LDCF)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		Increase resilience of vulnerable farmers, their livelihoods and agro-systems against the impacts of climate variability, specifically in the post-earthquake crises.	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		N/A	
Private sector involvement		N/A	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		March 8, 2012	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 1, 2013	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		April 30, 2016	
Actual date of project completion		June 30, 2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (Million US\$)	At Completion (Millions US\$)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	N/A	N/A
	Co-financing	N/A	N/A
GEF Project Grant		2.7	2.95
Co-financing	IA own	.59	.49
	Government (in-kind)	0.3	0.4

	Other multi- /bi-laterals	8.43	9.88
	Private sector	N/A	N/A
	NGOs/CSOs	N/A	N/A
<b>Total GEF funding</b>		2.7	2.95
<b>Total Co-financing</b>		9.32	10.77
<b>Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)</b>		12	13.72
<b>Terminal evaluation/review information</b>			
<b>TE completion date</b>		12/2017	
<b>Author of TE</b>		Alexandre Borde (Team Leader), Alain Thermil (National Consultant), Tala Talaee (Evaluation Manager, FAO Office of Evaluation)	
<b>TER completion date</b>		01/04/2018	
<b>TER prepared by</b>		Yuliya Gosnell	
<b>TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)</b>		Molly Sohn	

## 2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

### 3. Project Objectives

#### 3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

**The Adaptation Objective**, as stated in Project Document is:  
“To increase resilience of vulnerable farmers including their livelihoods and agro-ecosystems against the impacts of climate variability and in the post-earthquake crises through integration of disaster risk management and adaptation practices in the agricultural sector and replication of more hazard resilient crop varieties and cultivation technologies”. (Project Document, p. 21).

#### 3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The project’s development objective is the “Application and dissemination of good practices to increase the resilience to climate hazards, while integrating disaster risk management and adaptation goals in agricultural and environmental plans and policies”. (PIR 2017, p. 4) The project aimed to achieve the objective through four components: i) strengthening of local planting material and seed systems of climate resilient crop varieties, ii) field testing and replication of climate-resilient practices for climate risk management in agriculture, iii) promoting climate-resilient agricultural technologies and practices through Farmer Field Schools, and iv) integrating climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction into agricultural policies, programs and institutions. 3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

Following the recommendations of the mid-term review and the endorsement of the steering committee, the project duration was extended by 14 months. Two minor adjustments to target projects outputs were made following conclusions and recommendations of the mid-term review: the increase of seed production target for Output 1.1.4 and the decrease in the number of practices to be validated (by farmers) for Output 2.1.1.

### 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 project is relevant to both national priorities and to GEF focal area and LDCF/SCCF strategic objectives.

With regards to the national priorities, the project is aligned with the revised National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA, 2006), which gives priority to i) food security and adaptation measures in crop production, particularly in smallholder crop production, and ii) disaster risk management (CEO Endorsement, p. 10).

With regards to GEF focal area and LDCF/SCCF strategic objectives, the project is relevant to i) CCA-1, *reducing vulnerability of people, livelihoods and natural systems to adverse effects of climate change*, through mainstreaming of adaptation measures at the national and local levels, incorporating the measures in national policies, and continuous monitoring of participation in and adoption of the measures, and ii) CCA-3, *adaptation technology transfer*, through improving capacities of local agricultural producers with climate resilient seed and planting material, and building capacities of local research institutions in promoting adaptation practices for drought and flood management in crop production (CEO Endorsement, p. 10).

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

The TE rated effectiveness as satisfactory and evaluated contributions of the project vis-à-vis the stated objectives, without listing the achievements as they contributed to the four components of the project design: i) strengthening of local planting material and seed systems of climate resilient crop varieties, ii) field testing and replication of climate-resilient practices for climate risk management in agriculture, iii) promoting climate-resilient agricultural technologies and practices through Farmer Field Schools, and iv) Integrating climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction into agricultural policies, programs and institutions. The TE concluded that overall, the project contributed to an increase in agricultural production and trained farmers to address climatic hazards (drought and flood) and improve seed and grain storage techniques. Additionally, the project strengthened farming through improvements to post-harvest actions, which helped to stabilize agricultural commodity prices, increase reliability of subsistence, grow exports of agricultural products and improve conservation efforts (TE, p. 29). Finally, the project contributed to improved integration of disaster risk management into policies and the national and municipal levels (TE, p. 21).

The 2017 PIR gives an overview of project accomplishments by component and estimates the rate of achievement of outputs under each component between 75 and 400 percent.

Component 1: Strengthening of local planting material and seed systems of climate resilient crop varieties.

Under the first component, 15 climate-resilient varieties of staple crops were identified (against the baseline level of 3). One, a local drought-tolerant variety of Lima bean (Beseba) was successfully introduced in the South East and West parts of Haiti – the drier areas of the country. Approximately 2000 households improved their food security status as a result of multiplication and distribution of the identified climate-resilient staple crops, particularly during the El Niño drought of 2014-2015 and in the aftermath hurricane Matthew in October 2016 (against the target of 500). The project supported the establishment and training of 12 seed producer groups in four municipalities and equipped them with silos, packing bags, moisture meters, and tarpaulins for seed drying (on target). The groups contributed to

the production of 256 MT of climate-resilient seeds and over 1.7 M cuttings of vegetable material (against the target of 200 MT of seeds). The PIR estimates the completion rate of five outputs under Component 1 to range from 100 to 400 percent.

Component 2: Field testing and replication of climate-resilient practices for climate risk management in agriculture.

The project activities identified and ensured farmer buy-in to 15 climate-resilient adaptation practices and technologies (against the target of 20). The practices were disseminated through lead farmers, organized and presented in a published technical compendium for stakeholder use. The PIR estimates the rate of achievement of outputs under Component 2 from 75 to 150 percent (with 150 percent achievement of training and technical knowledge dissemination).

Component 3: Promoting climate-resilient agricultural technologies and practices through Farmer Field Schools.

The project established 20 farmer field schools (against the target of 15), recruiters training facilitators and provided technical assistance. Most training facilitators were established in the community lead farmers, well-positioned for validation and promotion of replication of climate-resilient practices.

Component 4: Integrating climate change adaptation and disaster risk reduction into agricultural policies, programs and institutions.

The Ministry of Agriculture and the Ministry of Environment showed commitment to continued climate change adaptation and disaster risk management agenda. By project completion, 10 disaster risk management plans were developed, published and diffused, and 10 disaster risk management committees began functioning. The plans are in the process of being aligned with national contingency plan (it is a part of continued institutionalization process carried out by FAO). The project has also contributed to review and updates of NAPA. The PIR rates achievement of outputs under Component 4 from 90 to 125 percent.

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

The TE rated efficiency as satisfactory and supports the rating with an argument that the project was implemented with approximately 95 percent success rate, but was extended for approximately 14 months with cost overruns of \$1.5 million (about 11 percent of total project costs), supplied through co-financing (TE, p. 40). While the project benefitted from efficient management of the Steering Committee, efficient information sharing during round tables of the Piloting Committee, and efficient structure of farmer field schools disseminating practices and technologies, the project experienced technical delays with some activities taking a longer than anticipated time. Such activities largely depended on the host country participants, and included, for example, delayed delivery of requested materials (such as emergency kits for the population) (TE, pp. 39-40).

#### 4.4 Sustainability

Rating: Moderately Unlikely

The results of the project are moderately unlikely to be sustainable after the completion of the project's implementation stage. Institutional, financial, socio-economic, and environmental risks affect the sustainability of this project.

*Institutional risks, negligible:* The national government understands the value of disaster risk management activities. During the implementation of the project, two government agencies – the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development and the Ministry of Environment – collaborated to support the project activities. The ministries took the lead in the development of disaster risk management plans, updating of NAPA, and the development of the climate change policy framework. Both ministries, and institutions at departmental and municipal level, participated in the project's well-functioning Steering Committee. The Steering Committee facilitated inter-ministerial and inter-departmental communication and joint efforts in the development of climate change adaptation structures, such as Communication for Development – an organization supporting farming and rural development in Haiti. At project completion, the national government and FAO agreed on a hand-over plan and joint monitoring and evaluation of continued disaster risk management and climate change adaptation activities, which will ensure the country's ownership of the efforts. The TE identifies no institutional risks to sustainability of the project's achievements in terms of a supporting framework, continuity of efforts, preparedness and ability to respond.

*Financial risks, substantial:* The share of the national budget available for continued disaster risk management and climate change adaptation activities is low. The government committed \$300,000 of mostly in-kind contributions. The sustainability of the project's activities largely depends on external funding for materials, equipment and human resources, and the government of Haiti expressed this need to FAO.

*Socio-political risks, low:* Both the government at all levels and the population of the country support climate-change adaptation efforts. Farmers have been increasingly demanding for climate-resilient seeds, and receptive to adaptation and disaster risk management approaches disseminated through farmer field schools. However, weak resource management, poor land tenure, and weak market integration of agriculture may limit production and adoption of new climate-resilient crops.

*Environmental, substantial:* Sustainability of the project's results depend on continued production of new crops and ability of new distributed to farmers equipment and technologies to withstand natural disasters. A substantial risk of serious floods and droughts, disease outbreaks or pests infestations, however, remains. A serious enough event can destroy plantations, stored seeds and/or silos and undermine the project's progress.

## 5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

Co-financing played an important role in achieving the objectives of this project. At project endorsement, co-financing amounted to \$9.3 million, or 78 percent of total project costs. At project completion, total co-financing increased to 10.8 million, or 80 percent of project costs. The increase in co-financing supplied the necessary cost overruns caused by the project's extension (necessary to complete project activities). Co-financing was predominantly raised by FAO from governments of OECD countries: Belgium, Spain, United Kingdom, United States and the European Union. Only a small fraction - \$0.4 million was allocated by the government of Haiti (\$0.3 million of in-kind contributions by the national government, and \$0.1 million of in-kind contributions by the local government). The host government expressed a concern that its climate adaptation efforts are limited by the amount and continuation of the work depends on a continued supply of co-financing.

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?

As recommended by the Steering Committee, the project was extended by 14 months, from an originally anticipated April 2016 completion date to June 2017. The extension was to address delays by Haitian project participants, such as production, assembly and delivery of necessary for achieving outputs equipment, logistical support for field activities and payment to implementing partners (TE, p. 7). The extension, therefore, enabled project implementors satisfactorily complete project activities.

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 was instrumental in achieving the project's results. "Key decisions and activities were implemented with systematic collaboration with the Ministry of Environment and Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development, as well as other the Haitian authorities. Close cooperation with the government enabled appropriation of the project by institutions at all levels, even that of the municipality, and thus imparting a degree of sustainability to project achievements." (TE, p. 44) "There were numerous exchanges between the Government and the project team, and the flow of information has been systematized (both administrative and technical)." (TE, p. 44)

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE rates the Monitoring and Evaluation design at entry as satisfactory (TE, p. 45). The M&E design included indicators for tracking progress towards achievement of both outputs and outcomes of the project, and in such way, to monitor progress towards institutional and participant capacity building (for example, *Tools and approaches developed* and *Levels of created human capacities*) and long-term impact (for example, *Level of adoption by farmers* and *Increased climate resilient crop production*) (Project Document, p. 41). The indicators were well defined, aligned with outputs and outcomes, quantitative, and included baseline values. The M&E design included continuous project monitoring and data collection and a thorough mid-term and end-of-project evaluations with assigned responsibilities and timelines.

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

The TE rates M&E implementation as satisfactory (TE, p. 45). The project implementors carried out monitoring and evaluation activities as anticipated and in line with proposed schedules, including reporting on the project's indicators in PIRs. Conclusions and recommendations of the mid-term review initiated adjustments to project activities during the second half of 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: Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	----------------------

The project was well designed, with clearly defined objectives, outputs, outcomes, and indicators for M&E tracking. Indicators had assigned baselines. FAO, as the implementing agency, implemented the project with an approximately 95 percent completion rate. It has succeeded in establishing a partnership with the national government and driving its involvement in the creation of municipal disaster management plans and reevaluation of its national plan to manage natural disasters and adopt climate-resilient practices. With these efforts, the government developed a successful supporting policy framework for sustaining project accomplishments. In addition, FAO secured beneficiary buy-in: farmers validated and adopted



practices identified and recommended by FAO. This occurred largely due to FAO’s ability to identify and recruit lead farmers who had clout in communities. And finally, as hurdles and delays in project implementation arose (driven by local implementation partners), FAO resolved them successfully and delivered results, albeit with extension in the duration of project, and 11 percent cost overruns.

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

Two agencies executing the project – the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture – successfully collaborated in executing project activities. Both provided continuous support, within the limits of their capacities and with some delays and hurdles, to directional efforts of FAO and the Steering Committee.

## 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.

The project did not produce a change in the environmental stress and the environmental status of the country, as that was not the project’s objective. Instead, the project aimed to prepare the highly susceptible to natural disasters country to mitigate impact of floods and droughts when they occur.

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 identified changes to the well-being of beneficiaries, such as improved food security, increased income, as well as improved resilience to volatile climate as a result of training and awareness raising activities. The project improved food security through accomplishing outputs and outcomes under the four components of the project. Training provided through farmer field schools improved the technical capacity of the agricultural population (TE, p. 31). “The level of adoption of the popularized practices is

close to 75 percent among the members of the FFS and 30 percent among non-participants in the FFS" (TE, p. 31). Subsequently, adopted practices, such as diversification of crops on plots, soil conservation techniques, mulching and sloping techniques, "resulted in a 30 percent increase in income for the beneficiaries and an increase in knowledge capital of around 50 percent compared to the initial situation. The teaching of these techniques [...] has increased profitability by 30-35 percent" (TE, p. 32). Training had a specific focus on women inclusion. "At least one third of participants in the FFS, Artisanal Seed Producer Group, DRM in agriculture activities in all the visited sites are women" (TE, p. 34). Participation in the training and techniques adopted as a result of it, particularly "irrigation production techniques...[,] increased the commercial and economic opportunities for women". (TE, p. 9). In addition, the project the project improved income reliability of both men and women through introduction of a "cash for work" program to support communities after extreme events. (TE, p. 34).

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

As a result of project activities, local communal agricultural offices and local production organizations increased their capacities as they received additional qualified human resources. In addition, technical capacities of agricultural populations improved as they accumulated knowledge on the prevention and management of risks related to natural disasters. Through trainings, provided largely through farmer field schools, field notes and brochures, populations adopted best practices in responding to drought – a proxy indicator of resilience (TE, p. 9). When Hurricane Matthew struck Haiti (during the project implementation), farmers supported by the project showed increased resilience and capacity to recover (PIR, 2017, p. 10). And finally, improved capacity and resilience of the agricultural population led to improved income generation as farmers implemented drought-resistant farming techniques such as mulching that consumes less water and conserves moisture (TE, p. 9).

#### b) Governance

The project improved governance at the national level. National agencies participating in the project - The Ministry of Agriculture (MARNDR) and Ministry of Environment (MDE) - assumed strong commitments towards climate change adaptation and disaster risk management. Working jointly, with support of project implementors, they developed the Determined National Contribution for COP21, and reviewed and updated the NAPA. In 2015, the MDE created the Climate Change Directorate (CCD), designed to lead or coordinate all national matters on climate change. The project has supported the establishment and activities of the CCD and worked closely with the Directorate of Civil Protection (Ministry of Interior) on the articulation of the Disaster Risk Management plans for the agricultural sector produced by the project with the National Disaster Risk Management System (PIR, 2017, p. 7). FAO evaluated the plans and concluded that "DRM plans have been aligned with national contingency plans and handed over to the Civil Protection Directorate" (PIR, 2017, p. 15).

- 1.4 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 report does not describe unintended impacts, either positive or negative

- 1.5 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.

Adoption of the project initiatives occurred within the scope of intended activities and within the targeted geographic region.

## 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.

Lesson 1: Vulnerability of population to climate volatility, specifically in the rural areas, can be ameliorated through identification and dissemination of climate adaptation practices and introduction of climate resilient crop species. Inclusion of all remote areas into climate adaptation work has a greater effect in reducing overall population vulnerability.

Lesson 2: Farmer Field Schools utilizing support of lead farmers with clout in communities are an effective channel for dissemination of information and productive agricultural techniques, which improve household income and food security. Farmer Field School model is replicable and may be scaled up throughout the country beyond the targeted by the project area.

Lesson 3: Communal agriculture offices of the government do not necessarily have sufficient financial means to take over a project. The project may need to recruit human resources and provide equipment to work with communities to provide support to vulnerable rural populations, in collaboration with the government.

Lesson 4: Lack of micro-credit institutions lending to farmers is a constraint to further development of agricultural production and improvement of its sustainability.

Lesson 5: Lessons learned from the experience of the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development could benefit in the work of other government agencies able to affect agricultural production. (TE, pp. 42-43)

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

Recommendation 1: The Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development, with the support of FAO, should capitalize on the achievements of the project, both at the national level and in the field, and consider a strategy to scale-up the project throughout the country.

Recommendation 2: FAO should continue activities to promote conservation of agriculture in Haiti and larger scale adoption of the efforts by the government.

Recommendation 3: Local authorities, with the support of FAO, the Ministry of the Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development should capitalize on the project's achievements to move from the logic of food security emergency intervention to that of development and resilience of agriculture.

Recommendation 4: FAO should support and advise the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development, in extension related work, in partnership with other relevant networks and national and international stakeholders to enable extension officers to meet farmers' needs to the maximum.

Recommendation 5: FAO and the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development should encourage the arrival of micro-credit institutions adapted to the needs of agricultural producers and rural groups in the South-East Department.

Recommendation 6: FAO, the Ministry of Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture, Natural Resources and Rural Development should continue to adopt a transversal and cross-departmental approach for any new climate change adaptation project.

*Lessons should be based on the project's actual experience. Action may or may not lead to a specific action. They may also come up with a recommendation that is not very useful.*

## 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	The assessment of relevant outcomes was brief and mainly highlighted the most prominent accomplishments. The report developed its own set of questions to be answered for the evaluation, which did not follow the M&E	MS

project and the achievement of the objectives?	framework; the report did not examine outcomes not fully accomplished and did not evaluate long-term impacts of the project.	
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report largely follows the structure it has developed and presented in the beginning of the report, although it does not always answer the questions it promises to answer. For example, in assessing efficiency, the report sets four questions stated on p. 16 (pages are not numbered in the report, which makes it challenging to work with it); these questions are not answered in Section 3.6 <i>Efficiency</i> , and the design of the questions themselves is set to evaluate effectiveness of the project rather than efficiency.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	In describing sustainability, the report does not evaluate risks which could threaten sustainability of project outcomes; the report focuses only on aspects likely to support sustainability.	<b>MS</b>
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	Lessons learned are titled “Conclusions” and are presented as such. Lessons learned can, however, be discerned in the conclusions, along with background information on the lessons. It is challenging to assess the comprehensiveness of lessons learned as the report does not evaluate challenging aspects of the project comprehensively. Some of the lessons learned introduce a new issue not described anywhere else in the report, for example, lack of micro-finance institutions, which, if they were available to farmers, could have improved the volume of agricultural output and improved food security of the country’s population.	<b>MS</b>
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes actual total project costs, but not per activity costs. The report does not include co-financing amounts for the project preparation stage.	<b>S</b>
Assess the quality of the report’s evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report’s evaluation of project M&E is rather brief; it does not discuss M&E implementation.	<b>MS</b>
<b>Overall TE Rating</b>		<b>MS</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 were used in the preparation of this TER.*

