

Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Evaluation Office, APR 2014

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		456	
GEF Agency project ID		851	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-1	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Participatory Management of Plant Genetic Resources in Oases of the Maghreb	
Country/Countries		Algeria, Morocco, Tunisia	
Region		Regional	
Focal area		Biodiversity	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		OP1 : Arid and semi-arid Zone Ecosystems	
Executing agencies involved		Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations; International Plant Genetic Resources Institute (IPGRI) Ministry of Agriculture in countries	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Secondary executing agency	
Private sector involvement		one of the beneficiaries	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		8/9/1999	
Effectiveness date / project start		5/26/2000	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		02/2005	
Actual date of project completion		12/2005	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.3	0.3
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2.78	2.78
Co-financing	IA own		
	Government	0.72	0.72
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	0.7	0.7
	Private sector		
NGOs/CSOs			
Total GEF funding		3.08	3.08
Total Co-financing		1.42	1.42
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		4.50	4.5
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		05/2006	
TE submission date			
Author of TE		Chakib ZOUAGHI and Abdelkader BAOUENDI	
TER completion date		11/14/2014	
TER prepared by		Nelly Bourlion	
TER peer review by (if GEF EO review)		Joshua Schneck	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF EO Review
Project Outcomes	HS	S	N/A	S
Sustainability of Outcomes	U	L	N/A	L
M&E Design	N/A	MU	N/A	MU
M&E Implementation	N/A	S	N/A	S
Quality of Implementation	N/A	HS	N/A	S
Quality of Execution	N/A	S	N/A	S
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			N/A	S

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The global environmental objective of the project is the conservation of within-species diversity of the date palm (*Phoenix dactylifera*) in Algeria, Morocco and Tunisia, and associated locally adapted landraces, dependent on the micro-climatic conditions created by the date palm (PD, pg.31). The project will remove barriers to combat genetic erosion of date palm.

According to the PD, ecotypes of the date palm are highly adapted to drought, sand storms, high levels of salt, poor soils and wide temperature variations, and are able to survive under a wide range of arid site conditions. Surveys of the region have identified over 800 cultivars of date palm in Algeria, 265 in Tunisia and 223 cultivars in Morocco (PD, pg.31). The date palm is the keystone species of the oases agro-ecosystem providing soil stabilisation, humidity, shade and shelter from high wind, effectively contributing to the prevention of desertification within oases, and the preservation of locally adapted landraces and cultivars growing there including a diversity of local varieties of olive trees, almond trees, fig trees etc.

The project is intended to fight against the two main factors that threaten the genetic diversity of date palm (see below).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project is “to increase the sustainability of agricultural production in arid and semi-arid areas of Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria and assist the three countries in their efforts to stem rural-urban migration” (PD, pg. 37). National capacities will be strengthened, activities and the management of agricultural ecosystems will be coordinated and market diversification of agricultural markets will be promoted to spread the risk of shock from market fluctuation on the sector (PD, pg. 37).

The project aims at removing barriers to the fight against genetic erosion of date palms which are:

- (1) the replacement threat from national cultivation programs that are multiplying and distributing only a few cultivars of trees and
- (2) Market forces that are encouraging farmers to grow only a few high value cultivars of date palm to the exclusion of a wide range of other cultivars.

The project will form an integrated ecosystem approach to the management of the oases sites. No outcome are defined in the logframe. Instead, there are the following immediate objectives (PD, pg. 79):

- (1) Preservation of within species diversity of date palm at selected sites
- (2) Combat incentives causing genetic erosion of in-situ date palm
- (3) Improve cost efficiency of project, by sensitising communities to project objectives, monitoring and adaptive project management, co-ordination with other proponents and replication of project activities.

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

A meeting was organized in January 2004 in Algiers and a new log frame was prepared by the date palm team with GEF and UNDP representatives. This new logframe has new objective, outcomes and impact indicators (PIR, pg.14).

The new objective is to “know and to conserve in situ and in sustainable way diversity of date palm in the oasis of the Maghreb region” (PIR, p.2).

The new outcomes are:

- (1) Increased National capacities to multiply and to exchange a larger number of date palm varieties
- (2) Promotion of legal Exchange of germplasm in an appropriate regional agreements
- (3) Identification and testing of Alternative markets for alternatives products of date palm to combat genetic erosion of date palm cultivars
- (4) Ensured Conditions of sustainability and duplication of successful results of project at policymakers and farmers levels (PIR, pg. 2).

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
----------------------	----------------------

Morocco, Tunisia and Algeria have already taken steps in the conservation of date palm and genetic resources of their Oases:

- (1) Tunisia has collections of rare date palm species, planted a small percentage of traditional varieties in new plantings; and continues to survey oases for genetic diversity of date palm and other species to monitor genetic erosion.
- (2) Algeria also has collections of date palm and other oasis genetic resources and stated its interest in developing a range of date palm varieties for multiplication.
- (3) Morocco set up the Comité nationale des ressources phytogénétique to manage activities to preserve genetic resources; the country has three collections of date palm varieties and also has a stated interest in expanding the number of varieties they can multiply and distribute to farmers.

Therefore, the project is relevant to the national strategies and priorities.

Moreover, the project falls into the GEF Operational Programme for Arid and Semi-Arid Ecosystems and the crosscutting issue of land degradation, especially in the part stating “...Special attention will be given to the demonstration of techniques, tools, and methods to conserve traditional crops and animal species in their original habitat” (PD, pg. 27). The project is also relevant to the Land Degradation Operational Strategy that states that “GEF will fund activities addressing land degradation issues as they relate to biodiversity issues that protect biodiversity and promote sustainable use in arid, semi-arid and Mediterranean-type ecosystems”.

The project is also relevant to the Convention on Biological Diversity and especially to its concern that (1) biological diversity is being significantly reduced by certain human activities; (2) the fundamental requirement for conservation of biological diversity is the *in-situ* conservation of ecosystems and natural habitats, and (3) the traditional dependence of local communities on biological resources are recognised (TE, p.19).

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

The effectiveness of the project is rated satisfactory in the TE. This TER concurs with the TE’s rating because, as stated in the TE, the main objective has been reached. In the revised logframe, the objective had 2 indicators that have been fully reached:

- 30% of threatened cultivars in the pilot sites have been preserved in situ, which is what was expected in the revised indicators
- The population genetics index for the 30% preserved has been maintained at a minimum degradation level by the end of the project, which fully matches the revised indicator.

Compared to the initial logframe, the immediate objectives 1 and 3 have been fully reached while immediate objective 2 has been partially reached; all the activities related to market forces have stayed

at the study and isolated experimentation level. While, the activities related to the studies about germoplasme exchange regulation have not had the expected influence in the national policies (TE, pg.34).

The project has enhanced the conservation and sustainable use of date palm genetic resources in accordance with GEF policy. It has developed significant awareness that allowed decision-making and measures to be taken by the three countries on the conservation of date palm genetic resources. The project activities have provided concrete solutions to fight against genetic erosion of the date palm oases of the Maghreb, both by in situ conservation and by the involvement of research and development actions focused toward in vitro multiplication of date palm varieties. Over 70 date palm cultivars have been added in laboratories to be multiplied in large numbers (26 in Algeria, 20 in Morocco and 29 in Tunisia). Multi-disciplinary teams have been trained in the methodology of participatory diagnostic inventory, and the description and screening of cultivars in the oasis. Legislative studies in the three countries have been conducted and findings disseminated to strengthen and harmonize measures for germoplasme exchange. Numerous audiovisual communication media have been developed to raise awareness of the biodiversity of the date palm and the importance of the participation of civil society while demonstrating social and economic interests (TE, pg.6).

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

Overall, the project efficiency is moderately satisfactory.

Eighty-seven % of the project budget was allocated towards initial immediate objective 1, which uncovered 39 new varieties introduced in the laboratory and strengthened the ex situ and in situ conservation (TE, pg.6). The initial immediate objective 2 was according to the TE too optimistic and the initial formulation of the project did not take into account the time required to act on market forces, therefore this objective has not been as efficient (TE, pg.6). The initial immediate objective 3 however, has been efficient given the results achieved in raising awareness on the diversity of plant genetic resources of the date palm and the need to conserve in situ and ex situ. The use of participatory approach has increased the efficiency of this result (TE, pg. 6). Synergies among the three countries as well as between local, national and international institutions have reduced the costs of mobilizing additional resources and have strengthened the results in the area of advocacy and leadership initiatives in the field of sustainable management of plant genetic resources.

Although the project has achieved satisfactory results, the financial situation over the last two years was very tense due to a provisional budget too limited and an underestimation of the financial needs at project start.

Moreover, the establishment of the accounting structure has been slowed down due to a change of the Regional Project Coordinator in late 2001. UNDP has coordinated the project, without additional

financial or human resources, during the whole first year. This has hampered the effective start of the project activities and therefore has led to delays. The new coordination team has been able to catch up thanks to the full involvement of the national coordination teams.

According to the TE, the ideal would have been to have a more flexible budget distribution between sites and project activities under the new management guidelines of international bodies such as the UNDP and GEF. IPGRI demonstrated understandable resistance to adopt this new system based on results and not activities (TE, pg.28).

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

The TE assesses a rating of Likely to Sustainability of project outcomes, and this TER concurs. According to the TE, the sustainability of the results is ensured, especially, for those related to capacity enhancements (TE, pg.9). All the capacity acquired about in situ and ex situ conservations is sustainable, especially through the biodiversity strategy in the three countries and partner institutions in the project, through the economic and financial instruments created, through the institutional adaptations contributing to the sustainability, through the ownership of the problem at the base and at the local level, and through the development of new projects and action plans from the project (TE, pg.9).

Risks to the sustainability of project outcomes are further assessed along the following four dimensions:

Financial Sustainability: Likely

The financial sustainability of the project is likely as TE finds that the project has increased the awareness about the interest and the commercial potential of common varieties that may exceed that of Deglet Nour. It has strengthened and diversified the income sources of local people and farmers, and it has reinforced the income for rural women and other stakeholders. Finally, the project has also played the role of mobilizer and catalyzer, starting from local initiatives to national and regional ones. This role has given an impulse to NGOs, Research centers, and to farmers and other government organizations to continue funding of initiatives supportive of project outcomes.

Sociopolitical Sustainability: Likely

The socio-political sustainability of the project is also likely, as TE finds that the project has strengthened the dissemination and transmission of local knowledge. Moreover, the national awareness on the need to protect and use more sustainable biological resources, especially those of date palm has increased; and the ownership of the conservation mission by farmers and the need to better organize the production flow on the market has improved.

Institutional Sustainability: Likely

The institutional sustainability of the project is likely as TE finds that the project has led to a change in the national policy about Plant Genetic Resources through concrete steps to encourage the planting of common date palms; to the creation of active NGOs and the creation of new initiatives for the conservation and utilization of genetic resources; and to the establishment of gene banks in the countries of the project.

Environmental Sustainability: Unable to assess

No information is provided in the TE on environmental risks to the sustainability of project outcomes.

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 has been funded by the GEF through UNEP for an amount of US\$2.78millions. The governments have been financing the project; Algeria US\$0.22, Morocco US\$0.24, Tunisia US\$0.27. According to the TE, there has not been any change in cofinancing during the project implementation (TE, p.15).

According to the TE (pg.7) co-financing was at the origin of replication of project activities on many sites that were not initially planned in the logframe.

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 accounting structure establishment slowed down due to a change of the Regional Project Coordinator in late 2001. UNDP has worked without additional financial or human resources during the first year of the project. This has hampered the effective start of the project activities during the same period, and has led to some delays. However, the new regional coordination team was able to bring project activities up to speed following these initial delays (TE, pg.28).

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:

According to the TE, the stakeholders' involvement at regional and national level is very satisfactory. Indeed, the national steering committees held 15 meetings with the participation of all national stakeholders, local committees held 57 meetings sites involving local stakeholders including farmers and NGOs. Also 56 training sessions and information exchange meetings between sites and countries were organized. This ownership and active participation was followed by the publication and dissemination of 59 monitoring reports and 59 studies on specific aspects of the date palm genetic resources in oasis.

They covered the economic, social, commercial, cultural, and the local knowledge aspects, taking into account the participation of women (TE, p.25).

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 Unsatisfactory
------------------------------------	-----------------------------------

The PD provides an M&E plan that calls for the following: Three national monitoring specialists were dedicated to design and monitor project impact indicators. International monitoring specialists were dedicated to provide technical backstopping to the National Monitoring Specialists. The project would be subject to Tripartite Review once every 12 months. The Regional Co-coordinator, with the assistance of the National coordinators, would prepare Annual Project Reviews. A Mid-term Review would be conducted in the third year of project implementation. A budget was also allocated to M&E activities (PD, pg. 52).

However, according to the TE, the indicators initially in the logframe have proven to be inadequate, and did not follow good quality standards of indicators for monitoring and evaluation.

The project team had to revise the logframe to more accurately reflect the reality of expected and possible outcomes. The revision was adopted in Algiers in January 2004, and led to the adaptation of the project to the new GEF requirements regarding results-based management and the needs of the project. The initial logical framework did not seem to meet the needs of the project related to the participatory approach and to the commodity markets of the date palm.

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

The project team has had to revise the logframe several times during the course of the project to more accurately reflect the reality of expected and possible outcomes. The last major change was inspired both by the recommendations made by the mid-term evaluation report, and also thanks to the new method of UNDP (ATLAS), which is more oriented towards the Results-Based Management (TE, pg.18). The indicators have been modified to allow quantification and measurement of project impacts on

genetic resources of the date palm and on ownership of the participatory approach by farmers and local stakeholders (TE, pg.23).

During project implementation, there has been a lot of useful documents used by the three countries and by the regional coordination to monitor the project. These documents and information were mainly focused on technical and financial aspects. Annual reports have been prepared in each country and in the Regional Coordination Unit. There have been monitoring and evaluation meetings in Tunis, Alger, and Rabat (TE pg.23).

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
--	----------------------

UNDP, implementing agency of this project, has played a key role throughout the project. Its role has evolved over time. It started as project manager when the project team had not yet been recruited and IPGRI had not yet legal status in the three beneficiary countries. UNDP provided all the facilities and all the “know-how” for an effective start of the project; although some delays were experienced.

A year and a half after the start of the administrative project, UNDP has played the role of supervisor and coordinator vis-à-vis the donor, being not only an intermediary, but also the guide ensuring follow-up and support to the project as needed. This role was essential to the proper conduct of activities at a regional scale. It also ensured quality standards among countries and a significant assistance to the project. Therefore, UNDP role was of prime importance in this project.

The Regional Coordinator has played a leading role in the success of the project. Its motivation has helped many national coordinators to carry out their activities. The search for synergies between regional and national components has been a great help for the activities implementation that was sometimes risky from the point of view of feasibility and timing (TE, pg.27).

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

IPGRI is the executing agency of this project, and was responsible for the planning and overall management of project activities, including supervision of the national executing agencies. IPGRI had responsibility for monitoring and evaluation of the project (PD, p23).

In each country, a national executing agency was organized to carry out activities, such as procurement and delivery of project inputs and their conversion into project outputs (PD, pg.23)

According to the TE, the coordination team (the four coordinators and their assistants) has done a lot even with the limited resources available. This is in part due to the significant contributions of the three governments, partners and NGOs, support from external experts from IPGRI, but also thanks to the commitment and expertise of the project team (TE, p.32).

IPGRI has coordinated the planning and management of the program in the three countries, which included de facto coordination between national research institutes, sometimes in competition. IPGRI has fulfilled its commitments regarding the scientific support in several areas. Areas where the technical support of IPGRI has proved particularly popular with on-site coordinators was the help in the publication of various articles, in the ethnobotanical research, and in the SI-PALM database development (TE, pg.32).

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 below that this is indeed the case. 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.

Farmers are now more aware about biodiversity and they have started (after a long period of planting just one or 2 varieties) planting traditional varieties (PIR, pg.23). However, the TE provides no assessment as to whether this resulted in any changes in environmental stress or status by the end of the project.

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

The project contributed to (TE, pg.7):

- The strengthening and diversification of sources of income for local people and farmers;
- The strengthening of the incomes of rural women and other stakeholders;

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

NGOs are trained in the area of genetic resources of date palm and in the way of their conservation. Governments of the 3 countries are now more aware about biodiversity and their example is date palm project (PIR, pg.22).

3 reports (one by country) of Indigenous knowledge in cultivation of date palm tree and maintaining biodiversity were edited by date palm team and farmers (men and women) (PIR, pg.23).

3 reports (one by country) about all 'traditional recettes' cakes and food made with dates were edited by date palm team (PIR, pg.23).

1 report about traditional knowledge in the oasis of Degache Tunisia (PIR, pg.23).

1 article about traditional medicinal, cosmetic and aromatic use of date palm produced (PIR, pg.23)

The project contributed to (TE, pg.7):

- A better understanding of the biological diversity of the date palm in each country,
- Capacity building in communication and exchange of information on biological diversity of the date palm in each country;
- Capacity building for conservation and ex situ multiplication in the three countries;
- Capacity Building Conservation in Situ reinforced in the three countries;
- Strengthening participatory management of genetic resources.

During the project period 38 meeting reports or minutes were produced and 14 meetings regularly held with national committees and local committees (TE, pg.23).

Periodic and special reports (59 reports) for each activity or meeting reports have contributed much to the good communication between team members internally and with external actors in the direct management of the project (TE, pg.23).

b) Governance

Tunisia was preparing a national strategy to rehabilitate oases and to conserve genetic resources.

Algeria have included varieties selected by date palm project in Ghardaia in the list of varieties to be encouraged by national programmes (PIR, pg.22).

The project has also contributed to changes and actions at policy and institutional level in the three countries for strengthening the conservation of date palm biological diversity (TE, pg.7).

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.

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.

Morocco was developing a national project to conserve GR in the oases.

Tunisia encourages conservation of date palm GR in 3 sites of about 500 ha.

Tunisia, Algeria and Morocco were preparing a new project to conserve biodiversity in the oases after the success of date palm project. More attention is paid by the 3 governments to biodiversity. Over 30 NGOs were developing projects of biodiversity of date palm in different oases of the Maghreb. Private sector was developing activities of processing and marketing of dates and products of dates and date palm tree. Ministers of agricultures, of environments and of Research, etc. had visited sites of the project. Other countries such as Libya, Egypt, Oman and UAE were interested by the replication of date palm project results (PIR, pg.23).

The project has led to conventions and partnerships based on synergies and the strengthening of human, institutional, technical and material capacities. A total of 21 agreements were signed directly with the project (TE, pg.33):

- In Algeria, four NGOs signed seven agreements
- In Morocco, four NGOs have signed four agreements
- In Tunisia 7 NGOs and grassroots groups 3 signed 10 agreements

The project has developed significant opportunities for mobilization of cofinancing. The total contribution is estimated at 7.75 million US dollars split into US\$5.25million in cash and US\$2.5million in

kind. Co-financing has been at the origin of replication of the project activities on many sites not initially foreseen by the project logical framework with the involvement of NGOs and grassroots organizations in the oasis (TE, pg.33).

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 identified the key lessons (TE, pg. 10):

- The participatory approach in the conservation and sustainable management of plant genetic resources of the date palm is effective;
- The combination of in situ and ex situ conservation of date palm exhibits synergistic interests genetic resources;
- Micro-financing is very effective in this kind of project that builds the capacity of local actors and are based on participatory and synergies between local and national actors approach.
- The conservation of biodiversity is the source of additional revenue for users of natural resources.
- Genetic erosion can be reduced significantly by the effective fight against market forces. Provided that this fight is recorded over a sufficiently long period.
- The institutional base has a large impact on the success of the project and the results achieved.
- Raising awareness of policy makers is causing significant measures for the conservation of genetic resources and the initiation of a process of change in the policy of conservation of biodiversity in the three Maghreb countries.
- Taking concrete steps to limit genetic erosion and date palm and a better understanding of the texts of laws governing the transfer of genetic material in each country are responsible for significant changes in the process management of date palm genetic resources;
- The role played by the civil society (farmers, NGOs and private sector) in the conservation of biodiversity has been very important and rewarding for all local and national actors.
- The involvement of NGOs has attracted significant additional financial resources mobilized for the preservation of date palm genetic resources in oasis.
- The participatory approach is the cause of strengthening and partnerships between NGOs and GOs
- The development of local expertise and cultural dimension related to biodiversity are the source of its preservation.
- The participatory process allows ownership of the issue of preservation of date palm genetic resources by farmers and researchers at the same time.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The following key recommendations are given in the TE (TE, pg. 47):

- Ensuring continuity of positions filled through the intervention of the project in the laboratory for ex situ conservation
- Strengthening participatory process involving local NGOs
- Strengthening partnerships initiated by the project through the intervention of the national structures
- Strengthening cooperation and decentralized participation among the three countries in biotechnology capacity of the plant material and the preservation of biodiversity oasis
- Continue to develop the laboratory capacity in vitro culture in technologies other than those used to date to maintain a form of "technology watch" and to strengthen the capacity of plantlets in terms of number of rate success and number of varieties
- Develop a partnership with the private sector nurseries to have a complementary role to the in situ and ex situ conservation, they will form a "bridge" between the two in order to strengthen the capacity of national varieties sought currently on the market and in anticipation of changes in the types of varieties produced initiated or enhanced by the project
- At the NGO level the situation is less tense when some agreements have been fully realized others are in progress, the question is how NGOs are able to rely on their ability to seek co-financing, climbing projects and develop their portfolios partners or donors. The relationship with government institutions also represents an interesting potential to meet the growing needs of NGOs, agricultural or environmental as well as INRA can play this role in regional offices.

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 report gives a very detailed assessment of project objectives, outcomes and outputs, and their respective achievements. However, the reports mentions that there has been a change in logframe and objectives, outcomes and outputs were modified. But it does not give the initial objectives, it only gives the most recent logframe. A comparison of both would have been useful.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent and evidences are complete. The ratings are given for each category and justification are given.	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The project assesses project sustainability based on project findings. However, some aspects of sustainability are not given, or not detailed enough, such as financial sustainability or institutional sustainability.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are supported by the evidence in the TE. The recommendations are also very detailed ad supported by the evidences.	S

Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report includes the actual costs, per country, per activity, per outputs etc. The budget break down is very detailed.	S
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The M&E system is assessed in details. The change in logframe is mentioned. However the reasons why the logframe was modified are not explained enough, and a comparison between the initial logframe and the actual logframe would have been useful.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

$$9*0.3 + 18*0.1 = 2.7+1.8 = 4.5$$

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