

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

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4570	
GEF Agency project ID			
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		IFAD	
Project name		Adapting Agriculture Production in Togo (ADAPT)	
Country/Countries		Togo	
Region		West Africa	
Focal area		Climate Change	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CCA-1 and CCA-2	
Executing agencies involved		COD-PADAT (Delegated Coordination Unit of Agricultural Development Support Project in Togo), Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, and Fishery (MAEP), and Ministry of Environment and of Forestry Resources (MERF)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Institut Africain pour le Développement Économique et Social (INADES), Association pour la Gestion Intégrée et Durable de l'Environnement (AGIDE) and Cercle d'Action pour le Développement Intégré en Afrique (CADI Afrique)	
Private sector involvement		None	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		7/31/2013	
Effectiveness date / project start		12/11/2013	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		12/31/2016	
Actual date of project completion		09/30/2017	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	1.00	1.00
	Co-financing	0	0
GEF Project Grant		5.35	2.5
Co-financing	IA own	10.00	UA ¹
	Government	0.79	0.39
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	0.42	0
Total GEF funding		6.35	2.5
Total Co-financing		11.21	0.39
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		17.56	3.89
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		3/2/2018	

¹ This amount is not reported in the TE

Author of TE	IFAD - no author credited
TER completion date	December 2018
TER prepared by	Ritu Kanotra
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Cody Parker

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the CEO Endorsement Request, the Global Environmental Objective of the project was 'mainstreaming into the planning process the climatic parameters and integrating agriculture good practices resilient to Climate Change' (Endorsement Request, Pg 22).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the CEO Endorsement, the Development Objective of the project was to 'sustainably improve food security and incomes of farmers' (Endorsement Request, Pg 22). The project was structured into three components as detailed below:

Component 1. Integration of adaptation to climate change tools in the agricultural production systems

- Expected outputs under this component included undertaking sectoral (3), thematic (3) and mapping studies; forming working groups for awareness raising and leading an exchange platform on climate change; supply of equipment and amenities to strengthen the agro-meteorological network followed by training in collection and storage of meteorological data.

Component 2. The vulnerable agricultural production systems are adapted to current and future climate impacts

- Expected outputs under this component included promotion of practices such as animal husbandry and other soil amendment practices amongst 450 households; 1000 hectares developed brought under climate resilient measures and varieties; 1000 hectares of degraded ecosystems restored through reforestation and promotion of aquaculture and fish farming.

Component 3: The stakeholders animate a device of management (education, information and communication) adapted to climate change knowledge

- Expected outputs included strengthening capacity of the Project Office (50%) to understand and assess climate change vulnerability; 2000 stakeholders understand message related to adaptation of agricultural production systems facing the climate change; 50% of decision makers operate the MARP on the ground, master the tools and manuals of adaptation to climate change and at least 80% of small producers of 300 sites and their organizations have the skills to adapt to climate change

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

The TE doesn't report any changes in the Global Environmental or Development Objectives of the project.

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 the relevance of the project to be 'moderately unsatisfactory' on the basis of the complementarity and synergy between the current project and *Projet d'Appui au Développement Agricole au Togo* (PADAT), the IFAD supported baseline investment in Togo which the current project was going to add on to , as well as the administrative issues and other operational difficulties faced in the implementation of the project. But this TER assessed relevance on the basis of the extent to which the extent of the current project aligned with national priorities as well as priorities and strategies of GEF. The TE assigned a rating of relevance of the project to be 'satisfactory'.

The project objectives fit well into the strategies and priorities of the Government of Togo. The project responds to Togo's urgent and immediate adaptation needs as identified in National Adaptation Program of Action (NAPA) as well as consistent with First and Second National Communication on Climate Change, National Development Strategy and National Food Security Program, Poverty Reduction Strategies Paper, National Investment Program for Agriculture, amongst others. The Government of Togo also prepared a National Program for Investment in Environment and Natural Resources (PNIERN) in order to incorporate climate change in food security and agriculture production system and represented the global environment framework for investments in the country for five years. The current LDCF intervention was fully integrated in the national planning framework and was in line with the priorities identified in the PNIERN to create the capacity at the national level to respond to and monitor climate change impact as well as increasing the awareness of local communities on climate change. The project was also designed to bolster the resilience of the IFAD supported *Projet d'appui au développement agricole* (PADAT) baseline project, through providing support to mainstream adaptation tools in the agriculture production system.

The project was funded as part of the LDCF grant and aligned with the GEF focal area of Climate Change and more specifically with the objectives of CCA-1 - Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level and CCA-2 - Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national,

regional and global level. In line with the LDCF additionality principle, the identified activities were additional to baseline interventions under PADAT without duplicating them and based on the NAPA indications and other climate-related policies and strategies.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
-------------------	--

As per the English summary of the TE, most of the activities initiated under the project couldn't be finished due to insufficient or lack of availability of equipment, training and long-term advisory support and insufficient follow-up period to assess the success of interventions supported through the project. There is not enough evidence in the reports to assess and assign rating to each component separately. The project faced several delays during the startup phase and the cash flow difficulties during the last quarter of implementation which precluded the completion of some major project activities. The available evidence, although limited, points towards the effectiveness of the project outputs and outcomes as being 'moderately unsatisfactory'. This TER has organized the available information under the three components as follows:

Component 1: Integration of adaptation to climate change tools in the agricultural production systems
– Moderately unsatisfactory

The TE notes that the project was largely successful in raising awareness about climate change and its impact, paving the way for future interventions. However, the TE didn't mention if the project supported the integration of climate change adaptation into the agricultural production systems through conducting sectoral and thematic studies; organised the working groups for awareness raising and led an exchange platform on climate change, as expected under the component 1. The TE notes that the project facilitated the supply of equipment and amenities for meteorological modern agriculture and ecological monitoring but it is not clear if this was adequately supported through training on the collection and storage of meteorological data.

Component 2: The vulnerable agricultural production systems are adapted to current and future climate impacts – Moderately satisfactory

The evidence in the TE points towards completing some of the activities under this component. The TE notes that the project helped in promoting the use of organic products for crops which had a positive impact on the productivity and quality of production and also successfully conducted a reforestation campaign in the classified areas managed by the State and on community lands. The project tested climate change adaptation and mitigation measures such as market gardening under micro-irrigation, beekeeping, agro-forestry practices, improved varieties of cereals and cassava that were more resilient to the climate hazards. As the TE notes, the benefits associated with the pilot operations conducted through the project (beekeeping, reforestation with economically valuable species, market gardening, drip irrigation) have allowed for profound changes in people's attitudes towards natural resources and the adoption of new technologies. On the other hand, the project failed to complete the fisheries and aquaculture activities, soil and water conservation interventions as the works that had to be carried out by *Projet d'Appui au Developpement Agricole au Togo* (PADAT) and experienced significant delays in implementation. The TE didn't include any data related to land or ecosystem covered (in hectares) under climate resilient agricultural production systems.

Component 3: The stakeholders animate a device of management (education, information and communication) adapted to climate change knowledge – Moderately unsatisfactory

The TE notes that the project was not able to produce the planned studies related to knowledge management. However, the project produced the awareness raising posters on climate change and a fact sheet on the Taungya method of maintaining reforestation plots. The reports available for the review include no information on the extent to which the activities under this component were completed.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
----------------	--

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the efficiency of the project to be ‘moderately unsatisfactory’.

The project faced several delays during the startup period. According to the TE, the delays were mainly due to issues related to recruitment of staff dedicated to the project, an inefficient procurement system and delays in mobilizing the implementation partners. The project was supposed to secure its cost efficiency through close integration with the IFAD supported baseline intervention – *Projet d'Appui au Developpement Agricole au Togo* (PADAT) thus leveraging its management structure and reducing the transaction cost. But in practice the synergies were difficult to implement due to lack of coordination in the planning of various PADAT activities and recurrent staffing problems that impacted the coordination and administrative functions of the project.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately unlikely
--------------------	------------------------------------

The reports available for this review don't have enough information to analyze sustainability along its four dimensions separately. As per the English summary of the TE, the overall sustainability of the project is assessed to be ‘moderately satisfactory’. On the basis of the evidence in the reports, this TER assessed the sustainability to be ‘moderately unlikely’. The TE assessed sustainability of specific activities supported under the project rather than analyzing the financial, institutional, socio-political and environmental factors impacting the overall sustainability.

As per the TE, the technologies and approaches supported by the project had the potential to be adapted and replicated by beneficiaries and partners. At the same time, since all the project activities were not completed, there is no guarantee that the beneficiaries had the required skills and capacity to sustain or replicate these technologies. For instance, according to the TE, water reservoirs and drip irrigation kits related investments could be difficult to scale up, since the majority of the technical and management trainings planned under the project couldn't be completed or were partially completed. Similarly, the report also questions the sustainability of management committee and producer organizations supported under the project. However, some of the multiple innovations tested under the project, such as agroforestry parks, were already being scaled up in classified forest areas, indicating that some innovations tested under the project have the potential to be sustained probably through the initiative of the community members. But overall, there doesn't seem to be a systematic effort in terms of providing institutional, legal, technical and financial support, due to which the sustainability is assessed to be ‘moderately unlikely’.

Moreover, the sustainability of the project was to be guaranteed through its integration with the PADAT project, notable through a common management structure, integration of the monitoring and evaluation framework and creation of synergies on the field. But as the TE notes, the synergy with the PADAT project was difficult to achieve due to a lack of coordination in the planning of various PADAT activities and the recurrent staffing problems in the coordination and administrative functions of the 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 TE, the project duration was reduced due to several start up delays as a result of which only 50% of the co-financing from the government could be realized. The TE doesn't discuss the implications of low co-financing but notes that the project faced issues related to cash flow impacting its overall progress. It is highly likely that the cash flow problems were due to non-realization of co-financing as the \$11,219,000 in co-financing was to make up the bulk of project funding. The TE doesn't report on the actual contribution by the IFAD and beneficiaries.

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 evidence in the TE is not consistent on the duration for which the project was implemented. But the TE notes that the project faced several start-up delays and most of the activities were not started until late 2014 or 2015. Some of the reasons for later start included delays in recruitment of the staff dedicated to the project and delays in contracting the implementation partners. According to the TE, the recruitment of the project manager and the operational coordination team was still not set up at the project completion which had a significant impact on the progress of 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:

There is not enough information in the TE to assess 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: Satisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE didn't assess or assign a rating to the M&E design at entry. But based on the information in the Prodoc, this TER assessed the quality of the M&E design at entry to be 'satisfactory'.

The project had a separate budget for supporting the project management and M&E function of the project. The Project Document included a detailed M&E framework with smart, measurable, achievable, relevant and time-bound indicators to be tracked, means of verification and assumptions. The M&E function of the current project was to be integrated with the M&E system of the IFAD supported Projet d'Appui au Développement Agricole au Togo (PADAT) operation and build on its baseline. The project document placed emphasis on participatory approach to M&E and specified all the parties, including local institutions and other partner organizations, that were required to be involved in the monitoring of the activities. The document also specified the role of the project's Steering Committee in reviewing the progress regularly (PD, Pg 20).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unable to assess
-----------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE didn't include a detailed review of the M&E implementation, except that 'the main achievements of the project are mainly due to the skills and motivations of the interim PADAT M&E officer' and that the 'the project didn't conduct a timely review of its activities (volume) and its implementation approaches, despite the recommendations of the mid-term review mission'. However, there is still not enough information or evidence to review the quality of 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: Moderately unsatisfactory
--	--

This TER agrees with the rating assigned by the TE to the quality of project implementation as 'moderately unsatisfactory'. The project faced significant difficulties related to the staffing issues faced by the executing agency – Coordination Unit of Agricultural Development Support Project in Togo (COD-PADAT) along with the complexity of procurement and contracting procedures with the partners. These administrative issues not only delayed the project but also brought cash flow difficulties due to which the project had low disbursement rate at a stage when project was still in full implementation due to its late start. Given that the project was delayed during the initial phase and had staffing issues at COD-PADAT, the IFAD and the Steering Committee failed to supervise and take appropriate corrective measures to review the project's objectives and targets at least during the mid-term review in 2015, due to which the quality of project implementation is rated as 'moderately unsatisfactory'.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately unsatisfactory
---	--

This TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the quality of project execution as 'moderately unsatisfactory'. The project was to be implemented through the common management structure of the IFAD supported baseline intervention – Projet d'Appui au Développement Agricole au Togo (PADAT) and a unified project coordination unit known as Coordination Unit of Agricultural Development Support

Project in Togo (COD-PADAT). The Project Document emphasizes coordination with the key ministries and identification of private associations and NGOs as service providers in the area of capacity building and agricultural training. According to the TE, project experienced significant difficulties in its implementation due to the staffing problems experienced by PADAT (mobility of key personnel, vacant positions, and functions performed by temporary workers) as well as the complexity and the heaviness of the procurement and contracting procedures with the partners (TE, Para 7). The TE notes that delays in recruitment of key staff positions such as ADAPT project manager also had a significant impact on the progress of the project with the operational coordination team not set up even at project completion (TE, Para 22). Moreover, the prolonged absence of a financial officer and the replacement by a staff member not trained sufficiently led to cashflow difficulties at the end of the project, while the project was still in full implementation due to its late start (TE, Para 7). As a result, the project faced low disbursement rate of 46.69% for the GEF grant as of 09/30/2017 and 50% for the Government's contribution. The steering committee was also ineffective as it failed to take into account the implications of a significant reduction in the duration of implementation on the project. It is for these reasons that the quality of project execution is rated as moderately unsatisfactory.

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 TE doesn't indicate any changes in environmental stress or status brought about by 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.

According to the TE, the project contributed to an increase in the production of maize and rice, food security, income, protection of natural resources and climate change adaptation, confirmed to the evaluators during the stakeholder workshops. The TE also notes that innovative activities supported through the project were appreciated by the farmers, particularly the ones aimed at strengthening household resilience to climate change through diversification of agricultural activities (modern beekeeping, cashew orchards, agroforestry, etc.). But the report didn't include any data on the changes brought about through the project.

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 per the TE, several technical and management trainings planned by the project could not be carried out, or were only partially completed. This was mainly due to shortening of the duration of project implementation resulting from the long delays in recruiting staff dedicated to the project and the delay in contracting implementation partners.

b) Governance

The TE notes that the project was largely successful in raising awareness about climate change and its impact, paving the way for future interventions. However, there is not enough evidence in the available reports to back up this claim.

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

The TE doesn’t report any unintended impacts of the project..

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

There is no information in the TE about the adoption of initiatives taken under the project at a large scale. The project implementation was shorter than the original duration of four years due to various administrative and management issues faced by the project and it is unlikely that the project made an impact that could lead to broader adoption.

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 as follows:

1. Promotion of market gardening with drip irrigation makes it possible to secure production in a context of climate change while improving food security. The large-scale development of this technology implies, however, the establishment of an investment support or subsidy policy, and a structuring of the sectors to improve the conditions of access to equipment and inputs as well as to the market in a regional exchange framework.
2. Awareness of the reality and effects of climate change translates into a high demand for farmers' innovations and a high capacity for change in their farming practices. Rural development policies will have to take into account this demand of producers in terms of innovations and support their desire for diversification.
3. The economic dimension of beekeeping, and the interest of the populations in this activity, represent an important motivation for the preservation, the extension and the enrichment of the wooded areas.
4. Reforestation is a demanding activity in terms of work and monitoring and is sometimes difficult to conduct in a community context (availability of land and guarantee of medium and long-term rights on reforested areas). The promotion of individual reforestation (orchard, hedge and grove) with improved varieties of species with high economic value is popular with rural populations because it helps to reconcile the fight against climate change and meeting the financial needs of households.
5. Cultivation in reforestation plots (*taungya* method) during the first three years improves the plants' survival rate, growth and development significantly which also allows landless farmers to have permanent access to crop plots by moving into state forests. They become itinerant farmers using one plot for two or three years and then move on to the next.
6. ADAPT's experience shows that behavioural changes are best achieved when interventions combine advocacy and pilot operations that contribute to the community/household economic strengthening perspective.
7. The strategy of outsourcing and delegating implementation responsibilities (known as *faire-faire*) and the strong involvement of partners on the ground is an effective implementation arrangement for institutional sustainability. However, the partnership can be thwarted due to delays in procurement process and signing of contracts with the partners as in this case of the current project.
8. The integration of the project into PADAT (the baseline project) reduced the visibility of the project and its objectives. The lack of specific follow-up (supervision reports, RIMS, AWPB, etc.) and the fact that the project started two years after PADAT also contributed to this lack of visibility, which certainly affected its implementation.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations are listed below:

1. Carry out a review of beekeeping interventions in order to develop a national strategy to promote this activity by integrating the interrelations with forestry activities, particularly reforestation.
2. Develop a national strategy for irrigation development, including drip irrigation and micro-sprinkling, taking into account issues of access to water, access to equipment and pumping technologies and by building capacities on farm management and structuring irrigated value chains.
3. Conduct a capitalization study of the experiences and good farming practices in the Sahel countries in order to integrate them into agricultural development strategies to cope with climate change in the context of Togo. Continue sensitization and training on climate change and ensure the dissemination of adapted varieties of rice, maize and cassava as well as the various good practices tested within the framework of the project which have received very positive feedback from the affected populations.

4. Identify experiences tested by other projects and accepted by financial and technical partners that had impacts in terms of reducing the duration of the contracting and procurement procedures.
5. Develop and implement a capacity building plan for the operational/managerial directorates in order to create a pool of confirmed skills for more efficient project management.

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?	This TER didn't have access to the full evaluation report which was in French. It's not possible to comment on the adequacy of the information and evidence on the basis of the summary of the report available in English.	UA
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The English version of the TE made available for this TER didn't have adequate information to determine if the TE's evidence was complete and convincing.	UA
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The information in the English version didn't cover different dimensions of sustainability. But this TER cannot comment as the extent to which the main TE covered assessed different aspects of sustainability	UA
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The Lessons listed in the English version of the report do not match or draw from the evidence or issues listed in the rest of the report. Since the main report was in French, this TER cannot comment if this was the case with the main report as well.	UA
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The report contains information on project cost and co-financing but doesn't include if the co-financing from IFAD was materialized and also the implication of the low co-financing on the project outputs.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	This was not covered adequately in the English summary made available for this TER. But it's not possible to say whether this aspect was covered adequately in the original report available in French.	UA
Overall TE Rating		UA

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

Beside an English summary of the TE, no additional sources were used in the preparation of this TER.