

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

1. Project Data

| Summary project data | | | |
|--|---------------------------|---|------------------------|
| GEF project ID | | 4720 | |
| GEF Agency project ID | | 615423 | |
| GEF Replenishment Phase | | GEF-5 | |
| Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects) | | FAO | |
| Project name | | Land rehabilitation and rangelands management in small holders agro-pastoral production systems in south western Angola | |
| Country/Countries | | Angola | |
| Region | | Africa | |
| Focal area | | Land Degradation | |
| Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives | | LD-1 Agriculture and Rangeland Systems: Maintenance or improvement of the flow of services of agro- ecosystems that sustain the livelihoods of local communities. LD-3 Integrated landscapes: reduction of pressure on natural resources in the competition for the use of land. | |
| Executing agencies involved | | Ministério do Ambiente (MA), Ministério da Agricultura e do Desenvolvimento Rural e das Pescas (MINANDER), Provincial governments of Namibe, Huila, and Benguela | |
| NGOs/CBOs involvement | | None | |
| Private sector involvement | | None | |
| CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP) | | 1/28/2014 | |
| Effectiveness date / project start | | 4/28/2014 | |
| Expected date of project completion (at start) | | 4/22/2018 | |
| Actual date of project completion | | 6/30/2018 | |
| Project Financing | | | |
| | | At Endorsement (US \$M) | At Completion (US \$M) |
| Project Preparation Grant | GEF funding | - | |
| | Co-financing | - | |
| GEF Project Grant | | 3.01 | 3.01 |
| Co-financing | IA own | 0.55 | 0.65 |
| | Government | 16.74 | 16.83 |
| | Other multi- /bi-laterals | | |
| | Private sector | | |
| NGOs/CSOs | | | |
| Total GEF funding | | 3.01 | 3.01 |
| Total Co-financing | | 17.29 | 17.48 |
| Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing) | | 20.30 | 20.49 |
| Terminal evaluation/review information | | | |
| TE completion date | | November 2018 | |
| Author of TE | | João N. Pinto | |
| TER completion date | | February 2019 | |
| 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 | S | | S | MS |
| Sustainability of Outcomes | | | MS | MU |
| M&E Design | | | S | S |
| M&E Implementation | | | S | S |
| Quality of Implementation | | | S | S |
| Quality of Execution | | | NA | MS |
| Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report | | | | S |

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Global Environmental Objective of the project is to ‘pursue Land Degradation neutrality by enhancing the capacity of southwestern Angola’s smallholder agro-pastoral sector to mitigate the impact of Land Degradation (LD) processes and to rehabilitate degraded lands by mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) technologies into agro-pastoral and agricultural development initiatives’ (PD, Pg 82).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document, the Development Objective of the project is ‘to increase local livelihoods by introducing locally adapted Sustainable Livelihood Management approaches and by strengthening and diversifying livestock and non-livestock-based value chains’ (PD, Pg 82). The project had the following four components:

1. Rangeland management planning
2. Rangeland rehabilitation through best range and herd management practices for small agro-pastoralists
3. Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management (SLM) into agricultural and environmental sector policies and programs
4. Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation

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

There were no 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 |
|----------------------|-----------------------------|

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the relevance of the project as 'satisfactory'. The project responded to Angola's priorities to address land degradation, desertification and unsustainable use of natural resources, which were the main problems identified as affecting the southern part of the country. The project aligned with the main national policies and program, which dealt with land degradation, environmental protection, biodiversity conservation and rural development in a coherent manner as reflected in the National Food Security and Nutrition Strategy (ENSAN) and Strategy for Fighting Poverty (ECP). The Long-Term Development Strategy, 2025 of Government of Angola also emphasized agriculture development as a key component for ensuring food security and a concern of developing commercial agriculture. Other policies and programs that this project was coherent with include the National Development Plan 2013-2017 (PND), the Agricultural Sector Mid-Term Development Plan 2013-2017 (PDMPSA) and the Municipal Programme for Rural Development and the Fight against Poverty (PMIDRCP, 2010).

The project contributed towards the GEF Strategy under the focal area of 'Land Degradation', namely in its strategic objectives LD-1 - Agricultural and Rangeland Systems: Maintenance or improvement of the flow of agro-ecosystems services that sustain the livelihoods of local communities; and LD-3 - Integrated landscapes: reduction of pressure on natural resources in the competition for the use of land.

| | |
|--------------------------|--|
| 4.2 Effectiveness | Rating: Moderately satisfactory |
|--------------------------|--|

The TE assesses the effectiveness of the project as 'satisfactory'. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assesses the effectiveness of the project as 'moderately satisfactory'. The project was successful in training a substantial number of people from public institutes and NGOs in different methods to analyze land degradation and participatory planning of land management. The Agro-Pastoral Field Schools (APFS) herd management practices introduced through the project contributed to introducing new community work methods, leading to improvement in agricultural techniques, animal production and the livelihoods of the communities. The project was also successful in rehabilitating over 750 ha of rangelands and establishing 30 000 ha of rangeland reserves and 28 water points. However, the actual results of these rehabilitation efforts will take longer time to materialize and could not be recorded within the timeframe of the project. Lastly, the enhancement of ethnoveterinary medicine was found to be relevant and opened up new opportunities for communities to tackle animal health issues.

However, the performance of the project under component 3 was not found satisfactory. Although, the project made significant progress in the preparation of a proposal for a sustainable land management policy, it was not yet approved by the government. Also, the project's contribution to reinforcing the

governance and dialogue among multiple stakeholders and different sectors of the government was very limited. A governmental investment plan that could have reinforced sustainable land management was also not prepared.

Component 1: Rangeland management planning

The project was successful in building capacities through training close to 200 (target of 80) people from public institutions and civil society organization on different innovative methods for analysis and decision making on land degradation and facilitate integrated territorial planning. However, the training was geared towards intermediate management and directors, and not the field specialists, which according to the TE, could compromise the effectiveness in the practical application of the knowledge and skills acquired. High turnover in specialists and decision makers, was also found to further limit the appropriation of the capacities covered. The evaluator found evidence of some towns interested in using the land degradation assessment in drylands. But the TE notes that long-term monitoring would be required for further supporting and consolidating the methods promoted through the trainings. The project led to the successful completion of 6 land development plans (target of 8) negotiated and agreed upon. However, the TE notes that this activity was performed and completed very close to the end of the project. Completion of these plans in the first half of the project would have provided more time to monitor its evolution in the field and support the institutions and other stakeholders involved in this activity.

Component 2 - Rangeland rehabilitation through best range and herd management practices

As per the expected outputs under this component, the project supported training of 30 master trainers (target of 20 trainers) as Agro-Pastoral Field Schools (APFS) facilitators in sustainable land management and herd management practices. The project was also successful in establishing close to 35 APFS (target of 70 APFS) with herders and farmers adopting SLM and herd management practices. As per the recommendation of the midterm review, the target of 70 established Agro-Pastoral Field Schools was found ambitious and unrealistic within the project duration. As a result, the target was revised to 35 APFS during the midterm and a guide on minimum quality guidelines for the Agro-Pastoral Field Schools was also produced during the project. The TE highlights that 'APFS constitutes a complex method and requires significant time to gain the trust of the communities, implement changes in behavior and work routines and promote social transformation' (TE Pg 38). These practices were reportedly used by communities with improvement in agricultural and rangeland techniques. The project was also successful in developing capacity of the communities on ecosystem-based rehabilitation, as a result of which a total of 750 ha (target of 500 ha) rangeland was rehabilitated. The project also successfully tested and implemented 6 Agro-Pastoral Field Schools (target of 6) based verification and experimentation systems for grasses adaptability and palatability. The project also exceeded the target and rehabilitated 28 as against 15 water points. A total of 30,000 ha of *mise en défense* rangeland reserve area was delimited as against target of 900 ha. But the results of this activity in terms of pasture improvement as well as land and biodiversity conservation, couldn't be confirmed at the time of evaluation as the results for such activities would only be visible in the medium - long term.

Expected outcome of improvement of livelihood of households in at least 70 communities was not achieved fully. Despite trainings (3 trainings) on micro-entrepreneurship and preparation of over 60 community projects, only one activity generating income could be supported in practice (production of mumpeke cosmetic oil). Similarly, regarding the last the output under this component, aimed to improve the production and value chain of meat in five herding communities, the project facilitated

several trainings for livestock handlers on ethnoveterinary medicine, equipping them with ‘veterinary kits’ that also brought revenue to the facilitators and benefitted the communities.

Component 3 - Mainstreaming sustainable land management into agricultural and environmental sector policies and programs

The outcome related to increased integration of sustainable land management into policies and programs was not fully achieved. Despite discussions and work done through the project on the proposal of a ‘National Policy for Sustainable Land management’, it was not yet approved by the government. The project raised awareness amongst decision makers on the need to reinforce responsible governance of tenure of land (VGGT) and the adaptation of the national policies. But there was still little evidence of mainstreaming of sustainable land management in other programs and policies of the government. The output aimed to create a platform to implement Decree 2016/11 was eliminated after the recommendation from midterm review due to the provision of creation of such a platform through other projects in the field that had more financial resources to accomplish this. The project’s contribution to the reinforcement of governance and dialogue among several stakeholders and different sectors of the government was very limited. The proposal after the mid-term review to create an online platform to facilitate inter-sector coordination could also not be get much interest from the government. Another outcome expected under this component of securing investments from the government to reinforce Sustainable Land Management (SLM) in agro-pastoral systems was also not met. But the project was able to establish negotiations with the donor community (European Commission, International Fund for Agricultural Development and GEF), which generated ‘good prospects for channeling resources to maintain continuity of the project outcomes’ (TE, Pg 46).

Component 4 - Knowledge management, monitoring and evaluation - Satisfactory

The project had a monitoring and evaluation system in place, which provided for the systematic collection and distribution of information about the progress. Good practices were systematized and disseminated in different formats (brochures, websites, local media). News about the project and its good practices was disseminated in the Food and Agriculture and Agriculture Organization (FAO) bulletin, GEF website, Food and Agriculture and Agriculture Organization (FAO) newsletter about agroecology, and World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies (WOCAT) platform, among others.

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

The TE does not provide a rating to the efficiency of the project. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assesses the efficiency of the project as ‘satisfactory’. The project had an institutional structure, including the Project Steering Committee, that was appropriate to facilitate efficient decision-making, coordination and execution of the project in the field. Implementation of the project was delayed in its first year but it recovered well from the second year onwards and picked up satisfactory progress in the completion of the activities and the achievement of outputs. At the time of the final evaluation, the project reported a financial implementation rate of 95 percent, a GEF grant disbursement rate of 100 percent and full realization of co-funding from rest of the sources.

4.4 Sustainability

Rating: **Moderately unlikely**

The TE assesses the sustainability of the project as 'moderately satisfactory'. Based on the evidence in the TE, this TER assesses the likelihood of sustainability as 'moderately unlikely'. Given the current economic and financial situation in Angola, possibility of an increase in public investment to give continuity to the project's outcomes is quite weak. However, as the TE notes, there was a possibility of mobilization of funds from the donor community to ensure their continuity through new projects in the short-term (European Commission, GEF, IFAD). The project also helped in generating awareness and trainings amongst community members, who were likely to sustain the initiatives taken under the project. But, the legislative and public policy framework in Angola was still weak and that required it to more clearly integrate the ecosystem rehabilitation and sustainable management aspect into its ambit. Furthermore, it is likely that this region will continue to be affected by extreme climate phenomena, such as prolonged droughts, which could also compromise some of the outcomes achieved under the project. The four dimensions of sustainability are discussed further below:

Financial: **Moderately unlikely**

This TER agrees with the rating to the likelihood of sustainability due to financial risks as 'moderately unlikely'. Given the country's current economic and financial crisis, it is unlikely for the government to allocate public investments for sustainable land management and the rehabilitation of degraded lands, which was one of the main outcomes of the project. The proposal on 'National Policy for Sustainable Land Management' prepared by the project was also not approved at the time of evaluation. But, according to the TE, its approval in future is likely to open up new opportunities for increase in public funding. However, prospects of allocation of public services were much more at the local level through municipal administration for continuation of support to project activities. In addition, the TE also indicates towards prospects for the donor community to give continuity to and support to the project outcomes, namely through the new GEF, IFAD and European Commission projects. But there is no information if any new projects were approved from these donors at the time of the evaluation.

Socio-political: **Moderately likely**

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the likelihood of sustainability due to risks associated with socio-political support as 'moderately likely'. TE notes that fight against desertification would continue to be one of the Government of Angola's political priorities, particularly in the context of climate change. Also, the project raised awareness and a substantial number of specialists from public institutions trained, who were likely to support some of the approaches, specially related to Agro-Pastoral Field Schools methods, introduced through the project. In addition, a significant number of members of the communities received trainings on animal health and handling, are also likely to continue their activities independently. Lastly, the dissemination of outcomes of the project also led several NGOs to demonstrate an interest in adopting the methods, specially Agro-Pastoral Field Schools methods, introduced through the project.

Institutional: **Moderately unlikely**

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the likelihood of sustainability due to risks from institutional factors as 'moderately unlikely'. Despite efforts made by the project through trainings and awareness-

raising activities, the ecosystem rehabilitation and sustainable management aspects were still not integrated fully into the legislative and public policy framework in Angola. The proposal prepared by the project of the 'National Sustainable Land Management Policy' could improve this scenario, but was pending government approval at the time of the evaluation. The project managed to raise greater awareness of the need to reinforce responsible governance of tenure of land (VGGT) and the decision-makers became aware of the need to adapt national policies and legislation to the commitments taken on globally. However, there was still little evidence of the mainstreaming of sustainable land management in projects of the Multisectoral Commission for the Environment (CMA) or in other existing coordination and dialogue structures, due to which the overall institutional structure may still not be considered conducive for the initiatives taken under the project.

Environmental: **Unlikely**

This TER concurs with the rating assigned to likelihood of sustainability due to risks from environmental factors as 'unlikely'. The impact of climate change is quite visible in the south of Angola, where the project activities were implemented. It is likely that this region will continue to be affected by extreme climatic phenomena, namely prolonged droughts, which may compromise some of the project's outcomes. The TE states that if the phenomena related to climate change got stronger, the livelihoods of the families supported through the project could be affected, particularly affecting herds (death of livestock) and the production of the agricultural subsistence crops.

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 planned for co-funding from the partners of around \$ 17 291 000. At the time of the final evaluation, the co-funding realized was reported as \$ 17 485 00 and exceeded what had been foreseen initially, which led to the successful completion of all the project activities on time.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The project started in April 2014 and was supposed to close after 48 months in April 2018. But the project was extended until June 2018. The project experienced substantial delays during the startup phase, mainly due to delay in selection and establishment of the project team (hiring international staff fluent in Portuguese, Chief Technical Adviser as well as hiring local personnel with the right experience and profile for the project), logistical difficulties due to a wide geographical area of intervention and delays in signing protocols and concessions of facilities for the project by local authorities and the financial crisis in the country that began in the second half of 2014. However, the project managed to recover and complete the activities planned from the second year onwards, due to which the project was completed more or less on time with only three months of extension.

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:

Overall, the project had a moderate level of support from the government at the national level. The support from the government was evident through the participation of government representatives in the Steering Committee which was responsible for the overall supervision of the project. The co-funding from the government also materialized fully. However, activities under component 3, which to a great extent were dependent on the support provided by the Government, were not completed during the project. For instance, the sustainable land management policy prepared through the project was still pending approval; the establishment of a new cross sectoral coordination system that also required Government's approval and institutional changes, could not be completed and the output related to mainstreaming of the sustainable land management approach in sectoral program and policies could also not be undertaken. But, as TE notes, Component 3 focused on political, institutional, legislative and budgetary changes that require time and are not always possible within the lifetime of a single project. The project, however, had good support from the government authorities at the provincial and municipal level, completing most of the activities undertaken within their purview on time.

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 does not assign a rating to the M&E design at entry. Based on the evidence in the available documents, this TER assesses it to be 'satisfactory'. The project document included a comprehensive results framework, including targets and SMART indicators and means of verification, designed to monitor both project performance and impact. The baseline and targets were also established in the results framework. The project monitoring and evaluation function was well budgeted, with provision for day to day monitoring, six monthly and annual progress reports and reviews, with mid-term and terminal evaluation. The responsibilities for carrying out different monitoring and evaluation functions were also clearly defined in the project document. | |
| 6.2 M&E Implementation | Rating: Satisfactory |

This TER agrees with the assessment by the TE of M&E implementation as 'satisfactory'. According to the TE, the project had an adequate monitoring and evaluation system that involved gathering of information in the field regularly. The data collection and monitoring involved beneficiaries, regular field visits by the local technical teams and central project team, as well as periodic meetings with different stakeholders involved (including the Steering Committee), and FAO/GEF-Rome backstopping missions. The reporting of information was systematically gathered and shared through different reports, namely: i) initial project report; ii) twice a year Project Progress Reports; iii) Annual Project Implementation

Reviews; iv) technical Reports; v) co-funding Reports; vi) Land Degradation Monitoring Tool (LD-GEF); vii) Mid-term Review Report. Midterm review led to several recommendations that helped in adaptive management and improve the effectiveness of the project.

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 |
|--|-----------------------------|

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the quality of project implementation as ‘satisfactory’. The project was implemented through FAO Representation in Angola, which provided administrative, organizational and financial management support to the project. It also played a very important role in the institutional relationship with the Ministries at central level. The Lead Technical Officer based in Rome also seemed to have provided adequate ongoing technical support throughout the execution of the project. This support was well received by the local project team, in terms of planning, preparation of work plans, clarification of technical and methodological queries and budgetary reviews. However, some stakeholders consulted during the final evaluation expressed their dissatisfaction with FAO administrative/bureaucratic procedures (recruitment, resource transfer, signing of contracts, etc.) that delayed the progress of the project during its startup phase. But the delay in the initial year did not affect the project as it picked up pace in later years and completed all the activities.

| | |
|---|--|
| 7.2 Quality of Project Execution | Rating: Moderately satisfactory |
|---|--|

The TE does not assign a rating to the quality of project execution. Based on the evidence in the available reports, this TER assesses the quality of execution as ‘moderately satisfactory’. According to the Project Document, the execution of the project was to be carried out by the Government of Angola represented by the Ministry of Environment (MA) in close cooperation with the Ministry of Agriculture and Rural Development (MINANDER). Other executing partners included: the provincial governments (Namibe, Huila and Benguela) and the municipal and communal administrations and their technical services. As per the TE, the project established three provincial coordinators (appointed by the provincial governments) and five municipal coordinators (appointed by the municipal administrations), in addition to the overall coordination led by the Steering Committee. The information from reviews, specially mid-term review, was used for adaptive management by the project team and the Steering Committee members. For instance, the midterm review found the manuals and methodological guides prepared during the project too theoretical and therefore difficult to use by specialists. The project team revised these materials and prepared simpler and more practical ‘field guides’ adapted to the local context (TE, 35). The project team also revised the targets of Agro-Pastoral Field Schools (APFS) herd management practices from 70 to 35 after the midterm review, which found this target unrealistic given

the project duration and difficulties of working in the field. Overall, the institutional structure, specially created at the provincial and municipal level, and the Steering Committee was appropriate that facilitated decision-making, coordination, execution and review of the project in the field.

The TE does not highlight any issues related to the quality of project execution, other than the need for a national coordinator who could have assumed a more political role in the dialogue between the different sectors and ensured a greater participation from the government. The project had 'a low degree of appropriation by the partner government institutions, as these had assumed a passive position, limiting themselves to waiting for the project team to fund and implement the activities' (TE, Pg 7). So, while the quality of execution at the provincial and municipal was satisfactory, strengthening of the institutional structure through recruitment of the national project coordinator could have led to better coordination amongst government departments at national level, which in turn could perhaps have resulted in more progress under component 3 where the government partnership was found lacking.

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 evidence in relation to the environmental objective was not documented as it related to more long-term outcomes. For example, the project resulted in rehabilitation of over 750 hectares of rangelands, establishing almost 30 000 hectares of rangeland reserve areas (*mise en défense*) and rehabilitation of 28 water points. But increase in vegetation due to rehabilitation of rangelands was not documented as the recuperation efforts are likely to take significant amount of time to generate effects on the land.

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 reports that there was evidence of an improvement in the livelihoods of the beneficiary families as a result of this project. However, the exact data on improvement in the well-being is not shared in any of the available reports.

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

1. According to the TE, close to 200 people received training on different innovative methods (Land Degradation Assessment Methodology, Assessment of Climate Resilience of Farmers and Pastoralists (SHARP), Geographic Information System). The project made a significant effort, in terms of access to information and knowledge through the provision of manuals, methodological guides and technical reports in appropriate formats, which were important tools for supporting the work of specialists and decision makers. However, TE found little evidence that the public institutions were going to introduce these methods in their daily work routines and practices given that this process required ongoing monitoring and learning by experience, which could not be supported through the project due to its limited time duration.

2. The innovative methods introduced through the project were well received by the communities, namely: i) participatory selection of species for the rehabilitation of agro-pastoral ecosystems; ii) participatory rehabilitation of ecosystems with the support of the community; and iii) verification and experimentation systems for adaptability and palatability. The adoption of these participatory methods led to rehabilitation of over 750 hectares of rangelands and 28 water points and establishment of almost 30 000 hectares of rangeland reserve areas (*mise en défense*). However, the impact of the rehabilitation can only be seen in medium and long run and not necessarily within in the duration of the project. But, according to the TE, communities and public institutions were committed to continuing with this activity and monitoring the reserve areas, with a strong likelihood to recuperate the rangelands in future.

b) Governance

1. The proposal of a ‘National Policy for Sustainable Land Management’ was concluded and widely discussed at national level, but there was no evidence in the available document that it was going to be approved in the short-term.

2. The project managed to raise greater awareness of the need to reinforce responsible governance of tenure of land (VGGT) and the decision-makers became aware of the need to adapt national policies and legislation to the commitments taken on globally. However, there was still little evidence of the mainstreaming of sustainable land management in projects of the Multisectoral Commission for the Environment (CMA) or in other existing coordination and dialogue structures.

3. The project's contribution to the reinforcement of governance and dialogue among several stakeholders and different sectors of the Government was very limited. Reportedly, only preliminary meetings were held with the Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) Land Tenure team for the creation of an online forum. A proposal was prepared for a website but it did not have any other progress at the time of the evaluation.

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 project did not lead to any positive or negative unintended impacts.

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.

The TE notes that the project established negotiations with the donor community (European Commission, IFAD and GEF) for channeling resources to maintain the continuity of the project outcomes. But it does not provide any further details on the projects that are going to be supported through these donors.

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 lessons listed in the TE are as follows:

1. The implementation of capacity-building processes requires a substantial amount of time, which may exceed the duration of the project.
2. The projects must cover a realistic geographical range of areas.
3. The projects must consider less ambitious targets for the outputs, particularly in terms of the implementation of the Agro-Pastoral Field School methods.
4. The involvement of local governments in the decision-making processes of the projects is important, as well as the measures that favor appropriation by the national institutions.
5. The Agro-Pastoral Field School methods need a minimum set of initial resources to operate sufficiently.
6. The publications (guides, manuals, reports, etc.) produced and distributed to the public institutions must be suitable for their context, as well as easy and practical to use.
7. The integration of specialists from public institutions in the local technical teams of the projects must be prioritized over hiring external personnel.
8. The projects' design must include a suitable gender analysis and this approach must be applied consistently throughout execution.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The main recommendations listed in the TE are as follows:

1. Food and Agriculture Organization recommended a set of steps to the partner organizations to guarantee a minimum monitoring of the main outcomes, in order to guarantee their sustainability. This should be followed by the respective responsible parties along with the timeframe maintained
2. Future GEF projects should be of longer duration, for example six to eight years, that allow more time for monitoring, consolidating the knowledge transferred and the practices/methods introduced. This is also particularly important in projects that focus on building capacities and promoting institutional changes for planning and management. This is also relevant for the projects that include aspects regarding the reinforcement of legislation and public policies, taking into account the time required for national governments to approve laws and policies.
3. Future GEF/FAO projects must focus on the establishment, by means of targeted training, of national specialists in the area of the methods that they aim to introduce. The local expertise so acquired could also be used for future projects instead of hiring international experts.
4. Future GEF/FAO projects must be designed based on a pre assessment and realistic diagnoses that show the real existing capacities at national level, particularly at the level of local institutions. This avoids the risk of designing projects based on the assumption that public institutions have the capacity to monitor/execute the actions, but then do not have any means to such end (e.g. money for fuel, available vehicles, appropriate facilities, etc.).
5. Future GEF and FAO projects that cover the topics of production and dissemination of knowledge must provide effective partnerships/collaborations with universities and research centres existing in the countries. This aims to promote the generation of knowledge in conjunction with national researchers/specialists, and contribute to research and development (R&D) at country level.
6. Future GEF/FAO projects must also include students from formal education (secondary and higher education) as beneficiaries of the capacity-building processes, to complement the exclusive training of specialists from public institutions (municipal services, agricultural, veterinary and environmental services). The aim is for secondary and higher education students to also benefit from the training actions and therefore have access to information on the innovative methods introduced by the projects.

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? | The TE provides a comprehensive assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project activities. | S |
| To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated? | The evidence presented is complete, internally consistent and ratings well substantiated. | S |
| To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy? | The TE covers different aspects of sustainability adequately | S |
| To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive? | Lessons given in the TE relate to the discussions and evidence in the main body of the report | S |
| Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used? | The TE confirmed the GEF budget and the actual co-financing that materialized during the project | S |
| Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems: | The TE covers the M&E aspect of the project in adequate details. | S |
| Overall TE Rating | | S |

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

No other documents were used for the preparation of this TER.