1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		4775	
GEF Agency project ID		GCP/ECU/085/GFF - GCP/ECU/092/SFC	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)	
Project name		Promotion of Climate-smart Livestock Management Integrating Reversion of Land Degradation and Reduction of Desertification Risks in Vulnerable Provinces	
Country/Countries		Ecuador	
Region		Latin America and Caribbean	
Focal area		Climate Change Mitigation / Climate Change Adaptation / Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CCM-5 - Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land-use change, and forestry); LD-1 To maintain or improve the flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain the livelihoods of local communities; LD-3 To reduce pressures on natural resources from conflicting land uses in the wider landscape.	
Stand alone or under a programmatic framework		Stand alone	
If applicable, parent program name and GEF ID		NA	
Executing agencies involved		FAO-Ecuador as the main implementing and executing body. Executing partners: Ministry of Environment of Ecuador (MAE) Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Small and medium sized livestock farmers, as one of the beneficiaries	
Private sector involvement (including micro, small and medium enterprises)[1]		El Ordeño La Telefónica	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval (MSP) date		July 01, 2015	
Effectiveness date / project start date		May 02, 2016	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 02, 2020	
Actual date of project completion		October 31, 2020	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.100	0.100
	Co-financing	0.688	0.688
GEF Project Grant		3.856	3.535
Co-financing	IA own	0.320	0.354
	Government	21.025	16.025
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	0.067

[1] Defined as all micro, small, and medium-scale profit-oriented entities, including individuals and informal entities, that earn income through the sale of goods and services rather than a salary. (GEF IEO 2022)

	NGOs/CBOs	0.811	1.757
	Other	-	0.024
Total GEF funding		3.956	3.635
Total Co-financing		22.157	18.227
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		26.113	21.862
Terminal evaluation validation information			
TE completion date		August 10, 2020	
Author of TE		Doris Cordero, Team Leader Gissela Moncayo	
TER completion date		December 12, 2022	
TER prepared by		Mariana Vidal Merino	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Neeraj Kumar Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives and theory of change

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Global Environmental Objective of the project is "to reduce soil degradation, and mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in the livestock sector of Ecuador" (TE, p. 13).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project is "to sustainably increase and improve the supply of goods and services from livestock production" (TE., p. 13).

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or project activities during implementation? What are the reasons given for the change(s)?

No changes reported.

3.4 Briefly summarize project's theory of change – describe the inputs and causal relationships through which the project will achieve its long-term impacts, key links, and key assumptions.

In Ecuador, the livestock sector is fundamental to food security and a primary source of livelihood. However, milk and meat productivity are low, particularly for small and medium-sized producers. These producers mainly practice livestock farming as extensive or free-range, with large, often underutilized areas. Such conditions increase this sector's Co2eq emissions, making it one major GHG emissions contributor at the national level (TE, p. 13).

The specific objective of the project was "to reduce soil degradation, increase adaptive capacity to climate change, and mitigate GHG emissions by implementing cross-sectoral policies and sustainable livestock management techniques, with emphasis in the vulnerable provinces."

To achieve its proposed objective, the project implemented five strategies: (i) strengthening of capacities among state civil servants; (ii) design and implementation of public policies; (iii) transfer of technologies to livestock farmers; (iv) monitoring of GHG emissions and adaptation capacity; and (iv) development of climate-smart livestock farming (CSL) incentives (TE, p. 14).

Medium-term outcomes of the project include the development of the national CSL Strategy, the creation of the Nationally Appropriate Mitigation Action for the livestock sector (livestock sector NAMA), the incorporation of CSL criteria in the land use and development plans (LUDP), the adoption of the CSL approach by the livestock producers of the seven provinces in which the project has been implemented and the use of financing mechanisms and incentives by the producers (TE, p. 14).

In the long term, the project contributes to reducing soil degradation and mitigating greenhouse gas emissions in the livestock sector. It also supports increasing and improving the supply of goods and services from livestock production in Ecuador. Pre-conditions for achieving these long-term goals are the political will of the Ecuadorian state to adopt and promote the CSL approach and the adoption of the approach by the producers at the national level (TE, p. 14).

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

The outcome ratings (relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and overall outcome rating) are on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory. The sustainability rating is on a four point scale: Likely to Unlikely.

Please justify the ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance and Coherence**	Rating: Highly Satisfactory

The TE assesses the project's relevance as **Highly Satisfactory.** This review concurs.

The project was consistent with the GEF 5 objectives regarding its strategic areas "climate change mitigation"[2] and "land degradation"[3] and with the GEF Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)[4] objectives. The project also aligned with the FAO Strategic Framework (2010-2019), Strategic Objective 2, "Increase and improve provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner" (outcomes 2.1, 2.2 and 2.4); and Strategic Objective 5, "Increase the resilience of livelihoods to threats and crises" (outcome 5.3) (TE, p. 17).

[2] Particularly CCM-5, “Promote conservation and enhancement of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land-use change, and forestry” (outcomes 5.1 and 5.3).

[3] Particularly Objectives LD-1, “To maintain or improve the flow of agro-ecosystem services to sustain the livelihoods of local communities” (Outcome 1.2) and LD-3, “To reduce pressures on natural resources from conflicting land uses in the wider landscape” (Outcome 3.1).

[4] Particularly SCCF Objective 1, “Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level” (outcomes 1.1 and 1.2); Objective 2, “Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level” (outcomes 2.1 and 2.2); and Objective 3, “Promote transfer and adoption of technology for adaptation” (outcomes 3.1 and 3.3).

The project was consistent with national priorities, particularly the National Plan for Good Living, the 2017-2021 National Development Plan "Toda una Vida", the 2012-2025 National Strategy on Climate Change, and its outcomes contribute to concrete climate change adaptation and mitigation targets in the country (TE, p. 18).

There is good alignment among the project's theory of change, governance structure, activities, and M&E system.

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: Highly satisfactory

The TE assesses the effectiveness of the project as **Highly satisfactory**, and this review concurs.

The project achieved all the outcomes and targets outlined in the project design and results framework. Noteworthy achievements include the incorporation of climate-smart livestock farming (CSL) approach into different strategies at national and local levels; 40,388 hectares of degraded lands for livestock production under the CSL approach; determination of the 2016 baseline for GHG emissions of cattle farming for Ecuador; development of two tools for monitoring GHG emissions, one at the national level and one at the farm level, among others (TE, p. 20).

Furthermore, the project had additional outcomes that were not part of the project design. These include the creation of a green credit line with development bank BanEcuador for CSL practices; the support to the preparation of gender indicators for the measurement, reporting and verification (MRV) system; and the inclusion of the CSL approach in Ecuador's National Agriculture Plan for 2020-2030. Additional technical outcomes are the development of online tools to measure adaptation capacity and the reduction of GHG emissions and the development of a mobile phone application in partnership with the private company Telefónica (TE, p. 20).

The project successfully validated and consolidated a livestock development model that supports producers' adoption of environmentally sustainable and improved management practices that can lead to increased income and reduced losses. It is considered that the project contributed to reducing land degradation and mitigating GHG emissions in the livestock sector in Ecuador (TE, p.42).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: Highly satisfactory

The TE assesses the project's effectiveness as **Highly satisfactory**, and this review concurs. Despite minor delays in activities and differences in co-financing, the project successfully achieved its planned objectives in a cost-effective and timely manner.

The project started in August 2016, with a proposed end date of June 2020. However, the project requested and received a no-cost extension until the end of October 2020. The stated reason was the ongoing Covid-19 pandemic, which caused delays in the formulation and revision of technical products and the project closure (PIR 2019-2020, p. 32). The TE (p. 30) notes that "despite the country's social and

political situation during the lifetime of the project, there were no substantial delays or effects that hindered the development of the project".

The total project funding was USD 26.1 million, including USD 4.0 million from the GEF and USD 22.2 million of co-financing. As of June 30, 2020, the actual disbursement of the GEF grant was USD 3,6 million (91,9% of the budget estimated at appraisal), and co-financing was USD 18.2 million (82,3% of the budget estimated at appraisal). Budget constraints of the implementing partners, the Ministry of Environment and Water of Ecuador (MAAE)[5] and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG), explain differences in estimated versus realized co-financing (PIR 2019-2020, p. 3). The TE notes that the project was able to leverage additional funding that was not contemplated in the project design (PIR 2019-202, p. 40).

4.4 **Outcome**	Rating: Highly Satisfactory

The TE assesses the achievement of project outcomes as **Highly satisfactory**, and this review agrees. The project outcomes were met and some of them exceeded expected targets. The project was highly relevant to the GEF and FAO and country priorities. It responded to a concrete need to overcome barriers to the spread of the sustainable livestock approach in Ecuador. Furthermore, the project was implemented in a cost-effective manner and without major delays.

Key outcomes related to environment, human well-being, and enabling conditions (Policy, Legal & Institutional Development; Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building; Knowledge Exchange & Learning; Multistakeholder Interactions) are summarized below:

A. Environmental Change. The project's Global Environmental Objective was to reduce soil degradation and mitigate greenhouse gas emissions in the livestock sector of Ecuador (TE, p. 13). By the end of the project, implemented activities contributed to the reduction of 50 034 tCO2eq of direct GHG emissions, and sequestration of 347 582 tCO2eq of carbon (stocks) in 2020, with a projected increase for 2021 (TE, p. 20). The project also implemented CSL practices in 40 388 hectares, including 3 275 conserved and 438 restored (TE, p. 21). Consequently, the project resulted in the increased and improved provision of goods and services from sustainable livestock production using climate-smart livestock farming (TE, p. 20).

B. Socioeconomic change. The Development Objective of the project was to sustainably increase and improve the supply of goods and services from livestock production. The project made it possible to validate and consolidate a livestock development model by means of which the producers benefit from an improvement in the management of their farms that involves an increased income and reduced losses or hardship (TE, p. 42).

C. Enabling conditions. Notable project's achievements include:

- Policy, Legal & Institutional Development. The project developed public policy documents and positioned climate-smart livestock farming (CSL) on the national agricultural agenda. The CSL

[5] Formerly the Ministry of Environment of Ecuador (MAE).

approach was incorporated in the NDC (submitted to the UNFCCC) as a line of action for the agricultural sector; the project supported the development of the sustainable livestock farming strategy 2030 and the livestock sector NAMA, both not yet finalized at the time the project was completed. Similarly, the CSL approach was integrated into relevant strategies at the province and cantonal Decentralised Autonomous Government levels (TE, p, 21).

- Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building. The project developed sound methodological tools and strengthened the capacities of a broad group of stakeholders (TE, p.42). Noteworthy, the project supported field schools for technical assistance and demonstrative practices. In total, 859 training workshops took place as part of the 37 field schools established, with 1,056 producers who graduated across seven different regions (TE, p, 21). The project also focused on promoting the creation or strengthening of local comprehensive businesses, establishing seven Agricultural Services Centres (ASC) in three provinces. These micro-enterprises provide technical services to producers on CSL practices and are run by local producers (TE, p. 23).
- Knowledge Exchange & Learning. The project developed a total of 75 CSL practices, some specific to the geographic regions, divided into 12 categories: "i) farm planning; ii) food; iii) food and nutrition; iv) animal management; v) animal health and welfare; vi) genetic improvement and reproduction; vii) conservation and restoration; viii) management to reduce conflict with wildlife; ix) management of agro-chemicals and veterinary supplies; x) management of livestock waste; xi) management of organic and inorganic solid waste; xii) management and handling of water" (TE, p. 22).
- Multistakeholder Interactions. The TE notes a good level of coordination of the project with the main stakeholders. In most of the provinces, the project technicians were hosted in the Ministry of Environment and Water of Ecuador facilities, which fostered inter-institutional coordination and trusting relationships inside each territory (TE, p. 31). Besides government stakeholders, the project successfully established partnerships with the private sector, which added value to the project (TE, p. 20).

D. Unintended impacts. The project alliance with the private company El Ordeño to train some of its milk-producer members in climate-smart livestock (CSL) practices created a private-driven pathway to promote and disseminate this approach (TE, xi). In terms of public policies with national scope, the TE notes the following unexpected outcomes: "i) creation of the green credit line at BanEcuador; ii) contribution to the formulation of gender indicators for the MRV system of the national climate action; iii) incorporation of the CSL approach in Ecuador's National Agriculture Plan for 2020-2030" (TE, p. 27).

4.5 **Sustainability**	Rating: Moderately unlikely

The TE assesses the likelihood of sustainability of the project benefits as **Moderately unlikely**. This review concurs. The following risks, if materialized, may affect the continuation of the project's benefits:

Financial resources. The economic crisis the country has been facing over recent years, which has been accentuated by the COVID-19 pandemic, is the main barrier to the sustainability of the project's benefits (TE, p. 40). The PIR (2019-2020) identifies, as a substantial risk, a lack of effectiveness of the BanEcuador

credit line for livestock implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MAG). To minimize this risk, the project recommends strengthening technical and political management with the MAG, other ministries, and the private sector.

Sociopolitical. At the local level, the lack of support for producers from the technicians of the ministries and decentralized autonomous government could hinder the continuity of the project's benefits. Conflicts related to land tenure and local governance could restrict the access to credit to continue with the approach (TE, p. 41).

Institutional framework and governance. The project identifies the risk of national technicians lacking knowledge on CSL practices as substantial. To minimize this risk, the project has put effort into training technicians from the National Sustainable Livestock Program to use the project's methodology (PIR 2019-2020, p. 29). The lack of a formal project exit strategy was another identified risk (TE, p. 39).

Environmental. The project identified the potential occurrence of climate-related risks such as extreme weather events and El Niño as a substantial risk. However, the project has reduced this risk by increasing the resilience and reducing the vulnerability of livestock producers (PIR 2019-2020, p. 30).

Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. The TE notes that the project is considered a benchmark due to the positive results in terms of training, inter-institutional coordination and the development of public policies that led to the achievement of the outcomes proposed (TE, p. 27). The project developed two online tools, one to monitor the reduction in GHG emissions and the other to calculate adaptation capacity at farm level. Both tools were to be launched on a mobile application developed by the private company Telefónica, to be used on a larger scale (TE, p. 25). The incorporation of the Climate-smart livestock farming approach into several policy documents at national and subnational levels is also a pathway to scale up the project interventions.

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, 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 co-financing was pertinent and relevant to achieving the project objectives, even though the actual funding was smaller than anticipated. The expected amount of co-financing was USD 22.2 million, however, at project closure only USD 18.2 million materialized.

The difference in co-financing arose from the economic crisis in Ecuador which impacted the pledged funds by the Ministry of Environment and Water of Ecuador and the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (TE, p. 48). There were no reported impacts to the project's sustainability or outcomes due to differences in co-financing.

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

The project began in August 2016, with a proposed end date of June 2020 and a duration of almost four years. Later, the project was granted a no-cost extension until October 2020. The TE reports some delays due to changes in the technical staff (TE, p. 30) and delays in implementing activities in some provinces due to political constraints (TE, p. 35). However, these minor delays did not affect project results (TE, p. 30).

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

The project conducted participatory rural diagnosis in each province to identify local needs, problems, and potential solutions. The TE notes that the high involvement of key stakeholders throughout the project cycle fostered a high level of participation and ownership of results.

The TE highlights the following strategies as contributing to the project's implementation and sustainability of its benefits: (i) The engagement modality with livestock producers, who signed a letter of agreement committing to participate and benefit from the project's activities and invest in implementing climate-smart livestock farming (CSL) practices; (ii) The alliance with the private company El Ordeño for training its milk-producing members in CSL practices; (iii) The cooperation agreement with the NGO Children of the Andes Humanitarian to implement CSL and install a dairy processing plant for the benefit of the educational centre and the neighbouring communities; and (iv) The agreement between FAO-Ecuador and BanEcuador to open a green credit line to finance the implementation of CSL practices, which was not part of the initial project design.

The TE also notes that the current complexity at FAO in collaborating with private stakeholders was a hindrance to the involvement of further private actors (TE, p. 36-37).

5.4 Other factors: In case the terminal evaluation discusses other key factors that affected project outcomes, discuss those factors and outline how they affected outcomes, whether positively or negatively.

The TE notes that if the project had linked producers to markets, that would have offered additional benefits to the livestock producer who adopted the CSL approach. However, this topic was not part of the project's ToC (TE, p. 42).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 **M&E Design at entry**	Rating: Highly satisfactory

The TE and the Mid-term review (MTR) both assess the project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) design as Highly satisfactory. This TE concurs.

The TE notes that the provincial Annual Operational Plan included management and outcome indicators, which facilitated regular monitoring of project activities and results. In addition, the Results Framework included SMART indicators and outcome and management indicators linked to the specific activities (TE, p. 33).

No changes to the original M&E design were reported.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: Highly satisfactory

The TE and the Mid-term review (MTR) both assess the implementation of the project monitoring and evaluation system as **Highly satisfactory.** This TE concurs.

The TE notes that the M&E system allowed the identification of emerging issues and implementation of corrective measures in a timely manner (TE, p. 43). The project published monthly progress reports based on the data from the M&E system, detailed by component and province, which supported the decision-making in real time. In many cases, visits were programmed to the provinces that experienced delays in the implementation of activities as a monitoring strategy to avoid delays and ensure the achievement of the outcomes and targets proposed (TE, p. 35). The use of innovative open-source applications (Open Data Kit-ODK) for monitoring and technical reporting of activities made it possible to centralize, order, systematize and communicate project implementation (Executive Summary of the Midterm Review of the Project).

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation rating is based on the assessment of the performance of GEF Agency(s). Quality of Execution rating is based on performance of the executing agency(s). In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six-point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 **Quality of Project Implementation**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE and PIR rate the quality of project implementation as Highly Satisfactory but do not provide supporting evidence. From the implicit evidence presented in the TE the project appears to be well implemented. Therefore, this review assesses quality of project implementation as **Satisfactory.**

FAO was responsible for the preparation of the project proposal, which was well designed, with relevant and attainable project outcomes, and clear and attainable objectives and indicators. The TE (p. viii) notes that "the project management model, in which FAO held the role of implementing and executing agency, proved to be efficient and suitable for the context", and that "it facilitated the achievement of outcomes and fulfilment of objectives, as well as the continuity of the activities."

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: Highly Satisfactory

The TE rates the quality of project execution as **Highly Satisfactory**, and this TER concurs. The TE notes that FAO directly executed the project satisfactorily and efficiently (TE, p. 43). The project budget was managed efficiently, and activities were implemented without significant delays. Purchases and staff recruitment were relevant for implementation (TE, p. 30).

The steering committee (composed of the ministers of the Ministry of Environment and Water of Ecuador and of, the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, and the FAO Representative) and the project management committee (composed of the technicians involved) worked effectively and fostered inter-institutional coordination by holding periodic meetings and taking timely corrective measures. FAO had an impartial role as technical advisor and bridge when there was a change in authorities and/or in technical staff with roles in the project (TE, p. iix-ix).

The TE attributes achieving and surpassing the project outcomes and targets to outstanding project coordination at central and provincial levels as well as the commitment of the project staff (TE, p.31).

8. Lessons and recommendations

8.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, including how they could have application for other GEF projects. Lessons must be based on project experience.

The TE highlights eight lessons learned (TE, pp. 45-46), summarized in this section:

- The regular monitoring of the project's alignment with national priorities and policies helped in addressing the needs of the interested parties, challenges that arose during the implementation and in implementing adaptation measures. This becomes particularly relevant in times of crisis and sociopolitical instability. (Relevance)
- The use of participatory methods made it possible to design a capacity-building strategy contextualized to the needs of the livestock sector of each province. The direct relationship of the project technicians with the individual producers rather than via groups, associations or trades that often prioritize private interests was also key for achieving the outcomes and targets proposed. (Effectiveness)
- For projects implemented by two or more ministries with different objectives and competencies, it can be helpful to have a neutral third party with a high technical level and an active role in inter-institutional coordination. The project shows that, for future actions, the technical and support role

of the FAO National Office makes it possible to minimize negative impacts related to changes in authorities and technical staff, conflicting objectives between ministries, etc. (Efficiency)

- The M&E and knowledge management systems used made it possible to generate a project documentation bank and store the platform for CSL knowledge management online, which was useful for the sustainability of project outcomes and for promoting their replication (Monitoring and evaluation).
- The permanent presence of project technical staff in the provinces made it possible to support the producers constantly, increasing their engagement. The formalization of the commitment of each producer by signing the LoA for co-execution clarified the project's contribution to the producers and ensured their commitment to maintaining the CSL practices after the project ended. (Participation and commitment of the interested parties)
- The prior diagnosis of the specific roles, problems and needs of the different beneficiary groups is an essential input when generating an effective intervention strategy that responds to the situation and needs of the participants. It is also important to incorporate the gender-sensitive approach from the design stage and by the whole project team, with guidance of a specialist. (Gender and social equality aspects).
- The development of capacities of the technical team and professionals involved in the project. One important lesson is the need to promote the integration of technical team members in other institutional spaces and new initiatives, which will contribute to the sustainability of the outcomes and strengthen those institutions. (Sustainability)
- To integrate the commercial approach, the value chains, the insertion into the markets and the relationship with the private sector within the dynamic of FAO projects, which would make it possible to give incentives and contribute to ensuring better income for the producers who adopted the climate-smart livestock farming approach. (Progress towards impact)

8.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE (p. 48-50) outlines eight recommendations, which are summarized below:

Recommendations specific to the area of action of the project:

R1. To contribute to the country's commitments regarding climate change, it is recommended: (i) The project team should finalize the 2030 Sustainable Livestock Farming Strategy proposal and the livestock sector NAMA proposal as soon as possible. (ii) The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and the Ministry of Environment and Water of Ecuador should assess whether the livestock sector NAMA can be adopted or sent to the UNFCCC. (iii) The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock should assess the inclusion of the 2030 Sustainable Livestock Farming Strategy to have a political framework that facilitates the international financing of the livestock sector NAMA and in other similar initiatives.

R2. Ecuador should consolidate the green credit line in the state development bank. It is recommended: (i) BanEcuador should work with the international development bank to make the green credit line sustainable. (ii) FAO should encourage collaboration between BanEcuador and Corporación Nacional de

Finanzas Populares y Solidarias to support the popular and solidarity-based financial sector organizations so that they can offer the green credit line.

R3. To maintain the climate-smart livestock farming practices implemented by the livestock producers, it is recommended: (i) The Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock, for the Ministry of Environment and Water of Ecuador and FAO should support the decentralized autonomous governments in the implementation of the climate-smart livestock farming approach. (ii) FAO should promote outreach actions with private stakeholders to support the sustainability and replication of the climate-smart livestock farming approach.

R4. The Loja provincial decentralized autonomous government and the provincial departments of the Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock and the Ministry of Environment and Water of Ecuador in Loja, should continue implementing the gender equality strategy developed by the project.

R5. To maintain the outcomes (sustainability) achieved in the environmental, social, institutional and financial field, it is recommended: (i) FAO should promote the design and financing of new projects following the climate-smart livestock farming approach in the country and the region. (ii) The institutions involved should assess the possibility of including the project technical team members in the new initiatives to offer sustainability and replicate the climate-smart livestock farming approach.

Recommendations that address topics beyond the area of control of the project:

R6. The GEF Coordination Unit in Rome and FAO-Ecuador should identify the beneficial elements of having FAO as implementing and executing agency of a project. For example, when involving projects that link two or more ministries or portfolios of the State with diverging objectives and roles, FAO can play a key role as a high-level technical advisor, neutral third party.

R7. FAO should consider the monitoring and evaluation system developed in the project as a model to follow. Lessons learned should be systematized and shared with other GEF projects.

R8. In terms of impact, future FAO programmes and projects promoting climate-smart livestock farming and/or sustainable agricultural production should include value chains, market access, and partnerships with the private sector. FAO's connection to private stakeholders must be agile and efficient to respond to the sector's demands.

9. 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/indicators of terminal evaluation quality	GEF IEO COMMENTS	Rating

1. Timeliness: terminal evaluation report was carried out and submitted on time?		HS
2. General information: Provides general information on the project and evaluation as per the requirement?		HS
3. Stakeholder involvement: the report was prepared in consultation with – and with feedback from - key stakeholders?	Not clear if stakeholders' feedback was sought on the draft report	S
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change?		HS
5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology?	Not clear which activities were covered for verification	S
6. Outcome: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes?		HS
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability?	The likelihood of risks materializing, and their effects are not discussed	MS
8. M&E: Presents sound assessment of the quality of the M&E system?	Quality of M&E design and implementation, as well as use of information from the M&E system for project management, are not discussed in sufficient depth.	MS
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing?		HS
10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance?	Very limited discussion of factors that affected implementation and execution	MU

11. Safeguards: Provides information on application of environmental and social safeguards, and conduct and use of gender analysis?	In-depth account of the gender strategy. No report on environmental safeguards.	S
12. Lessons and recommendations are supported by the project experience and are relevant to future programming?		HS
13. Ratings: Ratings are well-substantiated by evidence, realistic and convincing?		S
14. Report presentation: The report was well-written, logically organized, and consistent?		HS
Overall quality of the report		S

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

- Executive Summary of the Midterm Review of the Project
- Midterm Review of the project (Spanish version)