GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form for OPS4

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	
GEF Project ID:	504		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
IA/EA Project ID:		**GEF financing:**	$9.05	UA
Project Name:	Botswana, Kenya, Mali: Management of Indigenous Vegetation for the Rehabilitation of Degraded Rangelands in the Arid Zone of Africa	IA/EA own:		
Countries:	Botswana, Kenya, Mali	Government:	2.15	2.65
		Other*:	2.18	0.77
		Total Cofinancing		3.42
Operational Program:	OP 1: Arid and Semi-arid Zone Area; Ecosystems.Biodiversity/ Land Degradation	**Total Project Cost:**	$13.38	UA
IA	UNEP and UNDP	Dates		
Partners involved:	Univ. of Oslo, Ministry of Agriculture (Botswana), Ministry of Environmental Conservation (Kenya), Ministry of Environment (Mali)	Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		March 2003
		Closing Date	Proposed: March 2007	Actual: March 2008
Prepared by: Pallavi Nuka	Reviewed by:	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing (in months): 48 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing (in months): 60 months	Difference between original and actual closing (in months): 12 months
Author of TE: Mark Nicholson Dr. Hallasay Sidibe, Mali Dr. Godfrey Olukoye, Kenya Prof. Mogodisheng B.M. Sekhwela,		TE completion date: September 2007	TE submission date to GEF EO: July 2008	Difference between TE completion and submission date (in months): 10 months

* Other is referred to contributions mobilized for the project from other multilateral agencies, bilateral development cooperation agencies, NGOs, the private sector and beneficiaries.

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS AND KEY FINDINGS

Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluation reviews for further definitions of the ratings.

Performance Dimension	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office evaluations or reviews	GEF EO
2.1a Project outcomes	**MU**	**U**	**U**	**U**
2.1b Sustainability of Outcomes	**U**	**MU**	**U**	**U**
2.1c Monitoring and evaluation	**MU**	**MS**	**MS**	**MU**
2.1d Quality of implementation and Execution	**MU**	**UA**	**NA**	**U**
2.1e Quality of the	**N/A**	**N/A**	**S**	**MS**

evaluation report				

2.2 Should the terminal evaluation report for this project be considered a good practice? Why?
No, the terminal evaluation report is poorly organized. The report focuses largely on the generalities of project design, rather than on the specifics regarding this project's implementation. Actual project costs are not reported. The report from the Botswanan national consultant is missing. The findings from the Kenyan and Malian national consultants are not integrated into the overall evaluation. The terminal evaluation does not adequately cover the utilization of GEF resources vis-à-vis expectations at the point of project approval.

2.3 Are there any evaluation findings that require follow-up, such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, mismanagement, etc.?
No

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES

3.1 Project Objectives

a. What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?

This project was designed as a demonstration program for biodiversity conservation and dryland ecosystem restoration in the arid and semi-arid zones of Africa. The global environmental objective was the conservation of biodiversity through the development of an appropriate system of natural resource management, which would reverse the present trend of land degradation by establishing sustained production systems within the agro-pastoral and pastoral economy of African arid zones.

To achieve this objective, the project aimed to develop models of land management that reinforce in situ conservation of biodiversity and control land degradation. The knowledge gained from these three demonstration areas was to be used for successful replication and expansion beyond the pilot sites. Expected global benefits were to be assured by selecting sites that were representative of the different habitats and eco-zones in arid and semi-arid Africa, and that had a higher probability of success in developing replicable models. A secondary expected benefit was to increase plant biomass, both above and below ground, which improves resistance to drought, and potentially creates benefits for climate change mitigation.

There were no changes in global environmental objectives during project implementation.

b. What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation? (describe and insert tick in appropriate box below, if yes at what level was the change approved (GEFSEC, IA or EA)?)

According the project document, the development objectives of this project were to rehabilitate degraded ecosystems and establish sustainable natural resource management systems in the seven sites. Major goals of the project were to facilitate an exchange of knowledge and experience between three comparable but different country situations and to develop models, which can be transferred to other arid zones within the continent. Technology transfer and supporting research was to be a vital part of the project. Specific development outcomes included:

(i) Strengthening appropriate indigenous management systems;
(ii) Developing integrated bio-socio-economic data systems;
(iii) Rehabilitating indigenous vegetation and degraded land;
(iv) Improving the effectiveness of livestock production and marketing and developing of alternative livelihoods.

Following the mid-term review, another development object was added: Mainstreaming the sustainable use of rangeland biodiversity into national programs and policies.

Overall Environmental Objectives	Project Development Objectives	Project Components	Any other (specify)
	X		

c. If yes, tick applicable reasons for the change (in global environmental objectives and/or development objectives)

Original objectives	Exogenous conditions	Project was restructured	Project was restructured	Any other (specify)

not sufficiently articulated	changed, causing a change in objectives	because original objectives were over ambitious	because of lack of progress	
X				

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT OF OUTCOMES AND SUSTAINABILITY

4.1.1 Outcomes (Relevance can receive either a satisfactory rating or a unsatisfactory rating. For effectiveness and cost efficiency a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU will be used)

a. Relevance (of outcomes to focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities) Rating: S

A.1. What is the relevance of the project outcomes/results to:

(i) the national sustainable development agenda and development needs and challenges?

Human and livestock pressures are contributing to desertification of semi-arid lands in all three participating countries. This project was relevant to each country's attempts to halt land degradation and improve rural livelihoods through the development of participatory, community-based sustainable range management systems. In the case of Botswana, these concerns are expressed in the UNEP/SADC Kalahari-Namib Project, the Agricultural Development Program; the Forestry Sector Development Policies and the National Conservation Strategy Action Plans; and the Land and Environmental Development Strategies under SADC. In Kenya, the project falls within the National Development Policy that aims at integrating arid and semi-arid lands into the mainstream of the national economy and social development in an environmentally sustainable manner. In Mali, the concerns are expressed in the National Plan of Action to Combat Desertification and the North-East Stock Raising and Land Rehabilitation Project.

(ii) the national environmental framework, agenda and priorities?

The project is integrated into national programs and plans, and addresses the baselines programs and policies in each country relating to the improved management of arid and semi-arid lands. Given the importance of arid and semi-arid zones, the Governments of Botswana, Kenya and Mali have undertaken several initiatives to address the issue of land degradation and the extensive loss of indigenous vegetation and biodiversity.

The Government of Botswana is currently undertaking a Range Inventory and Monitoring Project (BRIMP), and has allocated 28% of its National Development Budget to the protection and conservation of natural resources.

The Government of Kenya has developed a national policy bill on Environment Coordination and Management, which has specific policies addressing the conservation of biodiversity within the arid and semi-arid land ecosystems. The bill is currently awaiting the parliamentary approval and once enacted into a law it will provide an enabling environment for this project. In addition, Kenya is in the process of preparing a National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan with GEF financing, and one of the elements of this strategy will focus on dryland biodiversity.

Mali is also developing a national biodiversity strategy with GEF financing and has finalized the National Plan for Action on the Environment (PNAE). The project's outcomes are supported by the current decentralization process (e.g. changes in land-tenure systems), under which individuals and community take responsibility for land management.

(iii) the achievement of the GEF strategies and mandate?

The project falls within the GEF priority area of Arid and Semi-arid Ecosystems, Operational Program 1. The proposed project aims to conserve and rehabilitate globally significant biodiversity in the three African drylands areas.

(iv) the implementation of the global conventions the GEF supports (countries obligations and responsibilities towards the convention as well as the achievement of the conventions objectives)

This project supports the priorities of the COP of the CBD on the sustainable use and conservation of arid- zone ecosystems.

A2. Did the project promote of International (Regional and / or Global) Cooperation and Partnership[1]

An expected outcome was the development of a model for replication throughout the arid/semi-arid zones in Africa. Although this outcome was not achieved, the project has fostered some exchange of information between the participating countries.

b. Effectiveness **Rating: U**

According to the terminal evaluation report this project has not been effective in addressing issues of biodiversity

[1] Please consider for regional and global project only

conservation and rangeland rehabilitation in the three countries. The terminal evaluation concludes that the project objectives were too broad and ambitious, the implementation poorly focused, and the regional design incompatible with site and national specificities. It notes that, what turned out to be a rural development/livelihoods project with little focus on conserving native vegetation was "dressed-up" as a biodiversity project in order to appeal to donors.

The terminal evaluation found little progress in the six components listed below:

(i) Establishment and strengthening of appropriate indigenous management systems;
(ii) Establishment of a regional arid zone biodatabase;
(iii) Rehabilitation of indigenous vegetation and degraded lands;
(iv) Improved livestock production and marketing, and provision of alternative livelihoods;
(v) Technology transfer, training and regional comparative learning;
(vi) Targeted research;

Effectiveness in the three countries has varied widely. The project's effectiveness in Kenya was markedly better than in Mali or Botswana, but according to the terminal evaluation, this was because the project took over from range and livestock management projects that had been running for decades. The Kenyan national consultant rated project effectiveness in Kenya as satisfactory. Effectiveness in Botswana has been much less satisfactory. There, the project has succeeded in establishing community development trusts, charged with developing and implementing natural resource management plans. But, there is no plan for how these trusts can implement land management in a country where there is no control over the movement of livestock. In Mali, the project began with two pilot sites, but dropped one following the mid-term review. Communities at both sites were enthusiastic about the project, however they viewed it more as a rural development project rather than a biodiversity conservation project. Although the project enjoys the support of local authorities in Mali, it will have to include some income-generating activities in order to appeal to the community. Long-term effectiveness in Mali still remains in doubt due to the large numbers of transhumant pastoralists who graze herds on open land. This group must also be brought into any discussion about land management and conservation of land cover.

The scientific research results from this project will be useful in developing future natural resource management projects at these sites. The 12 students sent to Norway have completed their MSc degrees and the three national research institutes tasked with the execution of site-specific research in the participating countries are in the process of completing their final reports.

Despite these positive aspects, implementation challenges and flaws in project designs have created ongoing problems and delayed progress. Administrative difficulties at UNEP delayed disbursement of funds and the hiring of consultants. The technical partner, the University of Oslo, did not start baseline data collection until three years into the project. And, as noted in the 2008 PIR, the completion of the community-based rangeland management systems has taken much longer than anticipated because of an array of factors including: contractual disagreements with consultants; loss of project personnel; and a general lack of focus. While all sites have completed or are nearing completion of these management plans, only one site (Marsabit, Kenya) has begun implementation. The evaluation of whether these plans will be able to contribute to more sustainable management of rangelands and improved livelihoods of their users was not completed by this project.

According to the terminal evaluation, a major weak point throughout execution has been the lack of data collection and monitoring. This weakness has been overcome to some extent with the contracting of a consultancy firm for the design of a regional database. However, one of the expectations for this project was the inclusion of existing local knowledge and new, site specific, ecosystem information in the formulation of models for improved management of the natural resources. While the range management plans have been formulated in a sufficiently participatory manner, no systematic use has been made of the indigenous knowledge existing in the pilot communities, nor has this local knowledge been validated. Unfortunately, the outcomes from scientific work only became available towards the end of the project's lifespan, too late to have any significant influence on the formulation of these management plans (with the exception of one site in Botswana).

Except for a few promises of institutional adjustments, little progress has been made with respect to the mainstreaming of community-based rangeland management and biodiversity conservation into national or regional development plans. The 2008 PIR notes that project teams in the three countries have started to pay more attention to local training and capacity-building of government staff working in these communities. Following project termination, much more specific training of these stakeholders – and continued donor support--will be required to give the proposed management plans a realistic chance of being implemented.

c. Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) **Rating: U**

The terminal evaluation concludes that the project was not cost-effective, in view of lack of real outcomes and the fact that a regional project was not justified. This project was not the least cost option. The most cost-effective option would

have been five site-specific projects. In addition, project implementation was delayed considerably and this affected cost-effectiveness.
d. To what extent did the project result in trade offs between environment and development priorities / issues (not to be rated) – this could happen both during the designing of the project where some choices are made that lead to preference for one priority over the other, and during implementation of the project when resources are transferred from addressing environmental priorities to development priorities and vice versa. If possible explain the reasons for such tradeoffs.
This project seems to have most successful at the sites where local people felt that altering their status-quo land management systems would lead to improved incomes. In Kenya, local communities took the initiative in asking the project team to help them re-invigorate their traditional technique of deferred grazing. In Mali, an initial stage focused on income generating activities helped to raise community interest in the project by linking basic needs to improved natural resource management. Notably, community interest in the project remained even after the income generating activities were terminated following the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation.

4.1.2 Results / Impacts[2] (Describe Impacts) (please fill in annex 1 – results scoresheet and annex 2 – focal area impacts (against GEF Strategic Priority indicators, where appropriate and possible)

According the TE, the impact on biodiversity conservation and rangeland rehabilitation in the three countries is low. Some local impact is likely in the deferred grazing sites in northwestern Kenya and tree conservation in Marsabit, but the effects of this on a district, national or regional level will be evident for at least a decade. The terminal evaluation notes that in spite of this project, biodiversity is being lost at increasing rates in all areas. In the absence of any baseline or monitoring system at the sites, little can be proved about the project's impact on biodiversity. The terminal evaluation notes that the damming of the Turkwel in Kenya and the fencing of blocks for rainfed agriculture in Botswana may actually be causing some increase in the loss of biodiversity through land conversion and clearing. Exclosures have been attempted in Mali and in the biodiversity conservation areas in Botswana. The only successful and replicable technologies to date are the traditional rangeland systems promoted in Kenya.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= Likely (no or negligible risk); 3= Moderately Likely (low risk); 2= Moderately Unlikely (substantial risks) to 1= Unlikely (High risk)). The ratings should be given taking into account both the probability of a risk materializing and the anticipated magnitude of its effect on the continuance of project benefits.

a. Financial resources	**Rating: U**
Plans to continue with the project's activities on a reduced scale accepted and funded in Mali. There is no follow-on funding to continue project activities in Kenya or Botswana.	
b. Socio-economic / political	**Rating: MU**
In the three participating countries, the formulation of seven range management plans has been completed or is nearing completion. Some plans have been accepted by the local authorities, others are awaiting approval. Marsabit, Kenya is the only site in the implementation stage. Towards the end of project there was reduced commitment from stakeholders across sites when it became clear that there would not be a project follow-up phase.	
c. Institutional framework and governance	**Rating: U**
In 2006 the National Coordinators (Government representatives) of the three participating countries have committed themselves to strive for institutional changes aimed at perpetuating the goals and objectives of IVP as they relate to the involvement of communities in the management of rangeland resources. Some progress in introducing these institutional changes was made in 2006/2007 in Kenya and Botswana but Mali developed no activities in this respect.	
d. Environmental	**Rating: MU**
All sites were located in arid regions that are subject to prolonged droughts and occasional flooding. This should not be defined as a risk. It is an existing condition that needs to be taken into account in the search for resource management solutions.	
e. Technological	**Rating: L**
It's unlikely that any new technology introduced will have a significant negative impact on the project's environmental outcomes.	

[2] Please consider direct and indirect global environmental results; any unexpected results; local development benefits (including results relevant to communities, gender issues, indigenous peoples, NGOs and CBOs)

4.3 Catalytic role[3]

a. INCENTIVES: To what extent have the project activities provide incentives (socio-economic / market based) to contribute to catalyzing changes in stakeholders
Use of income-generating activities in Mali helped increase interest in the project.
b. INSTITUTIONAL CHANGE: To what extent have the project activities contributed to changing institutional behaviors
There have been no major institutional changes, no laws passed, and no change in government programs.
c. POLICY CHANGE: To what extent have project activities contributed to policy changes (and implementation of policy)?
There have been some progress toward changing land management policies in Kenya, but this may have been the result of on-going efforts rather than project activities.
d. CATALYTIC FINANCING: To what extent did the project contributed to sustained follow-on financing from Government and / or other donors? (this is different than co-financing)
The Mali project has received some follow-on funding from the Malian Government to continue limited activities.
e. PROJECT CHAMPIONS: To what extent have changes (listed above) been catalyzed by particular individuals or institutions (without which the project would not have achieved results)?
No champions were mentioned.

4.4 Assessment of processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

a. Co-financing. To what extent was the reported cofinancing (or proposed cofinancing) essential to 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
Co-financing was necessary for the research component of the project, but it arrived too late to substantially impact project outcomes. NORAD donated $0.68 M for research activities to be conducted by the University of Oslo. After the mid-term evaluation, the University of Oslo allocated $90,000 each to three local universities for research activities. The governments of the three participating countries contributed $2.65M . This was slightly greater than the $2.15 proposed in the project document. Approximately 50% of government contributions went to technology transfer and training activities, and the development of land management plans, which were critical for the environmental outcomes of the project.
b. 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 it did, then in what ways and through what causal linkages?
The start of the project was delayed when the University of Oslo pulled out as executing agency, and had to be replaced by UNOPS. Site-specific research carried out by the University of Oslo only began three years into the project, meaning that the project was not able to collect baseline data to monitor the impacts of the indigenous vegetation projects in the three countries. According to the terminal evaluation, timely flow of funds was a major challenge after the introduction of ATLAS, the new financial accounting software adopted by UNDP. As a result of the funding delays, the project was slow to hire consultants and some communities became frustrated with the lack of progress, which offset some gains that had been made in micro-projects. It was only in 2006 that the three countries completed the design of community-based natural resource management systems, leaving only a year for implementation and evaluation.
c. 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.
This project was designed by UNEP working with the three governments and with a national consultant in each country. Governments were clearly involved in project design, but did not play a large role in execution. The project teams in each country were not embedded in local, regional, or national government structures and appear to have had little interaction with national governments at the Ministry level.

[3] Please review the 'Catalytic Role of GEF: How is it measured and evaluated – A conceptual framework' prior to addressing this section.

4.5 Assessment of the project's monitoring and evaluation system based on the information in the TE

a. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): MU
The project had a logical framework for monitoring with indicators for each outcome. However, there was no baseline and no quantified output for each indicator. There was also no timeline or work schedule for the project.
b. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): MU
The project teams did track progress using the indicators identified in the M&E plan and fulfill the specified reporting and evaluation requirements. But, there was no adaptation in response to M&E results.
b.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Yes
b.2a Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? No, there were funding delays during implementation.
b.2b To what extent did the project monitoring system provided real time feed back? Was the information that was provided used effectively? What factors affected the use of information provided by the project monitoring system? According to the terminal evaluation and 2008 PIR, monitoring information was not applied to improve project implementation because of weaknesses in the project team management.
b.3 Can the project M&E system (or an aspect of the project M&E system) be considered a good practice? If so, explain why. No

4.6 Assessment of Quality of Implementation and Execution

a. Overall Quality of Implementation and Execution (on a six point scale): U
b. Overall Quality of Implementation – for IA (on a six point scale): U
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as quality of the project design, focus on results, adequacy of supervision inputs and processes, quality of risk management, candor and realism in supervision reporting, and suitability of the chosen executing agencies for project execution. UNEP oversight and management was rated moderately unsatisfactory by the terminal evaluation. While UNEP reporting identified problems and risks, and maintained a focus on results, overall UNEP/UNDP management was disorganized. National units were started before the Regional Coordination Unit was setup. UNEP did not provide the right staffing levels, continuity, skill mix, or frequency of field visits. A Regional Technical Advisor was never hired for budgetary reasons (although this position was included in the project budget), and outcomes suffered as a result. According to the terminal evaluation, the UNDP (brought in as a co-implementing agency) delayed renewal of staff contracts and the hiring new staff, slowing down the project's progress. The terminal evaluation notes that one implementing agency would have been sufficient.
c. Quality of Execution – for Executing Agencies[4] (rating on a 6 point scale) U
Briefly describe and assess performance on issues such as focus on results, adequacy of management inputs and processes, quality of risk management, and candor and realism in reporting by the executive agency. The co-implementing agencies were UNEP and GEF. The partners included UNOPS, UNDP, University of Oslo (with sub-contractors, and later national universities and institutions) plus representatives of Ministries in Mali, Botswana and Kenya. According to the terminal evaluation, this multiplicity of actors and complexity of partnership led to long delays in implementation, and the eventual loss of some partners. The 2008 PIR notes that the management structure in this project was top-heavy, with too many decision-makers, and no clear chain of command. This project had a Regional Steering Committee, National Steering Committees, Implementing Agencies, Regional Coordinator (hired), National Coordinators (Government representatives), and National Project Managers (hired). Insufficient authority was devolved to national project managers and there was poor communication between national and regional project teams. The performance of the regional coordination unit was rated poorly by the terminal evaluation. The office was slow to adapt implementation in response to feedback from M&E. And, no risk mitigation plan was ever developed in response to identified risks.

5. LESSONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

[4] Executing Agencies for this section would mean those agencies that are executing the project in the field. For any given project this will exclude Executing Agencies that are implementing the project under expanded opportunities – for projects approved under the expanded opportunities procedure the respective executing agency will be treated as an implementing agency.

Assess the project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

a. Briefly describe the key lessons, good practice or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report that could have application for other GEF projects

1. This project grossly over-estimated the levels of awareness and education of the communities. Experience with community based natural resource management (CBNRM) projects in Africa suggests that the following are essential in the development of empowered community management structures:
    a. Time for villages (or a group of villages) to negotiate with their neighbors the boundaries of the lands that they are to manage.
    b. Empowerment by government to control access and to manage "their" lands/resources. This requires strong government commitment. This was seen in Mali but less so in Botswana, where the Government commitment to communal land appeared not as whole-hearted as it could have been.
    c. Control of access: community managers must be able to enforce rules governing the use of resources on their own members. People from outside the community wishing to access the community's resources must negotiate conditions of access with the empowered community management structure.
    d. Effective institutional capacity development for the community. This includes good governance, accounting and business management skills (communities need to manage their lands as a profit-making business), NRM capacities, equitable sharing of the costs and benefits of resource management, revenue generation to cover management costs and generate benefits for community members, and oversight and support from government/authorities.
    e. Help for livestock keepers in improving their production system and in developing safety nets during prolonged droughts. Since overgrazing exacerbates the effects of drought by shortening the duration when adequate grazing is available, these groups have to be taught that overgrazing is the result of too many animals. None of the communities the evaluator spoke to seemed to understand this concept clearly.
2. When developing projects for the sustainable management of natural resources, it is critical to involve people with experience in natural resource management in project development. For the development of community-based range/vegetation management systems, the field teams recruited or appointed should include sociologists, community development experts and animal scientists, not just foresters. Specialists with field experience are required.
3. There is an emerging body of lessons learned and best practices on CBNRM. These need to be captured and integrated into project design. The most critical condition that must be fulfilled before one can begin to develop a CB management system is to have a representative community management authority that is empowered to control access to the resource that they are to manage.
4. When designing a project to tackle one of the most difficult challenges in natural resource management, it is critical to focus on the outcomes. This project's logical framework is full of elements without clear strategic linkage to project objectives.

b. Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation

1. CBNRM cannot be achieved in five years. GEF should consider ten years for environmental projects with the first five years dedicated to community awareness-raising and empowerment.
2. A good site-specific, socio-economic and biophysical baseline is essential to measure impact. A vegetation project should assess initial tree cover, species composition & age structure, or annual biomass production from range under heavily grazed and lightly grazed conditions). More intense work on fewer sites would be better than spreading resources too thinly, in order to ensure quantifiable impact.
3. The TE considered that what should have been a range management and livestock production project became a biodiversity and land degradation project in order to satisfy the donors regarding eligibility and compliance with the focal areas. When speaking to the beneficiaries, the TE tried to determine what the problems were from the beneficiary perspective. The answers were almost always the same: scarcity of water, food insecurity, seasonal shortage of grazing, and lack of income for basic necessities. Loss of biodiversity, loss of indigenous knowledge and land degradation were never once mentioned. A project where the objectives did not directly address even on e of the perceived needs of the community does not have great potential for success.
4. Biodiversity and land degradation are often difficult terms for communities to accept, especially in the vernacular. Such projects will not be successful in isolation without trying to link modern concepts of environment with community perceptions of their environs. First, one must address the problems and needs of communities but it is clear that the integration of local and scientific knowledge using degradation indicators and remedial options can empower land users.
5. One idea for future projects might be for GEF funding to cover the environmental aspects and seek co-funding from other financiers to address the socio-economic needs of the beneficiaries. That way, the GEF component can remain focused on environmental issues.

6. The logical framework of this project was too complex and unfocussed. There should have been one achievable objective with a limited number of outcomes, outputs and activities directly related to plant biodiversity and land degradation.
7. A transboundary project would have been more relevant than a regional project. The three countries in this project had very little in common. Where a regional project is justified, it is important that the regional component is strengthened *a priori* before national components go their own way with regard to implementation.
8. GEF should consider simplifying partnerships in their projects. The TE poses questions about the realistic functioning of a partnership including UNEP/ UNDP/ UNOPS/ University of Oslo/ Government and other Institutional partners, which in most cases was difficult. The project was top heavy, with too many decision-makers, and bureaucracy having a negative impact on project implementation.

6. QUALITY OF THE TERMINAL EVALUATION REPORT

6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings based on other information sources such as GEF EO field visits, other evaluations, etc.

Provide a number rating 1-6 to each criteria based on: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, and Highly Unsatisfactory = 1. Please refer to document GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for terminal evaluations review for further definitions of the ratings. Please briefly explain each rating.

6.2 Quality of the terminal evaluation report	Ratings
a. To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	S
b. To what extent the report is internally consistent, the evidence is complete/convincing and the IA ratings have been substantiated? Are there any major evidence gaps?	MS
c. To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?	MU
d. To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	S
e. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	U
f. Assess the quality of the reports evaluation of project M&E systems?	U

7. SOURCES OF INFORMATION FOR THE PRERATATION OF THE TERMINAL EVALUTION REVIEW REPORT EXCLUDING PIRs, TERMINAL EVALUATIONS, PAD.

8 Project stakeholders and Key Contacts (Names, addresses, emails etc – mandatory for field visit countries)

9. Information Gaps (for Field visit countries only)