

Terminal Evaluation Validation form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	5503
GEF Agency project ID	625461
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-5 / LDCF
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO)
Project name	Mainstreaming ecosystem-based approaches to climate-resilient rural livelihoods in vulnerable rural areas through the Farmer Field School methodology
Country/Countries	Senegal
Region	Africa
Focal area	Climate Change Adaptation
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	CCA-1: Reduce vulnerability to the adverse impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level CCA-2: Increase adaptive capacity to respond to the impacts of climate change, including variability, at local, national, regional and global level CCA-3: Promote transfer and adoption of adaptation technology
Stand alone or under a programmatic framework	Stand alone
If applicable, parent program name and GEF ID	NA
Executing agencies involved	Main executing body: FAO Main executing partner: Ministère de l'Agriculture et de l'Équipement Rural (MAER)
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Yes, as implementing partners
Private sector involvement (including micro, small and medium enterprises) ¹	Not specified
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval (MSP) date	October 04, 2015
Effectiveness date / project start date	November 13, 2015

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](#))

Expected date of project completion (at start)		November 13, 2020	
Actual date of project completion		November 13, 2021	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.150	Not specified
	Co-financing	-	-
GEF Project Grant		6.229	6.050
Co-financing	IA own	0.200	0.180
	Government	24.407	27.630
	Other multi-/bi-laterals	-	-
	Private sector	-	-
	NGOs/CBOs	-	-
	Other	-	-
Total GEF funding		6.379	6.050
Total Co-financing		24.607	27.810
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		30.986	33.860
Terminal evaluation validation information			
TE completion date		October 2021	
Author of TE		Mr Saboury Ndiaye, Team Leader Mr Alexandre Diouf Ms Kéwé Kane Mr Mar Ngom	
TER completion date		November 20 2022	
TER prepared by		Mariana Vidal Merino	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Neeraj Negi	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review ²	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	HS ³	MS	MS	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		ML	ML	MU
M&E Design		MS	MS	MS
M&E Implementation		MU	MU	U
Quality of Implementation		MS	MS	MS
Quality of Execution		MS	MS	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report			-	HS

3. Project Objectives and theory of change

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The Adaptation Objective of the project was “to improve food security and nutrition in agro-sylvo-pastoral communities through the development of livelihoods resilient to climate change (CC)” (PD, p.43)⁴.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Development Objective of the project were twofold: “(i) facilitate the use of agro-climatic information and the adoption of climate change adaptation (CCA) by agro-sylvo-pastoral producers and (ii) improve the capacity of the agro-sylvo-pastoral sector to cope with CC by integrating CCA into policies, programs and agro-sylvo-pastoral development projects and strategies” (PD, p.43).

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)?

There were not changes in the project objectives although some of the targets were downscaled.

At the project indicator/target level, there was a 25 percent reduction in the number of Farmers Fields Schools. This represented a reduction in the initial target of 1 250 field schools, bringing the revised target to 937 (TE, p. xiii). This change was made in response to the recommendations made in the mid-term evaluation (PIR 2021, p. 53)

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.

² The terminal evaluation was commissioned and managed by the FAO’s Office of Evaluation. The ratings provided in the terminal evaluation are repeated for this column.

³ PIR 2021

⁴ This project was financed as part of the LDCF/SCCF, which are not aimed at creating Global Environmental Benefits, but Adaptation Benefits. This needs to be taken into account throughout this document. Reference from: [APR 2005 \(gefio.org\)](http://ap2005.gefio.org)

Even though climatic variability has been considered in rural development policies, programs and field activities, farmers and agropastoralists are subject to increased risks. They will have to adapt their agricultural and pastoral systems to a hotter and likely drier future and react to the risk of decreasing yields and degradation of the natural resource bases (soils, biodiversity) (PD, p. 2).

The project will (i) develop/fine-tune CCA strategies and tools based on improved knowledge and information management of CCA practices in agro-sylvo-pastoral systems; (ii) build capacities and disseminate CCA strategies, technologies, and best practices, and (iii) Mainstream CCA strategies into agro-sylvo-pastoral sectoral policies, programs and development frameworks at the national and local level. This will enhance the capacity of agro-sylvo-pastoral sectors to cope with climate change. In the longer term, the project will improve food and nutrition security of agro-sylvo-pastoral communities in Senegal.

The success of the project is dependent on a favourable political and socioeconomic environment; well-functioning partnerships; active participation of local partners; results-based management, and control of significant risks (translated from TE, p.21).

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: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE assesses project relevance and coherence as **Satisfactory** (p.45), whereas this review assesses it to be **Moderately Satisfactory**.

The project outcomes are aligned with the GEF strategic objectives related to climate change adaptation outlined in the Updated results Architecture for Adaptation to Climate Change under the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund⁵: i) reduce vulnerability and increase resilience through innovation and technology transfer for climate change adaptation; ii) mainstream climate change adaptation and resilience for systemic impact, and; iii) foster enabling conditions for effective and integrated climate change adaptation (TE, p.21).

The project provides a relevant response to climate change adaptation needs in Senegal. It is coherent in its design and aligns with the Emerging Senegal Plan (Republic of Senegal, 2014a and 2014b) and the various sectoral policies and orientations related to sustainable and agro-sylvo-pastoral development in Senegal (TE, p. ix).

The project is consistent with FAO strategic priorities at the time of its design, including two FAO strategic objectives (Strategic Objective 2, “Make agriculture, forestry and fisheries more productive and sustainable”, and Strategic Objective 5, “Increase the resilience of livelihoods to disasters”). It is also aligned with the new FAO Strategic Framework 2022–2031 (FAO, 2021b) – because of its focus on improving agricultural production and the environment – and with the FAO Strategy on Climate Change (FAO, 2017) through its Outcome 1 “Enhanced capacities of Member Nations on climate change through FAO leadership as a provider of technical knowledge and expertise” and its Outcome 2 “Improved integration of food security and nutrition, agriculture, forestry and fisheries considerations within the international agenda on climate change through reinforced FAO engagement.” (TE, p. 20)

The project is aligned with FAO and GEF strategic and operational policies and priorities with respect to capacity building and environmental safeguarding (TE, p. ix).

The project is complementary to other ongoing and completed project interventions in the area across different themes (TE, p. x).

The project provides support that meets the needs of the beneficiaries (men, women, youth). This includes support through dissemination of agroclimatic information to farmers and agropastoralists; (ii) improving knowledge for better climate change resilience at the level of farmer field schools (FFS) and agropastoral field schools (APFS); improving access to credit and rural savings through village savings and

⁵ [Updated results Architecture for Adaptation to Climate Change under the Least Developed Countries Fund and the Special Climate Change Fund \(2018-2022\) \(thegef.org\)](https://thegef.org/)

credit associations as well as income-generating activities through the climate resilience fund and the financing of diversification activities (TE, p. x). However, there TE indicates that the capacity-building needs of some farmers and agropastoralists were not met in villages because the planned FFS and APFS were either not set up or did not function (TE, p.22).

The project did not meet the need for some of the required production equipment and for improving the connectivity to the water distribution network in some areas. Some of the technologies and practices disseminated by the project were not adequate for the socioeconomic and environmental context of the project sites (TE, p.22).

Regarding internal coherence, the TE points to misalignment among the project's theory of change, governance structure, activities, and M&E system.

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

The TE assesses project effectiveness as **Moderately Satisfactory** and this review concurs. The TE reported that it found it difficult to assess the achievement of some project outcomes due to insufficient information on some of the results indicators.

Component 1: Development/fine-tuning CCA strategies and tools based on improved knowledge and information management of CCA practices in agro-sylvo-pastoral systems. The overall expected outcome of this component was an “Increased understanding and capacities to systematically gather and disseminate agroclimatic data to identify and improve best CCA practices and innovations in targeted agroecological zones.” The related project targets for this component were (i) 17 local GTP and the national GTP are fully operational; and (ii) At least four CCA practices are identified in targeted areas in collaboration with the agro-sylvo-pastoralist communities (Project Document, Appendix I).

The TE notes that, by the end of the project, 11 out of the 17 multidisciplinary working groups planned were revitalized at the departmental level, and the national multidisciplinary working group was strengthened. However, “the operation of the multidisciplinary working groups ended in 2018 following the termination of the funding provided by the project to ANACIM under the MOU with FAO. (TE, p.23).” The TE reports that the identification, selection and validation of seven CCA practices exceeded the set target. However, not all practices were new to the project area. (TE, p. 24).

Component 2. Capacity building and dissemination/upscaling of CCA strategies, technologies, and best practices for small agro-sylvo-pastoral producers through a growing network of Farmer Field Schools. Component 2 was linked to two expected outcomes. The first one was “The agro-climatic information is disseminated and improved CCA practices and innovations are adopted by agropastoralists.” The target was (i) the adoption of CCA practices by 25% of trained farmers and herders, (ii) 25000 people are directly

affected by the project; and (iii) at least 10 action plans for producers' associations integrated into CCA strategies.

The TE notes that the project did not systematically collect data, and neither did it have a database to track user adoption rate (TE, p. 26). However, the TE points to evidence of poor or limited adoption of CCA strategies due to several technical and financial constraints (TE, p.26). The TE records that action plans were successfully developed, but farmers' organizations did not have the financial resources to implement them (TE, p. 27).

The second expected outcome was "Household incomes and agricultural and livestock productivity of Farmer field schools (FFS)/ Agro-pastoral field school (AFPS) participants have increased through the use of CCA practices, agro-meteorological information and improved crop and beef production value chains". The related target was 100% training and adoption of meteorological forecast tools and a 20% increase in the incomes of targeted farmers and herders (Project Document, Appendix I). The TE notes that the project did not systematically monitor the production data of FFS and APFS, nor did it follow up on the farmers' plots after their training. As such, it was not possible to estimate these yields. In the field, the majority of participants in FFS and APFS said they were convinced of the usefulness of the technologies promoted (TE, p. 35).

Component 3: Mainstreaming CCA strategies into agro-sylvo-pastoral sectoral policies, programs and development frameworks at the national and local level. The expected outcomes of this component were (i) CCA is mainstreamed into policies, strategies and national programs, shifting from a reactive response to a proactive preparedness approach; and (ii) A national CC resilience fund is in place within an existing funding mechanism to support local CCA activities.

The TE found that, at the local level, the project had significantly contributed to the development of the local planning and budgeting guide, whereas at the national level, there was no evidence of CCA integration into policies and strategies (TE. P. 38). The TE notes that the project did establish the climate resilience fund. However, the target of doubling of the initial GEF contribution (doubling of the fund) was not yet effective (TE, p. 41).

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

The TE assesses project efficiency as **Moderately Satisfactory** and this TER concurs.

As of February 28 2022, the project had spent a total of USD 6.050 million, corresponding to a financial implementation rate of 98.2 percent (TE, p. xv). At the time of endorsement, it was expected that the project would close by November 2020. A no-cost extension of one year was approved based on delays in the implementation of the resilience fund due to the long approval process. Also, it was justified by the

requirement of at least two agricultural campaigns to be able to measure the effects of the of sub-projects funded by the resilience funds and the rescheduling of some activities due to Covid-19 (PIR 2021).

Project efficiency was negatively affected by wide and dispersed nature of intervention areas, combined with the high number of partnerships without any real coordination, synergy and harmonisation of actions, as well as the limited number of staff in the Project Coordination Unit (PCU).

Adding to this, the high workload made it difficult to continuously monitor the successful implementation of partnerships. This had several implications, such as the discontinuity of collaboration between FAO and RNFS after the initial MoUs expired.

The TE also notes slow administrative, financial and procurement procedures that delayed the establishment of FFS/APFS and the payment of facilitators' allowances, with some FFS/APFS only able to operate for one production cycle.

In the framework of the management of climate resilience funds, the TE notes that "the delegation of procurement procedures to farmers' organizations, technical assistance from the Regional Development Agency and the selection of local service providers made it possible to set up procurement procedures, contract execution and monitoring in a transparent and timely manner, despite COVID-19. With regard to the institutional set-up, it appeared that the quality of the institutional set-up of the climate resilience fund is a success despite the lack of a clear strategy for the sustainability of dedicated financial resources" (TE, p. 47).

4.4 Outcome	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
--------------------	---------------------------------

This review rates the overall project outcome achievement as **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE does not provide an overall assessment of the achievement of project outcomes.

4.5 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Unlikely
---------------------------	-----------------------------

Sustainability is rated in the TE as **Moderately Likely**, whereas this TER assesses the sustainability of project outcomes as **Moderately Unlikely**. As pointed out in the TE, "there are significant risks to the sustainability of project outcomes. The suspension of FFS and APFS following the end of the project and the lack of plans to access improved seeds are the most significant risks" (TE, p. xxii). The assessed risks related to financial sustainability, institutional framework and governance, have the potential to substantially affect the continuation of the project benefits.

Financial risks: The TE notes that support to beneficiary organizations in the project intervention area was discontinued after the end of the project. Most of these organizations lack resources to continue covering the facilitators costs and it remains unclear how and which institutions will continue this work. The

investment that has been made in income generating activities will continue to benefit the direct recipients, but beneficiary multiplication schemes are unlikely to be sustainable in the absence of the necessary supervision. The cessation of the operation of multidisciplinary working groups may lead to interruption of the dissemination of climate information. The lack of a mechanism to double the climate resilience fund is a major risk for the financing of farmers' organizations' sub-projects (TE, p.48).

Sociopolitical: Despite measures in place to mitigate potential sociopolitical risk, there are potential conflicts related to farmers' access to project benefits that remain. The TE points to "the lack of social cohesion due to the deviation of the Dimitra clubs from their objectives is a risk due to their cohabitation with VSLA (Village Savings and Loan Associations) funds." Also that community-based Dimitra clubs that are formalized may generate tensions within the communities (TE, p.48). Another risk mentioned in the TE refers to "the multiplicity of VSLAs in a village can lead to women over-indebtedness and social conflicts that are harmful to the cohesion of the community" (TE, p.49). Adding to this, the TE points to the risk of VSLA funds promoted by the project being implemented without considering the participation of farmers in similar already existing funds.

Institutional framework and governance: The TE notes risks related to the future involvement of some key stakeholders, concretely the regional directorates of agriculture, livestock or water and forestry and ANCAR due to the fact that no continuation of the MoU with FAO has materialized (TE, p. 49).

The second source of risk identified in the TE is a potential increase in mandate-related conflicts between institutions and within the same institution. There is a precedent of misunderstandings between ANCAR and FNDASP due to their respective prerogatives, specifically in relation to the institutionalisation of FFS and APFS. As noted by the TE, "the diversity of stakeholders active in the promotion of field schools without consultation and coordination raises the risk of fragilizing the governance of the agricultural and rural council through FFS and APFS. The delays in signing the order on COMNACC reform, despite the countless efforts supported by the project, raise the question of climate change governance" (TE, p.49).

Environmental risks: The TE notes no substantial environmental risks to sustainability.

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 project budget was USD 30.8 million and included an allocation from the GEF LDCF of USD 6.2 million and an expected co-financing of USD 24.6 million from other partners. The level of co-financing implementation as of June 31 2021, was 113% or USD 27.8 million (PIR 2021, p. 61; TE, p. 76). All financial contributions from partners through the PASA/LouMaKaf, Senegalese Agency for Reforestation and the Great Green Wall, PAFA-E, P2RS, and PADAER projects, have been implemented at 100%.

The TE notes issues related to tracking and mobilizing co-finance. The project lacked clear mechanisms for data collection on the achievements of co-financing partners and for mobilising resources from co-financing partners. The TE notes that this situation “made it difficult for the PCU to maintain a constant dialogue with funding partners. As a result, consultation and coordination between the funding partners and the PCU quickly broke down at the beginning of the project” (TE, p. 53).

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?

At the time of endorsement, it was expected that the project would close by November 2020. A no-cost extension of one year was approved based on delays in the implementation of the resilience fund due to the long approval process. At project completion in November 2021, the resilience fund was successfully implemented, with ten micro-projects being financed. However, delays in signing MOUs and mobilising funds delayed the start of microprojects. At project closure, the mechanism for doubling the fund – an outcome indicator of Component 3 - was not yet in place (TE, p. 74).

The project extension was also justified by the requirement of at least two agricultural campaigns to be able to measure the effects of the sub-projects funded by the resilience funds (PIR 2021). Additionally, some activities had to be rescheduled due to Covid-19. The TE notes that “delays in the signing of MOUs and procurement procedures, combined with the COVID-19 situation, which led to the suspension of supervision missions, have limited the quality of implementation” (TE, p. 76)

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 was developed and implemented by 16 implementing partners. In general terms, all partners fulfilled their commitments with regard to the project (TE, p. 56). At the same time, TE notes that the high amount of partnerships in the absence of a clear collaboration framework by the project has made implementation challenging, with little or no coordination between partners in the field and no synergy and harmonisation of interventions between partners (TE, p. 58).

The TE highlights four achievements in relation to stakeholder synergies: i) the revitalisation of the National Committee on Climate Change (COMNACC) and the Regional Committees on Climate Change (COMRECC) as policy and operational instruments; ii) the establishment of the Climate Resilience Fund and the integration of the CCA dimension into the knowledge platform supported by the International Fund for Agricultural Development; iii) the development of a national guide for local planning; and iv) the process of institutionalising field schools (TE; p. 57).

Following, the TE notes three weaknesses in relation to stakeholders engagement: (i) multistakeholder dynamics were challenging and complementarities and synergies insufficient due to lack of ownership and networking, lack or poor communication and M&E tools, and inappropriate support for activities at the decentralized level; (ii) the DRDR assumed a role of executors rather than steering strategic regional agricultural and rural development; and (iii) the project mobilised individual focal points and facilitators

from public institutions without adequate coordination, therefore acting in detriment of the institutional coherence theoretically advocated by FAO and claimed by the institutions concerned (ANCAR, DRDR, regional livestock services) (TE, p. 57).

The TE notes the project's positive effect in raising awareness of various stakeholders, including government, administrative and territorial authorities, and elected officials, on the benefits of FFS and APFS and CCA strategies. These are seen as promising factors for advocating for their integration into national and local public policies. The TE details that "process of institutionalising FFS and APFS in the research-extension and advisory continuum through National Agrosylvopastoral Development Fund (FNDASP) and the internalisation of FFS and APFS under the agricultural extension, via ANCAR, are favourable signals for the sustainability of FFS and APFS" (TE, p.48). On the other hand, it is also noted that the lack of clarification of the roles and responsibilities of ANCAR and the FNDASP in the process of institutionalising and/or internalising FFS/APFS, the low level of ownership by the Regional Directorate of Rural Development (DRDRs) and the National Network of Facilitators of Senegal (RNFS)/IPPM in the monitoring of FFS/APFS are institutional and governance risks to sustainability (TE, xxiii).

The outcome related to the operation of multidisciplinary working groups has been partially achieved. However, their operation ended in 2018 following the termination of the funding provided by the project to ANACIM under the MOU with FAO, which denotes weak ownership of their mandate by the members of the multidisciplinary working groups.

The TE further notes that "the involvement and empowerment of local non-governmental organizations (AVSF, Symbiose, National Federation of Cotton Producers) in the establishment of Dimitra clubs and VSLA funds, as well as the training of their facilitators, are a powerful lever for the continued provision of local services to the population. These stakeholders have all confirmed their commitment to continue supporting their partner farmers' organizations and to extend Dimitra clubs and VSLA funds to other areas" (TE, p.48).

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 the COVID-19 pandemic severely hampered the implementation of the project over the last two years (TE, xxiv).

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: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------------	---------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for M&E design at entry. This TER concurs.

The M&E design at entry complied with GEF policy requirements and guidelines related to monitoring and evaluation (GEF 2019c in TE, p.21). The Project Document and the detailed monitoring plan clearly define the monitoring and evaluation tasks and responsibilities, setting a two-tiered, multi-stakeholder M&E mechanism. The project results chain shows a good coherence between the envisaged activities and the different levels of expected outcomes. Financially, resources are foreseen for most of the key elements of monitoring and evaluation.

The GEF / LDCF / SCCF19 Adaptation Monitoring and Evaluation Tool (AMAT) was used in the design of the project results framework. AMAT indicators are used to measure progress towards outcomes and portfolio-level outcomes in the LDCF/SCCF results framework (MTR, p. 39).

The TE notes an adequate balance between quantitative and qualitative indicators. The TE also notes that some targets were too ambitious, particularly considering that many factors for their achievement are out of the control of the project (TE, p. 51). The logical framework of the Project Document does not have indicators to measure the effects of Component 4, “Project monitoring and evaluation” (TE, p. 44).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Unsatisfactory** for M&E implementation while this TER rates M&E implementation as **Unsatisfactory**.

The TE repeatedly notes the inadequate implementation of the project’s M&E arrangements as a hindering factor affecting the overall quality of the project. For example, the project did not have an M&E officer responsible for monitoring, data collection and information on indicators. Instead, these activities were assigned to the M&E expert from the FAO Representation in Senegal. This configuration did not allow the project to carry out this function and limited its ability to draw lessons learned from its experiences. The TE further notes that the M&E work had to be carried out by technical experts on top of their duties, which diminished the evaluation performance and did not ensure the independence and accountability of partners (TE, 51-52).

Overall, the TE concludes that “the absence of an expert in monitoring and evaluation exclusively dedicated to the project has created a gap in monitoring, data collection, analysis and project orientation, as well as capitalization” (TE, p. 53). In turn, this made the values of the outcome indicators reported not based on rigorous evidence (TE, p.77).

The MTR recommended reformulating and resizing some indicators to put in place all conditions that can facilitate the sustainable adoption of suggested technologies and strategies, particularly concerning having a better balance between the quantitative and qualitative objectives concerning the creation and operation of Field Schools and Dimitra Clubs (MTR, p.45). In response to this recommendation, the project adjusted its strategy by reducing the targeted number of Farmers Fields Schools by 25% and of beneficiaries.

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: Moderately Satisfactory
--	---------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for the quality of project implementation, and this review concurs. The implementing Agency for the project was the Food and Agricultural Organization (FAO).

The TE indicates that the Lead Technical Officer supported project implementation by providing the required technical guidance and being proactive in assisting the project to address risks to the delivery of quality outputs. In addition, the GEF Coordination Unit supported project development. The TE also notes that “the FAO Representation in Senegal worked in collaboration with the Government of Senegal and the headquarters team for the formulation of the project and its promotion by the Government of Senegal” and that “it led the recruitment of the PCU and the launch of the project. It regularly approved budgets, MOUs with partners, field missions, guidance in implementation, payment of facilitators and implementing partners” (TE, p.54).

However, the TE also notes administrative bottlenecks that slowed the implementation of project activities, notably causing delays in the signing MOUs with implementing partners, the procurement procedures for the acquisition of inputs and the payment of facilitators’ allowances and service providers, etc. (TE, p. 54).

In addition, the mid-term evaluation recommended FAO to improve its implementation strategy by strengthening its project monitoring and evaluation system and enhancing its anticipation and response capacities. However, the TE reports that the implementation of this recommendation was not achieved (TE, p.45).

Recommendations

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

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for the quality of project execution, and this TER concurs. The project was directly executed by FAO, following the direct execution modality. The PCU, recruited to ensure project implementation, worked under the supervision of the Rome-based Plant

Production and Protection Division and the GEF Coordination Unit within FAO. At the FAO Representation level, the FAO Representative in Senegal was responsible for the budget.

The TE notes that the PCU demonstrated “commitment and voluntarism”. It ensured a participatory and inclusive project implementation and made efforts to mobilize the necessary means to facilitate project implementation. But the administrative constraints and overall conditions in which the PCU operated, such as the dispersion of intervention areas, a large number of partnerships and limited staff, were unfavourable and hampered implementation (TE, p.53).

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 stressors and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project.

Not reported.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community cohesion, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project.

Not reported. In the longer term, the project aimed to improve the food and nutrition security of agro-sylvo-pastoral communities in Senegal (TE, p. 17). However, the TE notes the absence of surveys or impact monitoring data to track progress (TE, p. xxii).

8.3 Enabling conditions. Describe notable achievements in the following areas: Policy, Legal & Institutional Development; Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building; Knowledge Exchange & Learning; and, Multistakeholder Interactions. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these achievements, as well as how contextual factors have influenced progress.

The TE highlight the following project achievements:

- Policy, Legal & Institutional Development: The TE highlights four achievements: i) the revitalisation of the National Committee on Climate Change (COMNACC) and the Regional Committees on Climate Change (COMRECC) as policy and operational instruments; ii) the establishment of the Climate Resilience Fund and the integration of the CCA dimension into the knowledge platform supported by the International Fund for Agricultural Development ; iii) the development of a national guide for local planning; and iv) the process of institutionalising field schools (TE; p. 57).
- Individual & Institutional Capacity-Building: The TE describes how, following a capacity-building workshop for the members of the Louga Regional Committee on Climate Change (COMRECC) organized by FAO, the committee designed a project proposal that was later

on preselected for submission to the Green Climate Fund: (TE, p. 41). Additionally, the TE highlights the important role of the Dimitra clubs in capacity building and leadership for women and youth (TE, p.59).

- Knowledge Exchange & Learning: Lack of an M&E officer hindered drawing lessons from its experiences. The validation and sharing of the communication tools was delayed (TE, p.46). Knowledge Exchange & Learning products include two videos on Dimitra clubs and CCA practices; a capitalization document on APFS and an ongoing study of the sub-projects financed by the climate resilience fund; and a collection of good CCA practices elaborated and translated into local languages; and the use of community radios to disseminate project-related information. Regarding knowledge exchange, the TE highlights exchange visits to the Dimitra clubs (TE, p. 58).
- Multistakeholder Interactions: the TE notes three weaknesses in relation to stakeholders engagement: (i) multistakeholder dynamics were challenging and complementarities and synergies insufficient due to lack of ownership and networking, lack or deficient communication and M&E tools, and inadequate support for activities at the decentralized level; (ii) the DRDR assumed a role of executors rather than steering strategic regional agricultural and rural development; and (iii) the project mobilised individual focal points and facilitators from public institutions without adequate coordination, therefore acting in detriment of the institutional coherence theoretically advocated by FAO and claimed by the institutions concerned (ANCAR, DRDR, regional livestock services) (TE, p. 57).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects.

The TE does not indicate any unintended impacts that occurred by the end of the project.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, practices, approaches, or any of the enabling conditions identified above) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end.

The TE notes that “The project’s partner non-governmental organizations and projects are committed to replicating FFS, APFS and Dimitra clubs introduced by the project. Projects within the FAO Representation in Senegal are replicating FFS, APFS and Dimitra clubs, while other projects are planning to scale up the climate resilience fund. The government is currently institutionalising the FFS and APFS approach in the research-training-advisory continuum through FNDASP. ANCAR is also currently integrating the FFS and APFS approach into the agricultural and rural extension and advisory strategy” (TE, p. 49).

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 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 following lessons learned have been selected from the TE (see TE, p. 65):

- The inclusive dimension of the project, given the plurality of partnerships, is an important aspect of implementation. It allows for the mobilisation of resources through the co-financing system but also for a better achievement of the project's intended outcomes. It also helps to promote an intersectoral approach through collaboration between the various government technical services and other business areas. However, it requires coordination and communication to ensure the follow-up of commitments and perhaps also a certain limitation of the number of partnerships pursued. Given the procedural slowness of FAO in this area, it is not safe to multiply partnerships beyond what is strictly necessary.
- The empowerment of farmers' organizations in the establishment and facilitation of FFS and APFS and the training of relay facilitators has turned out to be effective and is a good way of ensuring the ownership and sustainability of achievements.
- The establishment of a climate resilience fund, which finances sub-projects managed directly by farmers' organizations with the assistance and supervision of technical services, contributes to the empowerment of farmers' organizations, self-learning on project management and the strengthening of good governance.
- The dialogue and consultation established between the CSE and ANACIM has made it possible to bring together two major institutions, to pool their resources (human and financial) and to jointly produce scientific documents.
- The participatory and inclusive dimension of the project through the plurality of partnerships is necessary, but its effectiveness is only guaranteed with good coordination of partnerships, joint planning, synergy and harmonisation of interventions on the field.
- There is a need to delegate procurement procedures to farmers' organizations and other implementing partners and to make them accountable in order to bypass FAO's bottlenecks and facilitate the timely provision of infrastructure, equipment and inputs.
- The multistakeholder and cross-sectoral coalition around the integration of climate change, gender, migration and nutrition in the local development planning and budgeting guide is a relevant, effective, efficient and sustainable approach.
- Discussions and consultation between agents and technicians from agriculture, livestock, water and forestry, and agricultural advisors in the same eco-geographical zone around CCA issues have allowed for the joint construction of know-how, the easing of working relationships and the promotion of a collective spirit.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides 15 recommendations (see TE, p.62-63):

- R1.** To FAO, high importance, high priority. Conduct a formal closure of activities by formally informing all partners and requesting them to do the same with the stakeholders on the field, especially the beneficiaries.
- R2.** To FAO, medium importance, medium priority. In future projects, empower from the outset grassroots farmers' organizations to train participants at the FFS and APFS level, set up, facilitate, monitor and capitalize on the project, in order to avoid the risks of decreasing the number of agriculture and livestock technical agents and overloading them.
- R3.** To FAO, high importance, medium priority. In future interventions, promote better coordination of partnerships and harmonisation of FFS-Dimitra clubs-VSLA-climate resilience fund approaches, as well as a revision of the related guides.
- R4.** To FAO, high importance, high priority. Delegate procurement procedures to implementing partners to facilitate the acquisition of inputs, materials, or equipment needed for the establishment and operation of FFS/APFS.
- R5.** To FAO and GEF, medium importance, medium priority. Strengthen coordination, synergies of action and harmonized interventions among implementing partners by establishing a mechanism for coordinating and monitoring the physical and financial achievements of funding partners as well as reporting to capitalize on lessons learned.
- R6.** To FAO, high importance, high priority. For future projects, ensure that an exit plan is developed within six months prior to the end of the project and negotiated with all stakeholders. For this project, negotiate an indicative exit plan with stakeholders by the end of 2021.
- R7.** To FAO, high importance, medium priority. For future projects, strengthen the capitalisation and sharing of knowledge generated during implementation.
- R8.** To FAO, high importance, high priority. In future interventions, recruit a person dedicated to monitoring and evaluation and set up a functional monitoring and evaluation system.
- R9.** To FAO, high importance, medium priority. When designing future projects, ensure the availability of human and financial resources to guarantee project implementation according to the geographical coverage.
- R10.** To FAO, high importance, medium priority. Strengthen the sharing and communication of knowledge products with all stakeholders.
- R11.** To FAO and ANACIM, high importance, high priority. Work with ANACIM and other development partners on a mechanism to sustain the funding and operation of multidisciplinary working groups.
- R12.** To FAO, high importance, high priority. Proceed with the effective integration of pastoralism in APFS and focus on facilitation methods with agropastoralists at the centre of learning.
- R13.** To FAO, high importance, high priority. Take into account the needs of persons with disabilities in the APFS, FFS, Dimitra clubs and VSLA fund approach.
- R14.** To FAO, ANCAR, FNDASP and DECC, high importance, high priority. Follow-up on the finalisation of the signature of the decree to reform the COMNACC and the acceleration of the institutionalisation and internalisation process of FFS and APFS.

R15. To FAO and FNDASP, high importance, high priority. Quickly put in place a mechanism to double the climate resilience fund.

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)

[Select detailed ratings here and fill in higher-level ratings and explanation in next table]

Criteria/indicators of terminal evaluation quality	Rating
1. Timeliness: terminal evaluation was carried out on schedule and its report submitted on time.	HS,
1.1 Terminal evaluation conducted within six months before or after project completion	Yes
1.2 Terminal evaluation report submitted at the GEF Portal within 12 months of project completion	Yes
2. General information: Provides general information on the project and evaluation.	HS
2.1 Provides GEF project ID	Yes
2.2 Lists evaluators that conducted the terminal evaluation	Yes
2.3 Lists the executing agencies	Yes
2.4 Specifies key project milestones (start date, first disbursement date, completion date)	Yes
2.5 Lists GEF environmental objectives	NA
3. Stakeholder involvement in evaluation: Participation of key stakeholders sought and their feedback addressed.	HS
3.1 Key stakeholders of the project were identified in the report	Yes
3.2 Feedback of key stakeholders was sought on the draft report	Yes
3.3 Feedback of key stakeholders was incorporated in finalization of the evaluation report	Yes
3.4 If national project, OFP Feedback was sought on the draft report of the evaluation	Yes
3.5 If national project, OFP feedback was incorporated in finalization of the report	Yes
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change.	MU
4.1 Discusses causal links/mechanisms to achieve intended impact	No
4.2 Presents the key assumptions of the theory of change	Yes
4.3 Discusses whether the key assumptions remain valid	No
5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology.	HS
5.1 Discusses information sources for the evaluation	Yes
5.2 Provides information on who was interviewed	Yes
5.3 Provides information on project sites/activities covered for verification	Yes
5.4 Tools and methods used for the evaluation are described	Yes
5.5 Identifies limitations of the evaluation	Yes
6. Outcomes: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes.	HS

6.1 Assesses relevance to GEF priorities	Yes
6.2 Assesses relevance to country priorities	Yes
6.3 Assesses relevance of project design	Yes
6.4 Reports performance on all outcome targets	Yes
6.5 Discusses factors that affect outcome achievement at sufficient depth	Yes
6.6 Reports on timeliness of activities	Yes
6.7 Assesses efficiency in using project resources	Yes
6.8 Discusses factors that affected efficiency in use of resources	Yes
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability.	HS
7.1 Identifies risks that may affect sustainability	Yes
7.2 Indicates likelihood of key risks materializing	Yes
7.3 Indicates the likely effects if key risks materialize	Yes
7.4 Indicates overall likelihood of sustainability	Yes
8. Monitoring and Evaluation Presents sound assessment of the quality of the project M&E system.	HS
8.1 Analyzes quality of M&E design at entry	Yes
8.2 Analyzes quality of M&E during implementation	Yes
8.3 Discusses use of information from the M&E system for project management	Yes
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing.	S
9.1 Reports on utilization of GEF resources	Yes
9.2 Provides data on materialized cofinancing	Yes
9.3 Provides data on sources of materialized cofinancing	Yes
9.4 Provides data on types of cofinancing (cash, in-kind; loan, grant, equity, etc)	No
9.5 Discusses reasons for excess or deficient materialization of co-financing	Yes
9.6 Discusses contributions of cofinancing to project results, including effects of excess or deficient materialization of co-financing	No
10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance.	HS
10.1 Provides account of the GEF Agency performance	Yes
10.2 Provides account of the performance of executing Agency	Yes
10.3 Discusses factors that affected implementation and execution	Yes
10.4 Discusses how implementation and execution related challenges were addressed	Yes
11. Environmental and Social Safeguards, and Gender: Discusses application of safeguards and gender analysis.	S
11.1 Reports on implementation of social and environmental safeguards	Yes
11.2 Reports on conduct of gender analysis	UA
11.3 Reports on implementation of actions specified in gender analysis	Yes
12. Lessons and recommendations: based on project experience and relevant to future work.	S
12.1 Presents lessons	Yes

12.2 Lessons are based on project experience	Yes
12.3 Discusses applicability of lessons	No
12.4 Presents recommendations	Yes
12.5 Recommendations specify clearly what needs to be done	No
12.6 Specifies action taker for recommendations	Yes
13. Performance Ratings: Ratings are well substantiated by evidence, and are realistic and credible.	HS
13.1 Ratings are supported with sufficient evidence	Yes
13.2 Evidence provided in support is credible	Yes
14. Report Presentation: The report was well written, logically organized, and consistent.	HS
14.1 Report is written in English (as required by the terminal evaluation guidelines)	Yes
14.2 Report is easy to read	Yes
14.3 Report is well-organized	Yes
14.4 Report is consistent	Yes
14.5 Report makes good use of tools that make information accessible (graphs/charts/tables)	Yes

[This is the table that will be made public]

Criteria/indicators of terminal evaluation quality	GEF IEO COMMENTS	Rating
1. Timeliness: terminal evaluation report was carried out and submitted on time?	TE was conducted within six months before project completion and the report was submitted at the GEF Portal within 12 months of project completion	HS
2. General information: Provides general information on the project and evaluation as per the requirement?	TE provides GEF project ID, list of evaluators, list of executing agencies, and key project milestones.	HS
3. Stakeholder involvement: the report was prepared in consultation with – and with feedback from – key stakeholders?		HS
4. Theory of change: provides solid account of the project's theory of change?	TE doesn't elaborate on the ToC but focuses more on the process of elaborating it.	MU
5. Methodology: Provides an informative and transparent account of the methodology?	TE discusses information sources, provides information on who was interviewed, on project sites/activities covered for verification, lists tools and methods used and identifies limitations of the evaluation	HS

6. Outcome: Provides a clear and candid account of the achievement of project outcomes?		HS
7. Sustainability: Presents realistic assessment of sustainability?	TE identifies risks to sustainability, their likelihood, likely effects of materialized, and overall sustainability likelihood.	HS
8. M&E: Presents sound assessment of the quality of the M&E system?	TE analyses the quality of M&E design at entry, and during implementation, and discusses use of M&E information for project management.	HS
9. Finance: Reports on utilization of GEF funding and materialization of co-financing?	The TE reports on utilization of GEF resources, provides data on materialized cofinancing, provides data on sources of materialized cofinancing, discusses reasons for excess or deficient materialization of co-financing. Doesn't provide data on types of cofinancing nor discuss contributions of cofinancing to project results, including effects of excess or deficient materialization of co-financing.	S
10. Implementation: Presents a candid account of project implementation and Agency performance?	TE provides an account of the GEF Agency and executing agency performances, discusses factors that affected implementation and execution and how related challenges were addressed.	HS
11. Safeguards: Provides information on application of environmental and social safeguards, and conduct and use of gender analysis?	TE reports on the implementation of social and environmental safeguards and actions specified in gender analysis. It doesn't report on the implementation of the gender analysis planned as part of the output 2.1.1. of the project's Results Framework	S
12. Lessons and recommendations are supported by the project experience and are relevant to future programming?	The TE presents lessons based on project experience but doesn't elaborate on their applicability. It presents recommendations specifying the action taker but doesn't detail what needs to be done to implement them.	S

13. Ratings: Ratings are well-substantiated by evidence, realistic and convincing?	Ratings are supported by sufficient and credible evidence	HS
14. Report presentation: The report was well-written, logically organized, and consistent?	The report is written in English, is easy to read, well-organized and consistent	HS
Overall quality of the report		HS

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

- Mid-term project review