

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5570	
GEF Agency project ID		5275	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		UNDP	
Project name		Mainstreaming Rio Convention Provisions into National Sectoral Policies	
Country/Countries		Jordan	
Region		Asia	
Focal area		Multi-Focal Area	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		CD-3	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environment; Ministry of Agriculture; Ministry of Water and Irrigation; and Ministry of Planning and International Cooperation	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Royal Botanical Gardens and the Stockholm International Water Institute (co-financers and executing partners)	
Private sector involvement		Not applicable	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		December 2014	
Effectiveness date / project start		May 2015	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		May 2018	
Actual date of project completion		May 2019	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	.05	.05
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		1	1
Co-financing	IA own	.05	
	Government	.8	
	Other multi- /bi-laterals		
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs	.28	
	Other		
Total GEF funding		1.05	1.05
Total Co-financing		1.13	Unable to Assess ¹
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		2.18	Unable to Assess
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		May 30, 2019	
Author of TE		Francis Hurst	
TER completion date		May 8, 2020	
TER prepared by		Laura Nissley	

¹ Actual co-financing is reported inconsistently in the TE. In the Project Summary Table, it is reported as \$2.13 million (pg. i), whereas in the co-financing tables (pgs. 39-40), it is reported as \$1.98 million.

TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Sohn
--	------------

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's objective was to "Mainstream Rio Convention provisions into key national sectoral policies and/or legislation." This objective was meant to contribute to the long-term goal of delivering "global environmental benefits through more holistic and effective management of the natural environment to meet national socio-economic priorities" (Request for CEO Endorsement, pg. 12).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Request for CEO Endorsement does not include development objectives separate from the project's global environmental objectives.

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

The TE indicates that during the inception phase, *Output 1.5: Rio Convention mainstreaming into the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan* was removed from the project design. A National Policy Statement on Drought was also added. The project team also reduced the number of consultancies and gave a "greater focus to policy practice through the pilot projects" (pg. vii).

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	-----------------------------

The TE assesses the project as “relevant.” The project’s objective is consistent with GEF-5 Cross-Cutting Capacity Development (CCCD) Strategy Objective 3: *Strengthening Capacities to Develop Policy and Legislative Frameworks*. The project is also aligned with Jordan’s national priorities, particularly its obligations under the three Rio Conventions. The TE indicates that the key issues underlying the project design, namely the increasing intensity and periodicity of droughts, as well as the degradation of rangeland, were highly relevant (pg. 54). The TE also notes that the changes to the project design during the inception phase “greatly increased the project and the Rio Conventions relevance.” Specifically, the project “was able to key into some of the larger reforms taking place in terms of decentralization, promotion of rural livelihoods, to promote a change from protection to sustainable utilization and to demonstrably address the pressing problems of unemployment, poverty alleviation and climate change/drought through the lens of the Rio Conventions” (TE pg. 55). Overall, this TER assesses project relevance as **Satisfactory**.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Highly Satisfactory
-------------------	------------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, and this TER concurs. The project met its objective of mainstreaming Rio Convention provisions into national sectoral policies without any shortcomings, focusing its efforts on two key sectors: water and agriculture. As noted above, activities related to mainstreaming the Rio Convention into the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan were cancelled, as the Plan was too narrow in focus and set to expire in 2016 (TE pg. 36). Pilot projects demonstrating Rio Convention principles related to drought and rangelands were expanded, and awareness of the Rio Conventions in Jordan was improved through a robust public awareness campaign and training program. The TE also indicates that a national policy on drought management was developed, as well as a Drought Early Warning System, which were unforeseen in the project document (pg. vii).

A summary of the project’s achievements, by outcome, is provided below:

Outcome 1: Enhanced institutional capacities to develop policies and/or legislative frameworks for effective implementation of the three Rio Conventions

It was expected that the project would complete SWOT and gap analyses of Jordan’s institutional framework for Rio Convention implementation, as well as strengthen inter-ministerial communication, coordination, and collaboration on Rio Convention mainstreaming. Additionally, it was expected that the Rio Convention would be mainstreamed into the National Rangeland Strategy and the National Drought

Management Action Plan,² and resources would be mobilized to replicate Rio Convention mainstreaming. The TE indicates that all expected results were achieved by project end. The project produced a number of analytical sector studies, including (1) *Institutional Gap Analysis and Analytical Framework for Rio Convention Implementation in Jordan*; (2) *Analytical Framework for Drought Governance in Jordan and a National Drought Resilience Strategy and Action Plan*, and (3) *Analytical Report for Gender Mainstreaming in the National Environmental Management System*. Additionally, inter-ministerial coordination and collaboration was strengthened through the restructuring and revitalization of the Rio Technical Committees on climate, biodiversity, and desertification. Two national by-laws on nature protection and climate change were also enacted (TE pg. 46).

The TE also indicates that global environmental priorities such as genetic diversity, community-based natural resource management (CBNRM), co-management, and national reserve selection, were mainstreamed into the National Rangeland Strategy and the National Drought Management Action Plan, as expected (pg. 45; 47). Eight projects were piloted at the municipal level based on the recommendations made in the policies, exceeding the six anticipated projects (TE pg. 93). As expected, a replication strategy was also produced and representatives from line ministries and NGOs were trained in fundraising and resource mobilization (TE pg. 105).

Outcome 2: Improved awareness and understanding of Rio Conventions' contributions to sustainable development

Expected results under this outcome included: (1) awareness raising workshops on linkages between Rio Conventions and socio-economic development; (2) a training program and accompanying knowledge materials; and (3) a public awareness campaign. The TE indicates that all expected results were achieved by project end. The project team carried out 20 workshops, trainings, and events to reinforce the pilot projects (pg. 47; 117). The project also produced training packages and accompanying materials such as the *Training Manual on Environmental Advocacy and Public Media*; *Roadmap for Effective Media Coverage for Local and Global Environmental Issues*; and the *Environmental Investigative Journalism and Reporting Guidelines*. Ten public service announcements targeting different issues under the Rio Conventions were produced, as well as a short documentary on the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Jordan (pgs. 47-48).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory**. The project experienced moderate delays at project start-up, including delays in establishing the Project Coordination Unit and hiring a Project Coordinator, who was appointed four months into implementation (TE pg. i). The TE attributes these delays in large part due to fallout from

² Output 1.5: *Rio Convention mainstreaming into the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan* was removed from the project design during the inception phase of the project.

the Arab Spring, which was beyond the control of the project (pg. 44). The inception phase of the project was also lengthened in order to revise the project's strategy (i.e. cancelling activities related to the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan and expanding the pilot projects), as well as leverage additional cash co-financing (pg. 44). A one-year no-cost extension was granted in order for the project to complete its activities. Overall, the TE indicates that the project was able to achieve its objective of mainstreaming the Rio Conventions into key sectors within a modest budget (pg. 51).

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Likely
--------------------	-----------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Likely** for the overall sustainability of project benefits, and this TER concurs.

Financial Resources

The TE assesses the sustainability of financial resources as **Likely**. The TE indicates that the government is likely to continue to financially support the outcomes and outputs of the project. However, the TE also notes that this support will need to be augmented by donor support. The TE indicates that the implementing agency, UNDP, is planning follow-on interventions as part of their strategic approach in Jordan (pg. iv).

Sociopolitical

The TE assesses the sociopolitical sustainability as **Likely**. The TE indicates that the project's approach (i.e. mainstreaming the Rio Convention principles and the strategic use of pilot projects) is sustainable from a socioeconomic perspective. The TE indicates that the project encouraged the use of Rio Convention principles as the "go to" means of addressing climate change and environmental degradation in Jordan. Additionally, the TE notes that the pilot projects have "real applications to improving rural people's livelihoods and security" and can be built upon to provide "multiple ecosystem benefits" (pg. v).

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Likely**. The TE indicates that the project "has been embedded in the political process and business and structures of government." The project revitalized the Rio National Committees which are now linked to the Higher Council. The TE indicates that these committees are supported by new national by-laws related to biodiversity and climate. Additionally, the Ministry of Water and Irrigation now has a Drought Management Unit (DEWS) (TE pg. v).

Environmental

The TE assesses environmental sustainability as **Likely**. The TE indicates that "a rational framework to guide decision-making is an essential first step in conservation planning and management." Additionally,

the TE notes that the Rio Convention principles now underpin “development in two important sectors, water and agriculture” which should contribute to the sustainability of project outcomes (pg. vi).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The TE is inconsistent in its reporting of actual co-financing. In the Project Summary Table (pg. i), actual co-financing is reported as \$2.17 million, whereas in the co-financing tables (pgs. 39-40) it is reported as \$1.98 million. In either case, actual co-financing appears to have been significantly higher than the expected \$1.13 million.

The TE does indicate that there were shortfalls in the in-kind contributions from the Ministry of Environment and the Royal Botanical Gardens, which provided 71% and 66% of their anticipated co-financing, respectively. The TE indicates that the reasons for these shortfalls were “the economic restraints imposed on the Ministry post Arab Spring and the regional economic slowdown and also in part due to the workload taking place in other Ministries such as the MWI [Ministry of Water and Irrigation]” (pg. 39). However, the project was able to leverage cash co-financing from the Badia Restoration Fund (\$.78 million) and the Stockholm International Water Institute (SIWI) (\$.29) which offset the shortfalls in in-kind co-financing. Co-financing from the Badia Restoration Fund was used to expand the number of beneficiaries reached by the rangeland pilot projects (TE pg. 92). Co-financing from SIWI was used to produce the Drought Early Warning System (pg. 33).

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

The TE indicates that the project did experience some delays at project start-up, particularly delays in establishing the Project Coordination Unit and hiring a Project Coordinator, who was appointed four months into implementation (TE pg. i). The TE attributes these delays to fallout from the Arab Spring, which was outside of the control of the project (pg. 44). The project was granted a one year no-cost extension in order to complete activities. There is no indication in the TE that these delays ultimately affected the achievement of project outcomes or sustainability.

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

The TE indicates that ownership over the project was strong, and that neither UNDP nor the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) regarded the project as a “UNDP project.” The TE also indicates that the PCU allowed its NGO and CBO partners to “own the process” which resulted in a sense of ownership at the community level as well (pg. 36).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Unsatisfactory
-------------------------	-------------------------------

The TE provides a rating of **Unsatisfactory** for M&E design at entry, and this TER concurs. The TE indicates the project's results framework lacks utility as a monitoring and evaluation tool. The TE describes the results framework as burdensome, noting that it included a "staggering" 49 indicators, 22 baselines, and 91 targets (pg. 19). Furthermore, the indicators provided in the framework are not SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely), and are largely stated as activities, targets, or results. For example, the two objective-level indicators either restate the objective (i.e. *Global environmental priorities are mainstreamed into National Rangeland Strategy, National Drought Management Action Plan, and National Energy Efficiency Action Plan*) or are vague enough to be unachievable and unmeasurable (i.e. *Overall awareness of the value provided by global environmental management is improved in all segments of society*). As the TE also notes, it's nearly impossible to match the numerous baselines and targets to indicators (pgs. 19-20). The Project Document does contain an M&E plan which discusses the planned M&E activities, responsible parties, and timeframe (Request for CEO Endorsement, pgs. 6-9). The TE indicates that a budget of \$30,000 was provided for M&E activities (pg. 37).

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for M&E implementation. The project's results framework was not fundamentally revised as a monitoring and evaluation tool during the inception phase. Some changes were made to the project's design, such as removing the output related to the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan. The TE indicates that overhauling the results framework might have "easily derailed the project and caused considerable delays," and that "the best option was to simply work with it, and around it" (pg. 42). The TE notes that the project never deviated from the objective and outcomes, despite struggling to use the results framework as a monitoring tool (pg. 19; 42). TER recognizes the risks associated with revising the results framework, however reporting on the project's achievements did suffer as a result. In light of this, this TER downgrades M&E implementation to **Moderately Satisfactory**.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation. The implementing agency for this project was the United Nations Development Programme. The TE indicates that UNDP provided considerable support to the Project Coordination Unit (PCU) and fulfilled its role of providing quality assurance to project implementation (pg. iii). The TE also indicates that UNDP, along with the PCU, engaged in adaptive management, including the decision to move away from mainstreaming the Rio Conventions into the National Energy Efficiency Action Plan, which was too narrow in focus and set to expire (pg. vii). Resources were reallocated to activities in the water and agriculture sectors, including the expansion of the pilot projects, which were a key success of the project. Furthermore, the TE indicates that UNDP encouraged national ownership of the project, which was crucial to the high performance of the project (pg. viii). However, UNDP was also responsible for the inherent flaws in the project's results framework, and therefore, this TER downgrades their performance to **Satisfactory**.

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

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for quality of project execution. The executing agency for the project was the Ministry of Environment. The PCU was housed within the Ministry of Environment, however the Ministry of Water and Irrigation and the Ministry of Agriculture also played key roles in executing components of the project, particularly the pilot projects. The Ministry of Water and Irrigation also invested a considerable time in developing the Policy Statement on Drought and the Drought Early Warning System (DEWS), key results not anticipated in the Project Document. The TE indicates that the PCU deftly facilitated relationships between the executing partners, including the line ministries as well as the CBO partners, the Royal Botanical Gardens and the Stockholm International Water Institute (pg. 36). The TE also indicates that the Project Executive Board and the Project Coordination Committee

were supportive of the PCU and met regularly throughout implementation (pg. 43). Given the high performance of the project, this TER concurs with the **Highly Satisfactory** rating provided for quality of project execution.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE reports that the pilot projects resulted in an improvement in environmental status, although the weaknesses in the project's results framework did not allow for the capturing of these changes. For example, the Al Disi Women Cooperative bred Al Ghadah, a native plant, to be planted in the degraded habitats of Wadi Rum Protected Areas. Additionally, water harvesting to support vegetation cover was piloted in the Al Shaumari Wildlife Reserve. The TE also indicates that the rangeland pilots contributed to the conservation of biodiversity (pg. 53).

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The results framework did not capture any socio-economic changes, however the TE indicates that the pilot projects did have "real applications to improving rural people's livelihoods and security" (pg. v).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The project produced the following analytical sector studies: (1) *Institutional Gap Analysis and Analytical Framework for Rio Convention Implementation in Jordan*; (2) *Analytical Framework for Drought Governance in Jordan and a National Drought Resilience Strategy and Action Plan*, and (3) *Analytical Report for Gender Mainstreaming in the National Environmental Management System*. The project team carried out 20 workshops, trainings, and events, and produced training packages and accompanying materials, including the following: *Training Manual on Environmental Advocacy and Public Media*; *Roadmap for Effective Media Coverage for Local and Global Environmental Issues*; and the *Environmental Investigative Journalism and Reporting Guidelines*. Ten public service announcements targeting different issues under the Rio Conventions were produced, as well as a short documentary on the implementation of the Rio Conventions in Jordan (pgs. 47-48; 117).

b) Governance

Global environmental priorities such as genetic diversity, community-based natural resource management (CBNRM), co-management, and national reserve selection, were mainstreamed into the National Rangeland Strategy and the National Drought Management Action Plan (pg. 45; 47). Additionally, inter-ministerial coordination and collaboration was strengthened through the restructuring and revitalization of the Rio Technical Committees on climate, biodiversity, and desertification. Two national by-laws on nature protection and climate change were also enacted (TE pg. 46).

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

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

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

The TE does not indicate that any adoption of GEF initiatives at scale, however it does note that the pilot projects “show considerable scope for replication and upscaling” (pg. vi).

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, including how they that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE provides the following lessons learned (pgs. ix-x):

1. **Global benefits need to have local relevance:** It is easy to lose sight of the purpose of the Rio Conventions within the febrile environment of a project. For instance, a shepherd in the Jordanian badia does not need to know that he or she is responding to the social articles in the FCCC, CCD or CBD. Sustainable use is defined in the CBD as the *“use of components of biological diversity in a way and at a rate that does not lead to the long-term decline of biological diversity, thereby maintaining its potential to meet the needs and aspirations of present and future generations”* (Article 2). Use can and, under favorable condition, does improve the conservation status of biodiversity resources. There is a growing body of evidence already cited in this report to show that resilient and diverse pasture lands sequester carbon in the soil and good soils increase water infiltration and reduce accelerated run off, recharging aquifers and reducing flood hazards and preventing the spread of desertification. Arguably, his or her actions, the choices and trade-offs made, are part and parcel of the Conventions.
2. **Sustainable use versus alternative livelihoods:** Much of the conservation effort in Jordan, particularly where it is related to protected areas, has until recently been focused on an *alternative livelihoods trade-off* approach. Whereas, when it came to resource use the CCCD project (along with its partners in the MA and RBG) took a robust *sustainable use* approach and also linked this to community-based natural resource management (CBNRM) and co-management arrangements (in the case of grazing reserves). Considerable attention is given to this (self-reliance and social capital) in all three Conventions in one way or another and it is not necessary to cite the specific articles here. The Project Document more or less set out to do this, at least as it relates to the institutional, policy and regulatory framework. However, the project, through its approach to implementation put policy into practice. This in itself is an important and progressive step and it should be important to continue to support and monitor the progress of this change in approach.
3. **Project design and Strategic Results Frameworks; what goes wrong?** The SRF is the primary tool for monitoring and evaluation in UNDP-GEF projects. However, in the TE’s experience the quality of these tools is often very poor. Major problems include, *inter alia*, inappropriate indicators, “SMARTness” of indicators and targets, misunderstandings over what is an outcome, an output, an indicator or a target, different formats across different projects, indicators with unachievable and/or very expensive data collection, data gathering beyond the competences of the country, data which will only be available following the successful capacity building by the project but necessary for a start of project baseline, to name a few.

In the case of the CCCD project it is apparent that the shortcomings of the project's SRF were widely recognized. However, very few changes were made to the monitoring and evaluation tool, despite the PCU and the UNDP CO being very experienced in project implementation and having a good track record of monitoring, evaluation and successful project implementation.

The TE posits that there is a dynamic within these projects which makes it difficult to contest and thereafter make substantial changes to the SRF. Whether or not this is real or perceived doesn't matter. Making any necessary and substantive changes to a project's SRF rarely happens. It is important that this dynamic is recognized by all those involved in developing a Project Document and steps are put in place from the very beginning to ensure that the development of the SRF is through a participatory process and remains highly adaptive until the inception phase of the project has ended. For the avoidance of doubt, in the case of the CCCD project's SRF a revision would have required the replacement of forty-nine indicators, twenty-two baselines and ninety-one targets. This is allowable and in theory it should have happened. However, it is wholly understandable if the project felt that such a move would have created considerable delays, may have been viewed with suspicion of "mission creep" by others and given that the project was already experiencing delays beyond its control, the decision to proceed with the SRF largely intact was reasonable under the circumstances.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pgs. viii-ix):

1. **Greater attention should be paid to the strategic results framework during project design:** It is hard to understand how the project's SRF was approved. Log frames or SRFs are many and varied and invariably there are different opinions and often heated discussion on what constitutes an outcome, an objective, an indicator and a target. However, in this instance the SRF had structural weaknesses (e.g. output indicators) as well as the inappropriate choice and / or phrasing and the number of indicators, baselines and targets.
2. **Action to be taken (UNDP CO):** Future project designs should be subject to a stricter and more systematic approach to developing the SRF. Whether this is through an expert panel or similar mechanism but the main point being that the SRF is developed during the design phase. Large stakeholder workshops are probably not the forum to do this because they are large, unwieldy and include too many participants with little interest in the monitoring and evaluation process. Neither is a narrow focus of the Consultant tasked with developing the Project Document. An expert consultation process followed by a facilitated expert workshop would be expensive but unless there is greater investment in developing the SRF they will continue to be of poor quality.
3. **Attention should be paid to assessing risks in the project design:** There were a number of un-assessed risks not mentioned in the Project Document risk assessment. The most important were related to the NEEAP and the National Drought Action Plan.
4. **Action to be taken (RTA):** Project Documents are fairly impenetrable affairs. They are wordy and confusing including a mixture of narrative, strategy and tools (e.g. the Risk Log, the budget, the

SRF, etc.). The narrative component is important because GEF projects are dealing with complex systems and should not be ignored. However, different RTAs appear to have different formats for many of the tools especially the risk log and the SRF. These need to be standardized, removed from the narrative part of the document and included as annexes and a checklist. Risk logs should be color-coded with a “traffic lights” system (High – red, Medium – orange, Low – green). Overall, Project Documents need to be made more accessible and “user-friendly” in the future.

Actions to Follow Up or Reinforce Initial Benefits from the Project and Proposals for Future Directions Underlining Main Objectives

1. **Continued external support is necessary:** The UNDP CO is preparing a project proposal based on the progress of the CCCD project on drought. It was recognized that it is important to establish a regional collaborative framework for drought adaptation through which countries of the region can exchange knowledge and share data on climate and to demonstrate practical measures for climate adaptation that reduce the risks of climate displacement, particularly in water and food security sectors. The project entitled *“Applying ecosystem-based approach to build the resilience of food and fragile socio- ecological systems in Jordan and Lebanon to adapt with the adverse impacts of climate change* is a multi-country project (Jordan and Lebanon) funded from the Adaptation Fund and the three outcomes: *1) Regional framework to develop a capacity and knowledge base of climate risks to avert food insecurity and climate displacement; 2) Demonstrated measures for applying ecosystem-based and other “hybrid” approaches at the farm landscape levels to improve resilience local livelihoods and food systems, and; 3) Knowledge on climate change adaptation measures is captured and institutionalized at community, landscape and upstream level*, pick up where the CCCD project has left off and build on the important gains made by the project. In particular, the current capacity and resources in the newly established Drought Management Unit within the MWI are still insufficient to lead the process of localizing the scientific approach to drought projection and upscale the local autonomous knowledge of drought adaptation to inform the national drought management plan and should be a particular focus of attention and support.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The report thoroughly assesses the relevant outcomes and impacts which is notable given the poor quality of the project's results framework.	S
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The evidence presented generally substantiates the ratings provided, however some ratings are mildly inflated (M&E implementation; quality of project implementation; project efficiency)	S
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report adequately assesses project sustainability.	S
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by the evidence presented.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Expected co-financing is not consistent with the Request for CEO Endorsement. Additionally, the TE reports actual co-financing inconsistently.	U
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The report's evaluation of M&E Design is thorough and well-substantiated, although the report is too generous in its assessment of M&E implementation.	MS
Overall TE Rating		S

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