

### GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
GEF Project ID: 88		Review date: 12/1/06		
IA/EA Project ID:	Kenya: P046838, Uganda: P046836, Tanzania: P046837	<b>GEF financing:</b>	at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Regional - Lake Victoria Environmental Management	IA/EA own:	Total: 35.0 Tanzania: 10.3 Uganda: 13.14 Kenya: 11.5	Total: 34.8 Tanzania: 10.6 Uganda: 13.12 Kenya: 11.1
Country:	Uganda, Tanzania and Kenya	Government:	Total: 35 Tanzania: 10.1 (IDA) Uganda: 12.09 (IDA) Kenya: 12.8 (IDA)	Total: 43.8 Tanzania: 19.8 (IDA) Uganda: 15.2 (IDA) Kenya <sup>1</sup> : 8.8 (IDA)
		Other*:	Total: 7.6 Tanzania: 2.3 Uganda: 2.7 Kenya: 2.6	Tanzania: Not available Uganda: 1.8 Kenya: Not available
		<b>Total Cofinancing</b>	Total: 42.6	Not available
Operational Program:	8	<b>Total Project Cost:</b>	Total: 77.6	Not available
IA	WB	<b>Dates</b>		
Partners involved:		Work Program date		04/01/96
		CEO Endorsement		06/20/96
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		03/05/1997
		Closing Date	Proposed: 06/30/2004	Actual: 12/31/05
Prepared by: Antonio del Monaco	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 7 years and 3 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 8 years and 9 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 18 months
Author of TE:		TE completion date: 6/27/06	TE submission date to GEF OME: 9/21/06	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 3 months

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

### 2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

Please refer to document "GEF Office of Evaluation Guidelines for the verification and review of terminal evaluations" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. IEG)	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes		Tanzania: S Kenya: S Uganda: U	Tanzania: MS Kenya: MS Uganda: U	MS
2.2 Project sustainability	<b>N/A</b>	L	L	U
2.3 Monitoring and		<b>N/A</b>	N/A	MU

<sup>1</sup> According to the IEG review, the IDA credit for Kenya was closed in the end of 2002 and about USD 4.4 million was cancelled because of the slow implementation progress. However, two extensions were approved for the GEF grant for Kenya which closed December 2005.

evaluation				
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A	S	

Should this terminal evaluation report be considered a good practice? Why?

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?

### 3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

#### 3.1 Project Objectives

- **What are the Global Environmental Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

To rehabilitate the lake ecosystem for the benefit of the people who live in the catchment, the national economies of which they are a part, and the global community. No changes according to the TEs of the countries.

- **What are the Development Objectives? Any changes during implementation?**

To: (a) maximize the sustainable benefits to riparian communities from using resources within the basin to generate food, employment and income, supply safe water, and sustain a disease free environment; and (b) conserve biodiversity and genetic resources for the benefit of the global community. In order to address the tradeoffs among these objectives which cut across national boundaries, a further project objective is to harmonize national management programs in order to achieve, to the maximum extent possible, the reversal of increasing environmental degradation. According to the TEs, the objectives were stated broadly and not changed during the course of implementation. Emphasis within each of the components changed over time, but within the broadly stated goals for the project. The component level objectives were fluid during the course of the project, and underwent change following shifts in emphasis and focus at key milestones (mid-term, the 2003 stock-taking and in the final phase). As a result, the TE indicates that the development modified objectives were: "**to (i) provide the necessary information to improve management of the lake ecosystem, (ii) establish mechanisms of cooperative management by the three countries, (iii) identify and demonstrate practical, self-sustaining remedies, while simultaneously (iv) building capacity for ecosystem management**".

According to IEG, the project performance is being assessed against these more specific objectives which most closely match the intent inferred in the design.

#### 3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

- **What were the major project outcomes and impacts as described in the TE?**

According to IEG, the lack of adequate measurable development objectives and associated performance indicators for each component makes it difficult to assess achievement in terms of results on the ground related the improvement of the Lake ecosystem. In addition, the benefits to the local communities were presented in a limited fashion, especially in terms of return to these communities from improved fishing stocks and related diversification of fish species. Cost benefit analysis at regional level to identify trade offs among various usages was not carried out. Other information applicable to each country and the ratings provided by IEG include:

**In Tanzania:** The achievement of the development objectives as defined after the mid term review (outcomes) is rated **Moderately Satisfactory**. Project implementation was slow. The project closing date was extended by two years, which allowed for a few activities to be completed with reasonable impact.

The implementation process was not adequately guided by well defined results based framework. Instead it achieved sequential incremental progress. The lack of strategic focus impeded prioritization and led to insularity within the components. Activities under the project were weakly linked to the ongoing work of the relevant ministries. Lack of emphasis on cost effectiveness, efficiency, and consistent quality assurance reflected weakness in technical and administrative management.

**For Uganda:** The overall implementation performance (outputs) was **Moderately Satisfactory**, and the achievement of the development objectives (outcomes) was **Moderately Satisfactory**. More details are provided below under effectiveness.

**For Kenya:** The overall implementation performance (outputs) was **Moderately Unsatisfactory**, and the achievement of the development objectives (outcomes) was **Unsatisfactory**. Project implementation was slow. The first two years of implementation were not productive. Much time was taken with establishment of the secretariats and related management, financial and procurement procedures. Implementation in Kenya lagged behind the other two countries through most of the project because of slow funding by the government. The poor performance of the project and its unsatisfactory rating necessitated closing of the IDA credit (with 30 percent undisbursed) at the end of 2002, further reducing the scope of activities. Despite Kenya's positive contribution to the design effort, the country's inability (both on the part of the Government and the implementing agencies) to address chronic weakness in management during implementation greatly weakened the entire effort of the three countries.

**4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT**

**4.1.1 Outcomes**

**A Relevance** **Rating: MS**

According to IEG the regional program for the sustainable management of Lake Victoria was relevant to the needs of the riparian countries to sustain efficient management of the Lake. The Lake is the source of the White Nile, which is an integral part of the Nile River Basin shared by nine countries. Local communities living around the Lake have been dependent on the Lake resources for their living, transport, fisheries, and energy. The IDA/GEF support was in response to requests from the riparian countries. The design addressed local, national, and regional issues with a high degree of stakeholders participation, well focused on appropriate scientific questions, but with limited explanation to policy makers and the public as to how solutions to these questions could be utilized. The project design was complex and the functional relationships among the components were loose and lacking strategic connections. In fact, according to IEG, activities under the project were weakly linked to the ongoing work of the relevant ministries.

**B Effectiveness** **Rating: MS**

According to IEG, at the local level, the activities led to increased capacity in the communities, enabling them to improve resource management, with many positive environmental externalities as well as contributing to improved livelihood. However the level of achievement of most objectives below was rated MS by IEG. Other information assessed by IEG includes:

**For Tanzania:**

**Objective one:** *Provide the necessary information to improve management of the lake ecosystem:* **Satisfactory**. The project supported many knowledge-building activities that advanced the understanding of the Lake Ecosystem, levels and sources of pollution, fish stocks, and hydrology. According to the TE, some of the finding are:

- Biodiversity of fish has declined, but many species thought to be extinct in the watershed are in fact present in refugia in satellite lakes.
- A sustainable catch of Nile Perch is probably within the range of 220,000 tons annually (trawl surveys) to 350,000 tons annually (acoustic survey).
- Point sources of pollution are important locally and have effects on public health, but are not the largest sources of phosphorus and nitrogen exacerbating eutrophication of the lake.
- Eutrophication is primarily due to nitrogen and phosphorus from atmospheric deposition, although the relative contribution of the catchment to it is yet unknown.
- The lake level has varied significantly over time and is highly sensitive to small changes in the balance of inflows and outflows.
- Constructed wetlands can be effective measures to enhance the contribution that natural wetlands make toward water quality.
- Water hyacinth can be effectively contained in the lake through biological control (weevils), but weevils are less effective in the rivers that flow into the lake.

**Objective two:** *Establish mechanisms of cooperative management by the three countries:* **Satisfactory**

The three countries made considerable progress in advancing the regional perspective in both planning and implementation. The Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization was operationalized,

although it requires strengthening. Fisheries sector rules and regulations were harmonized and regional information exchange was strengthened. For example, according to the TE, the East African Community (EAC) passed the Lake Victoria Protocol and, with its ratification by member states in November 2004, created the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC) to be based in Kisumu. Subsequently, a common Lake Victoria Vision was developed by the partner states with extensive consultation at the community level. Through the EAC and Lake Victoria Basin Commission, it is expected that the riparian states will be in a much stronger position in the future to act on the enhanced knowledge about the lake by agreeing on common enforcement of standards and regulations, some of which are now on the books but unevenly enforced.

**Objective three: *Identify and demonstrate practical, self-sustaining remedies: Moderately satisfactory***

The project contributed to establishing and strengthening co-management of natural resources. The participatory approach combined with micro-projects proved to be successful and cost-effective while improving local livelihoods and empowering communities. For example, according to the TE, water hyacinth infestation was reduced to non-nuisance levels through introduction of the weevils, and the symbiotic relationship between the insect and plant populations provides biological sustainability; i.e., when the hyacinth expands, the weevil population grows to bring it back into check. Work of the fish quality laboratory resulted in lifting of the temporary EU ban on import of fish from the lake, and the quality laboratory remains functioning. Better land management in the catchment and wetlands contributed to the reduction of silt and pollution entering the lake but could have benefited from improved targeting through stronger links with relevant ongoing research. The pilots and investments under the industrial and municipal effluent management, however, were problematical. A pilot to test an artificial wetland for municipal treatment of effluents at Butuja was constructed, but could not be fully tested due to delayed completion of the waste water treatment plant at Mwanza, which was operationally linked to the pilot. The lessons could not therefore be fully absorbed or scaled up. Municipal and industrial treatment facilities planned with sources of funding outside the project were either delayed or deferred, and hence the interventions to address industrial and municipal pollution under the project were not successful. Untreated municipal and industrial waste continues to flow into the lake.

**Objective four: *Building capacity for ecosystem management: Satisfactory***

Training and research activities financed by the project provided experience in designing scientific research and resource management, while technical skills were upgraded and the implementing institutions were equipped. Staff was trained in advanced degree courses (M.Sc. and Ph.D.) and others received on-the-job training and participated in short courses. Capacity building and awareness raising campaigns targeted local communities through a variety of instruments (use of local media, training days, workshops, study tours etc.) A Cleaner Production (CP) program was launched and provided useful lessons in industrial waste management. However, capacity building efforts were uncoordinated and opportunistic, rather than based on a well-defined strategy addressing identified needs.

**For Uganda:**

**Objective one: *Provide the necessary information to improve management of the lake ecosystem: Moderately Satisfactory.*** The project supported activities designed to increase understanding of the Lake Ecosystem, particularly in the sources of pollution, fish stocks, and hydrology. Great emphasis was placed on data collection and less on analysis, collation and dissemination. Quality of reports was not consistent. The lack of time-series data prevented conclusive analysis. Planned sedimentation studies were not completed. The effort at comprehensive lake modeling exceeded capacity at this stage, and was not fully successfully undertaken.

**Objective Two: *Establish mechanisms of cooperative management by the three countries: Moderately Satisfactory.*** An important institution, the Lake Victoria Fishery Organization (LVFO) was operationalized, although it requires strengthening. Fisheries sector frameworks were harmonized. Regional synthesis reports were prepared but not of high quality.

**Objective three: *Identify and demonstrate practical, self-sustaining remedies: Moderately***

**Satisfactory:** The project contributed to establishing and strengthening co-management of natural resources. The participatory approach combined with micro-projects proved to be successful and cost-effective while increasing local livelihoods and empowering communities.

**Objective Four: Building capacity for ecosystem management: Moderately Satisfactory.** Efforts to improve forests through local institutions was largely not successful. Most of the activities in the project were oriented towards capacity building, in scientific research and resource management, while technical skills were upgraded.

**For Kenya:**

**Objective one: Provide the necessary information to improve management of the lake ecosystem: moderately satisfactory.** The slow implementation did not allow for achieving full benefits of this objective specially in monitoring water quality and establishing the database.

**Objective two: Establish mechanisms of cooperative management by the three countries: Moderately unsatisfactory.** Delays in government actions slowed progress in advancing the regional perspective in both planning and implementation. The efforts of the other riparian allowed the Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization to become operational although it requires strengthening. Fisheries sector rules and regulations were harmonized and regional information exchange was not always possible because of weak planning by the government.

**Objective three: Identify and demonstrate practical, self-sustaining remedies: Moderately satisfactory.**

The project contributed to establishing co-management of natural resources. The participatory approach combined with micro-projects proved to be successful and cost-effective while improving local livelihoods and empowering communities. The activities were designed to increased capacity in the communities, enabling them to improve resource management and improved livelihoods. However, not all these activities were implemented because the project was not extended due to weak performance.

**Objective four: Building capacity for ecosystem management: Unsatisfactory.** Not all Government agencies carry out their responsibilities. Inspection panel criticized government for poor consultation with beneficiaries in testing technology for the control of water hyacinth. Funds were not properly allocated to enhance capacity building scientific research and resource management, and the national secretariat was unable to adequately address the implementation problem.

**C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)**

**Rating: MU**

According to IEG, efficiency is rated as **Not Available** due to the lack of evidence, the environmental nature of the project and the difficulty of assessing the longer term benefits at this “early stage” and it indicates that more could have been done in the analysis of cost effectiveness.

The TE indicates that one particular focus of the GEF support was the elaboration of a strategic framework for a large program of investment, particularly on municipal waste management and soil conservation that has not resulted to date. The project’s lack of success in addressing direct pollution from point sources diminished achievement of goals for water quality. Despite the difficulties in implementation, the TE judges the project to be satisfactory in meeting outputs, and marginally satisfactory in meeting objectives stated for the first phase.

This project cost more than 80 million dollars and was supposed to be implemented over 7 years but ended up being implemented over almost 9 years. The objectives were reduced from rehabilitating the lake ecosystem to providing the necessary information to improving the management of the lake ecosystem, establishing mechanisms of cooperative management by the three countries, and demonstrating practical, self-sustaining remedies, and building capacity for ecosystem management and still many of this fell short of being satisfactory achieved according to the TE. In the context of the costs, the duration, and the level of achievement of the project objectives with most rated MS in 2 of the 3 participating countries, the efficiency of the use of financial resources is Moderately Unsatisfactory.

**4.1.2 Environmental Impacts**

Uganda was the only one among the partner states to make progress on reducing direct point

source pollution entering the lake through the rehabilitation work on the Bugolobi sewerage treatment plant, which led to an improvement of 19 percent in the BOD in its wastewater. However, as mentioned above, the lack of adequate measurable development objectives and associated performance indicators for each component makes it difficult to assess achievement in terms of results on the ground related to the improvement of the Lake ecosystem.

**4.2 Likelihood of sustainability.** Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE.

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>The TE indicates that the 3 governments made a commitment within the Medium Term Expenditure Framework (MTEF) to include activities initiated under the project in the budget projections and programs for its mainline agencies. Further, the three governments committed USD 1 million as its contribution to the Bridging Phase to continue core activities from the first phase prior to the period when the second phase of external funding becomes available. Policy and decision-makers increasingly support the integrated management of the Lake testifying to the recognition of the public good aspects of the longer-term program. The shift from the financial basis of the first phase (largely project-based and not fully included in the MTEF) to that of the second phase will entail careful assessment of which activities to continue, which to expand, and which to wind down. That assessment is not yet complete, and when it is, not all activities will be retained. Nonetheless, a strong basis for financial sustainability of the overall program is in place within the budgetary framework and agreed modes of external assistance to all three countries.</p> <p>In addition, the TE indicates that in:</p> <p><b>Tanzania:</b> The Government has further indicated under the consolidated Tanzania Joint Assistance Strategy supported by a consortium of partners that Lake Victoria will receive support. Tanzania's external assistance is increasingly "on budget," i.e., reflected in the MTEF, and treatment of activities in Lake Victoria in this way signals continued commitment.</p> <p><b>Kenya:</b> The Government has made a commitment within the budget process to include activities initiated under the project in the budget projections and programs for its mainline agencies. The components with notable links included soil and water conservation and wetlands.</p> <p><b>Uganda:</b></p> <p>The study tour organized for parliamentarians to break the Parliamentary blockage of approval for the supplemental financing was very effective, and that, combined with current concern over the level of the lake, has greatly increased parliamentary support for the program.</p> <p>The risks to financial sustainability given the bridge financing commitments made by each country and the possibility of a second phase seem low.</p>	
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<p>IEG indicates that there was a high degree of stakeholder ownership of the planning process and that the design addressed local, national, and regional issues with a high degree of stakeholders participation, and was well focused on appropriate scientific questions. However, IEG indicates that there was limited explanation to the public as to how solutions to these questions could be utilized. In addition, the project design was complex and the functional relationships among the components were loose and lacking strategic connections.</p>	
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<p>The TEs indicates that the project enhanced institutions and generated momentum towards an integrated approach for the management of Lake Victoria and its catchment. Political commitment has been increased through information and creation of awareness among a wide section of stakeholders. The participatory approach and co-management of resources followed by the project, while time consuming to establish, contribute to sustainable results, especially when combined with adequate regulatory and monitoring mechanisms. The Lake Victoria Fisheries Organization is in place and functioning, although it needs strengthening. A decision has been taken to form a comparable organization for water, both quality and level. The Lake Victoria Protocol is ratified by the three riparian states. The EAC has formed the Lake Victoria Basin Commission to serve as a coordinating body. Finally, Rwanda and Burundi, two partners minimally active in the first phase but important for the maintenance of the watershed, have actively sought to join the second phase and are clarifying their relations with the EAC. Because of the increased visibility of the Lake Victoria agenda and its enhanced recognition within the governmental bodies of the riparian states, the difficulty experience in the first phase of embedding activities in the main ministries will be less problematical in the future. Each of the countries has designated lead ministries, and the "projectized" structure of the first phase will be disbanded and/or integrated into the relevant agencies.</p> <p>In Kenya, the Kenyan Ministry of Environment has acknowledged the shortcomings in performance of the project while it was under the Ministry's oversight and agreed to the transfer to KARI for the final period of implementation. The Ministry now actively seeks to lead Kenya's participation in the second phase, both in preparation and implementation, and has appointed a coordinator within the Ministry to lead that effort.</p>	

<p>KARI is eager to relinquish its present role and return to its core business of providing research to underpin improved agricultural practices that will serve the environment in the Lake Victoria basin. Because Kenya's contribution to the regional institutions is strong and the Ministry of Environment is showing commitment to resume responsibility for the Lake Victoria program under more promising circumstances than in the past, the outlook for institutional sustainability is good. Internal quality control and management processes (particularly for research) must be strengthened to enhance relevance and assure that the activities mainstreamed into the institutional structure are in fact delivering the needed results. For these reasons the outlook for institutional sustainability is good. Internal quality control and management processes (particularly for research) must be strengthened to enhance relevance and assure that the activities mainstreamed into the institutional structure are in fact delivering the needed results.</p>	
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
<p>The TEs indicates that through its soil and water and afforestation activities, the project affected, on a limited scale, the inflows caused by erosion. The project's contribution to reducing effluents through its planned priority investment activities in tertiary treatment was negligible. Continued over-exploitation of fisheries remains a concern, since the present offtake of Nile Perch is not within the range of catch estimated provisionally to be sustainable. The decline in the level of the lake during the first phase confirms the vulnerability of the level to changes in abstraction and precipitation. The research and consultative mechanism put in place under the project contributed toward actions that have drawn attention to the over-abstraction, but it remains to be seen whether further and possibly irreversible damage will be avoided. The lake is presently rising as the rainy season ends, but the longer term prospect is not yet clear because decisions taken over the last two years within Uganda but outside the purview of this project have exacerbated the recent fall in the level of the lake. If not reversed, over extraction from the lake within Uganda will undermine the accomplishments of the first phase of the Lake Victoria program for all the partners, and radically shift the emphasis during the second phase toward preserving the level of the lake as the supreme priority over all others.</p> <p>The current status of the fish stock, water quality, and the level of the lake confirm the need for clearly specified environmental indicators in the second phase and agreed and enforceable mechanisms to achieve the indicators. Furthermore, environmental assessment of the micro-projects should be enhanced and built into the environmental capacity of the local governments in the watershed.</p>	

Provide only ratings for the sustainability of outcomes based on the information in the TE:

<b>A Financial resources</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>B Socio political</b>	<b>Rating: ML</b>
<b>C Institutional framework and governance</b>	<b>Rating: L</b>
<b>D Environmental</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>

**4.3 Catalytic role**

<b>a. Production of a public good</b>
<b>b. Demonstration</b>
<b>c. Replication</b>
<b>d. Scaling up.</b> According to IEG, the design included several pilots to test new technology on the ground, but suffered from poor follow up to upscale and main stream results in the national agenda.

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

<b>A. M&amp;E design</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
<p>According to IEG, the design of M&amp;E was weak because there was no well defined result based framework. The project very much needed an alternative to the log frame; i.e., a practical guide to action and clarity on the results expected. Key performance indicators were established late in the implementation (in 2004) during an attempt to retrofit a log-frame.</p>	
<b>B. M&amp;E plan Implementation</b>	<b>Rating: MU</b>
<p>According to IEG, implementation of M&amp;E systems was weak, and this weakness was costly for the performance of the project. Nevertheless, changes introduced at the MTR allowed implementation to accelerate within the components and eventually allowed funds to flow. The TE indicates that the lack of adequate measurable development objectives and associated performance indicators for each component made it difficult to assess achievement in terms of results.</p>	

<b>C. M&amp;E budgeted and properly funded</b>	<b>Rating: U</b>
No	
<b>Can the project M&amp;E system be considered a good practice?</b> No for the reasons above	

**4.5 Lessons**

Project lessons as described in the TE

<b>What lessons mentioned in the TE that can be considered a good practice or approaches to avoid and could have application for other GEF projects?</b>
<p>According to IEG:</p> <p>1-Regional dimensions of national projects are vulnerable to failure if one of the partners do not deliver on agreed joint plans. Safeguards to mitigate such risks should be built into the design of regional programs.</p> <p>2-Scientific research must be targeted, provide usable information for management decisions and be widely accessible.</p> <p>3-The Basin perspective is critical to address the key environmental issues of large systems such as Lake Victoria.</p> <p>4-Regional projects necessitate greater emphasis on clarity of project objectives, monitorable frameworks, at multiple levels, and adequate mechanisms for governance.</p> <p>5-Capacity building has to address both current and projected needs of regional cooperation.</p> <p>6-Implementation in the medium to longer term can be undertaken through strengthening national agencies and governmental structures.</p> <p>7-Environmental benefits must be strongly linked to improved livelihoods for local people and communities.</p>

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

<b>4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.</b>
<p>Comments from Aaron Zazueta to IEG: The GEF Council approved this project as one regional project which the Bank subsequently divided into three projects.</p> <p>Comments specific to Lake Victoria Kenya Project IEG Review.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· Overall the GEF EO agrees with the rating of Unsatisfactory for the project outcomes, with the rating of Unlikely for sustainability and the rating of Unsatisfactory for Borrower performance.</li> <li>· In Bank Performance the IEG review does not assess the reasons why the Bank continued with GEF component even though it canceled its loan. In your opinion did the Bank apply the same stewardship efforts to the GEF component as it did to the Bank's loan? Also since 2002 GEF required Implementing Agencies to retrofit to include a logframe for projects that had two or more years left in implementation. The Bank did not fulfill this requirement. This should also be considered in the rating of Bank performance.</li> <li>· Given the lack of financial reporting in the ICR, this ICR would not be rated as Satisfactory. Accountability of funds is an important criteria in rating terminal reports of GEF projects.</li> </ul>

<b>4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report</b>	<b>Ratings</b>
<b>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</b> Yes, however, an assessment of the reasons why the Bank continued with GEF component even though it canceled its loan. The question of whether the Bank applied the same stewardship efforts to the GEF funds as it did to the Bank's loan remains unanswered.	MS
<b>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</b> IEG indicates that the TEs provided well	S



structured analysis of the strength and weakness of project design, implementation, and discussed factors affecting implementation with supporting empirical data. Most ratings were substantiated with some exceptions. For example, the TE assigns Uganda a rating of satisfactory, even though it indicates a rating of moderately satisfactory on both outputs and objectives.	
<b>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Yes</b>	S
<b>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</b> The TEs included well prepared annexes and provides adequate guidance to regional management as to the lessons learned.	S
<b>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</b> The Kenya ICR did not present adequate financial analysis of actual cost of each component and the Tanzania ICR did not have information on the actual contribution by the GoT.	MS
<b>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&amp;E systems?</b> Yes, although there was not a specific section on the TE with this information. The assessment on M&E systems had to be extracted from different sections of the TEs. IEG indicates that for Uganda, the SAR did not include adequate indicators to assess impact and results, and the ICR could not fill this gap.	S

**4.7 Is a technical assessment of the project impacts described in the TE recommended?** Please place an "X" in the appropriate box and explain below.

<b>Yes:</b>	<b>No: X</b>
-------------	--------------

Explain: A technical assessment of impacts is not recommended at this time. Depending on the results of the second phase, it may make more sense then to conduct this assessment.

**4.8 Sources of information for the preparation of the TE review in addition to the TE (if any)**

TEs of Uganda, Kenya and Tanzania, evaluation summaries of IEG for the three TEs, and project document.