

GEFM&E Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
		Review date:		9/8/05
GEF ID:	905		at endorsement (Million US\$)	at completion (Million US\$)
Project Name:	Land Use Change Analysis as an approach for investigating biodiversity loss and land degradation (LUCID)	GEF financing:	0.771000	NA
Country:	Kenya, Uganda and United Republic of Tanzania	Co-financing:	0.645700	NA
Operational Program:	OP1	Total Project Cost:	\$1.416700	NA
IA	UNEP	<u>Dates</u>		
Partners involved:	International Livestock Research Institute	Work Program date		NA
		CEO Endorsement		Nov 2000
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Jan 2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: Dec 2003	Actual: June 2004
Prepared by: Neeraj Negi	Reviewed by: Aaron Zazueta	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 3 years	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 3 years 6 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 6 months
Author of TE:	Jesse T. Njoka	TE completion date: Nov 2004	TE submission date to GEF OME: June 2005	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 8 months

2. SUMMARY OF PROJECT RATINGS

GEFME Ratings for project impacts (if applicable), outcomes, project monitoring and evaluation, and quality of the terminal evaluation: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Moderately Satisfactory (MS), Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), Highly Unsatisfactory (HU), not applicable (N/A) and unable to assess (U/A). GEFME Ratings for the project sustainability: Highly likely (HL), likely (L), moderately likely (ML), moderately unlikely (MU), unlikely (U), highly unlikely (HU), not applicable (N/A), and unable to assess (U/A). Please refer to document "Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems" for further definitions of the ratings.

	Last PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	Other IA evaluations if applicable (e.g. OED)	GEFME
2.1 Project impacts	S	S		S
2.2 Project outcomes	S	HS		S
2.3 Project sustainability	S	S		S

2.4 Monitoring and evaluation	N/A	MS		MS
2.5 Quality of the evaluation report	N/A	N/A		S

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

Yes

The TE provides a good account of the accomplishments and failings of the project. It presents information on project's performance in a systematic and lucid manner. It covers most of the major dimensions of the project very well. However, TE gives inadequate attention to providing financial details of project costs and appraising the actual functioning of the M&E systems. Despite these failings, the TE could be a good example for projects which aim at targeted research on environmental issues because it is excellent in terms of appraising the achievement of project objectives and outcomes, and issues that affect project sustainability.

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES, EXPECTED AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

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

According to the project proposal document (PDF-A)¹:

“The project goal is to contribute to the conservation of biodiversity and prevention of land degradation by providing useful instruments to identify and monitor changes in the landscape associated with biodiversity loss and land degradation, and identify the root causes of those changes. These tools will assist GEF in the design of multi-focal area projects. With information obtained from such tools, stakeholders and decision makers will be better able to implement effective remedial and preventive policy”.

In the Executive Summary of the report TE, however, describes the overall objective of the project to be to:

“Analyze new and existing data concerning the linkages between the processes of change in biodiversity, land degradation and land use in order to design a guide on how to use land use change analysis to identify spatial and temporal trends, and linkages, of change in biodiversity and land degradation².”

The TE reproduces this overall objective verbatim as an Intermediate Objective number one³ in later sections of the Executive Summary but does not provide any information on whether there has been a change in the overall project objectives and if yes then why. In annex 1, however, where the TE discusses the project logical framework, the TE repeats the overall project objective given in the PDF A. This apparent discrepancy seems to be due to a mistake in drafting of the TE report instead of any substantive change in the overall objectives during project implementation.

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

According to the project proposal document (PDF-A) the project has three Intermediate Objectives which are given as follows:

“Intermediate Objective One: Analyze new and existing data concerning the linkages between the

¹ This is the only project proposal document that is available on the PMIS.

² See paragraph 1 of the TE

³ See paragraph 2 of the TE

processes of change in biodiversity, land degradation and land use in order to design a guide on how to use land use change analysis to identify spatial and temporal trends, and linkages, of change in biodiversity and land degradation.

Intermediate Objective Two: *Integrate ecological, socioeconomic and land use data and theory to develop a replicable analytical framework to identify the root causes of land use change leading to changes in biodiversity and land degradation.*

Intermediate Objective Three: *Provide integrated data and information on the patterns and trends in land use, biodiversity and land degradation in East Africa that will provide a basis for more effective local, national and regional programs.”*

The TE reproduces these intermediate objectives in the narrative without any changes. Thus, it can be inferred that there has been no change in the development objectives of the project during its implementation⁴.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

According to the TE, the project has been able to satisfactorily achieve its intended impacts and outcomes. The TE finds the first intermediate objective of the project to be realistic and comments that the project was able to achieve it to a large extent. The TE opines that the project has been able to produce information products in form of working papers and has developed and tested a new research framework. The TE points out that many findings have not been shared widely with the potential end users since the project ended in June 2004. It feels that more time may be required for sharing this information with the stakeholders at the local, national and international level.

TE believes that the project has been able to meet its second intermediate objective in a satisfactory manner. The project has produced several good papers, especially Maitima et al. (2004) and Olson et al. (2004). It further opines that the LUCID research framework, developed under the project, integrates ecological and socio-economic factors, land use change and existing theories on the dynamics of these processes and is, therefore, is an effective tool for analysis of the root causes of land use dynamics.

The TE believes that the project has also been able to realize its third intermediate objective to a large extent as many scholarly papers have been produced that capture the achievement of this objective. However, it feels that despite the project being successful in identifying the information useful for effective program design, planning and implementation, the information requires more processing so that it can be converted into products that can inform policy and development partners and stakeholders. The data have also not been formatted for long term ecological and socio-economic monitoring as was envisaged at project proposal stage. The TE finds it a significant achievement that project has been able to post most of its research findings on its website. The information is also compiled in a CD-ROM, which includes most of the working papers, maps and some data. The TE opines that this information will, however, not be used unless the end users are trained on the LUCID research approach.

4. GEF OFFICE OF M&E ASSESSMENT

4.1 Outcomes and impacts

Rating: S

A Relevance

- **In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Explain**

The PDF A emphasizes the need for locally relevant knowledge and information management

⁴ See paragraph 2, 3 and 4.

products. The premise of the project is that governments, NGOs and communities lack effective tools for integrating socioeconomic and biophysical data to track and interpret changes in environmental conditions and the socio-economic driving forces of those changes. Further, there is an important gap in the knowledge of the trends, linkages and degree of importance of changes in biodiversity, land degradation, and land use and land management. The PDF A makes a case that these barriers prevent the policy makers and implementers from developing appropriate environmental and social responses to address the local livelihoods and ecological security issues in an effective manner. The PDF-A lays emphasis on creating new knowledge that integrates socioeconomic and biophysical data to track and interpret changes in the environmental conditions. This information can help the policy makers to account for various complexities pertaining to land use change in their policies. This it believes will help in addressing the environmental and socio economic problems prevalent in the project area countries.

During implementation, the project has indeed been able to generate required information and analytical tools that could be useful in devising better approaches to environmental management and biodiversity conservation. And, therefore, in this sense project outcomes have been consistent with the Biodiversity focal area strategies, especially those pertaining to arid and semiarid ecosystems. There is reasonable likelihood that in the long run program outcomes will contribute to improvement in the local biodiversity status of the project area.

S

B Effectiveness

- **Are the project outcomes as described in the TE commensurable with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address (i.e. original or modified project objectives)?**

According to the TE, the project has to a great extent realized its expected outcomes. It has produced quality information products such as reports, working papers, and articles, and a new research framework that addresses the complexities of addressing the land use change issues. Although the TE shows that the project has been effective in producing sufficient number of information products of high quality, it does not provide information on the extent to which these tools have been useful to the GEF in designing multi-focal projects, as had been outlined in the overall project objective. This apart, the project outcomes are extent commensurate with the expectations to a great extent.

MS

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness)

- **Include an assessment of outcomes and impacts in relation to inputs, costs, and implementation times based on the following questions: Was the project cost – effective? How does the cost-time Vs. outcomes compare to other similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems?**

According to the TE, despite six months of delay during the implementation of the project, the overall implementation of the project was conducted in an efficient manner. The personnel costs were within the accepted norm of 25% and only two persons were salaried to the project. Country scientists contributed to the project free of cost and institutions also allowed the project access to their national information without any charge.

According to TE, despite the financial allocations at the country level being very modest, the country site coordinators were satisfied that the financial allocation was well used to meet the project objectives and outcomes.

However, the TE does point out issues where financial constraints did prevent the project from attaining optimal results. For example, the quality of the information generated by the project – which is based on the remote sensing images of 30X30 m resolution – could have been vastly improved had there been an additional allocation of \$ 10,000 which would then have allowed the

LUCID database information system to use images of 10X10 m resolution or with even greater resolution. Other than this instance, which the TE points out to illustrate how cost constraints could actually reduce effectiveness, in the overall sense the program seemed to have performed well on this dimension. The TE observes that the results that have been achieved in this project would have normally required five-time the financial resources used had the partners not been very involved in this project. The TE also suggests that a follow up activity which will allow further processing and dissemination of the informational projects will help project attain an optimal level of cost-effectiveness.

HS

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of project sustainability based on the information presented in the TE.

A Financial resources	Rating: L
According to TE, since LUCID is a targeted research project it is expected to have only a catalytic effect and, therefore, financial sustainability of project activities itself is not expected. It further observes that some of the elements of the project, however, may be sustainable and may not require additional financial support. For example, some of the collaborating partners such as French Institute of Research in Africa are willing to follow up on LUCID outcomes. Community Management of Protected Areas Conservation (COMPACT) project (Tanzania) has also shown interest in accessing the findings of LUCID. Academic institutions such as Department of Geography, University of Dar es Salaam, and Makerere University are in the process of accommodating the LUCID approach in teaching departmental courses. Further, the Rockefeller Foundation and ILRI have committed to transform the findings into policy briefs for policy makers.	
B Socio political	Rating: L
According to the TE, the governments of Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda have been very involved in planning and implementation of the LUCID project. It observes that the partner countries share the feeling that this project will facilitate them in being able to meet their obligations under the international conventions on environment and sustainable development. It states that the project has received endorsement of the national governments through their respective national environment management authorities. The key institutions of the partner countries have also been involved in the development and testing of the LUCID framework, which shows that the project is sustainable in the socio-political dimension.	
C Institutional framework and governance	Rating: L
According to the TE, the LUCID project is likely to be sustainable in institutional and governance dimensions. It observes that the project fructified due to close collaboration among the researchers and the institutions from different disciplines and this collaboration is likely to continue at all levels. It observes that the LUCID approach is being institutionalized in ILRI, which is the executing agency for this project. Also, the LUCID findings are being used for teaching by Makerere University Institute of Environment and Natural Resources, and the Department of Range Management at the University of Nairobi has indicated interest in using the methodological guide and selected working papers to update teaching material on ecological courses. Further, it observes that since various stakeholders have already started using the information products of LUCID project many stakeholders believe that the project findings will be self sustaining in nature. However, the TE does feel that there could be a need to have a follow up phase for this project so that its findings reach an even greater audience.	
D Ecological (for example, for coffee production projects, reforestation for carbon sequestration under OP12, etc.)	Rating: NA
Not Applicable	
E Examples of replication and catalytic outcomes suggesting increased likelihood of sustainability	Rating: ML
The TE opines that replication of the LUCID project in other countries will come only at a later stage since the results and impacts of LUCID findings have not been disseminated beyond LUCID's primary network. It observes that the LUCID project findings will play a key role in informing the design of future projects on studies of land use and management of natural resources. However, without re-synthesis of information in a form that could be understood by the policy makers the project may not be able to achieve its fullest potential in informing national and regional environmental policies. Nonetheless, the TE feels that significant replication of the research framework is taking place in different geographical areas and also many scholars have been trained in the methodology which will facilitate its further replication.	

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

A. Effective M&E systems in place: What were the accomplishments and

<p>shortcomings of the project's M&E system in terms of the tools used such as: indicators, baselines, benchmarks, data collection and analysis systems, special studies and reports, etc.? Rating: MS</p>
<p>The TE explains that the LUCID project was designed using a partial logical framework to monitor and evaluate baseline information, performance indicators, project objectives, outcomes and activities. However, it does not comment on whether the M&E plan was suitable for the task at hand.</p> <p>The TE observes that identification of baseline information and benchmarks for assessing project's achievement of objectives, outcomes, and activities was a product of a consultative process between key scientists and institutions involved in the implementation of the project. This participative process, TE observes, created awareness among the implementing partners concerning the need for regular self assessment and the need for timely financial and technical reporting.</p> <p>According to TE the quality of the technical reports by the personnel who provided back stopping services is generally good in terms of relevance to the project objectives and the technical soundness. However, there were few instances when the responsible individuals were not able to deliver due to job change or change in job status. In such cases other scientists completed their reports.</p>
<p>B. Information used for adaptive management: What is the experience of the project with adaptive management? Rating: NA</p>
<p>According to TE, UNEP-GEF minimized the risks related to the management of project finances by selecting implementing institutions with well established internal financial control systems. It further observes that, although financial risks were easy to track as far as UNEP-GEF financial component was concerned, it was difficult to monitor the co-financing aspects carried out by executing and implementing partners. Other than this evidence – which may or may not be based on the information generated by the M&E system – the TE does not provide any information that would show us whether and how information from the M&E system was used in adaptive management.</p>
<p>Sufficient information not available</p>
<p>Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice?</p>
<p>Information on the M&E system of the project is patchy. While it does provide information on the M&E plan in annex I, it does not provide enough information to allow us to determine whether the project M&E system could be considered a good practice.</p>
<p>Sufficient information not available</p>

4.4 Lessons

Project lessons as described in the TE

<p>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?</p>
<p>The TE appreciates the flexibility shown by GEF in extending project completion timeframe, the efficacy of multidisciplinary approach in understanding complex problems, and the strategic partnership of the local institutions with international organizations as key factors that contributed to the project achieving its objectives. The TE observes that extension of the project completion deadline – without additional financial support – by six months was critical in allowing the project to complete many important activities which would have otherwise stayed unaccomplished. Further, the multidisciplinary approach to understanding complexities in land use changes allowed LUCID to develop a sophisticated analytical research framework. The TE also opines that the strategic partnership among UNEP-GEF, international research and training institutions and national institutions has enhanced the institutional and human resource capacities of the local</p>

institutions. Further, this has also facilitated in sharing of the lessons and experiences of from the project.

4.5 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 the “Criteria for the assessment of the quality of terminal evaluation reports” in the document “Ratings for the achievement of objectives, sustainability of outcomes and impacts, quality of terminal evaluation reports and project M&E systems” for further definitions of the ratings.

4.5.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings
 In some cases the GEF Office of M&E may have independent information collected for example, through a field visit or independent evaluators working for the Office of M&E. If substantial independent information has been collected, then complete this section with any comments about the project.

4.5.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	Ratings
<p>A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?</p> <p>The TE report provides a detailed account of the relevant outcomes and impacts of the program. It also provides us reliable information on the extent to which the project’s objectives were met.</p>	HS
<p>B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?</p> <p>The report is internally consistent and it provides complete and convincing evidence in supports of the claims that it makes. However, as also mentioned earlier, the overall objective of the project is described differently in Executive Summary and in Annex1. This could possibly be due to an error in drafting the report.</p>	S
<p>C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy?</p> <p>The report does assess the issues related to project sustainability and project exit strategy in a fairly detailed manner. It lists the evidence that could indicate the extent to which the project’s outputs and outcomes will be internalized by the institutions and countries involved in implementing the project. It also lists the constraints that may prevent the project from achieving all its potential benefits in future and it also suggests ways in which this issue can be addressed.</p>	S
<p>D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?</p> <p>The TE does provide evidence for the lessons learnt during project implementation.</p>	S
<p>E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?</p> <p>The TE does not provide details of the project costs. In Annex I and Annex III it provides information on the total budgeted amount – GEF component and the co-finance – and “incremental cost” but the per activity amount is not given. Also, it is not clear whether the “incremental cost” referred to in Annex III is the</p>	MU

actual amount of GEF funding spent till that point or does it refer to the final amount spent.	
<p>F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?</p> <p>The TEs assessment of the M&E systems in the project was a bit cursory. Although it did describe the M&E plan, it did not provide enough information on how this system actually functioned during the implementation of the project. Similarly, although it does discuss the instances when the project adapted based on the felt needs, it fails to inform whether the information that led to these adaptations were an output of the M&E system or was acquired through other sources.</p>	MU

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

Yes: X	No:
---------------	------------

<p>Explain:</p> <p>Since the project was a targeted research product, major outcomes and outputs of the project are in form of knowledge products. According to TE, these knowledge products are generally of high quality and could play a pivotal role in informing policy makers to form appropriate natural resource management and environmental policies. The TE also points out that although there is lot of interest in the products generated by the project, without appropriate follow up to facilitate dissemination of these products its potential may not be realized. It may be interesting to conduct technical assessment of these knowledge products and to reassess the knowledge products of the projects and to find out whether GEF could have a role in further dissemination of these products.</p> <p>Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.?</p> <p>None were mentioned.</p>
--

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

<p>PIR 2004 PDF A</p>
