GEF EO Terminal Evaluation Review Form

1. PROJECT DATA				
			Review date:	Dec 22, 2007
GEF Project ID:	981		at endorsement (Million US$)	at completion (Million US$)
IA/EA Project ID:	257	**GEF financing:**	0.75	0.75
Project Name:	Community Based Management of On-Farm Plant Genetic Resources in Arid and Semi-Arid Areas of Sub-Saharan Africa	IA/EA own:	1.30	1.42
Country:	Regional (Benin, Burkina Faso, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali, Uganda, Zimbabwe)	Government:		
		Other*:	-	-
		Total Cofinancing	1.30	1.42
Operational Program:	OP 1	**Total Project Cost:**	2.05	2.17
IA	UNEP	Dates		
Partners involved: IPGRI (EA) Institut National de Recherche Agricole du Benin (INRAB), Institut d'Etudes et de Recherche Agricoles (INERA) Burkina Faso, University of Ghana (UoG), the National Genebank of Kenya (NGBK), the National Plant Genetic Resources Centre in Chitedze (NPGRC) Malawi, Insitut d'Economie Rurale (IER) in Mali, the National Agricultural Research Organization (NARO) Uganda and the Dept. of Agricultural Research and Extension (AREX, former DRSS) Zimbabwe.		Work Program date		NA
		CEO Endorsement		Jan 2001
		Effectiveness/ Prodoc Signature (i.e. date project began)		Dec 2001
		Closing Date	Proposed: Dec 2004	Actual: April 2006
Prepared by: Alejandro Imbach	Reviewed by: Neeraj Negi	Duration between effectiveness date and original closing: 36 months	Duration between effectiveness date and actual closing: 53 months	Difference between original and actual closing: 17 months
Author of TE: Franck Attere		TE completion date: April 2007	TE submission date to GEF OME: August 2007	Difference between TE completion and submission date: 4 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 **EO UNEP**	GEF EO
2.1 Project outcomes	**S**	**S**	**S**	**S**
2.2 Project sustainability	**N/A**	**MS**	**MS**	**MU**
2.3 Monitoring and evaluation	**N/A**	**U**	**MS**	**U**
2.4 Quality of the evaluation report	**N/A**	**N/A**	**MS**	**S**

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

Yes. The Terminal Evaluation may be considered a good practice. In addition to the way it addressed Project sustainability issues, all other important issues have been adequately addressed.

Is there a follow up issue mentioned in the TE such as corruption, reallocation of GEF funds, etc.? **NO**

3. PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND ACTUAL OUTCOMES

3.1 Project Objectives

- **What were the Global Environmental Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to PAD this Objective was: To improve the effectiveness of traditional farming systems for conservation of crop landraces of local and global importance.

According to PIR and no changes were made to this objective.

- **What were the Development Objectives of the project? Were there any changes during implementation?**

According to PAD the Development Objective of the Project was: To develop models for enabling environments for an effective contribution of traditional farming systems in biodiversity conservation and measures to maintain and promote wider adoption of viable systems.

According to PIR and no changes were made to this objective.

3.2 Outcomes and Impacts

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

OUTCOMES

- A framework for analysis of best practices for conservation of crop landraces on-farm has been developed as part of the project.
- A draft framework that links 'best practices' for conservation of crop landraces on-farm to decision-making and policy was also developed through lessons learnt from several other projects around the world, and tested/ by most of the implementing countries during policy–makers' workshops.
- Capacity development has been carried out throughout project implementation and was targeted at researchers, extension staff, farmers and policy makers. Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali and Zimbabwe have began the process of integrating traditional knowledge on landraces in national policy initiatives leading to national decision-making strategies on PGR at policy levels in accordance with article 6b of the CBD on which the GEF is required to take action.
- While policy-makers have been engaged, the link between this project and the policy initiatives in these countries cannot be ascertained from the evidence provided. Although mechanisms to achieve it are in place it will take a longer time to influence the policy environment.

- Application of “good” or “best” practices replicated/extended in all participating countries, beyond project areas.
- Enhanced communication channels between projects, farmers, decision-makers, formal and informal institutions with regular updates and exchange of information
- Status reports on genetic erosion of local crop cultivars in selected areas in all partner countries, improving a previously unknown situation on this issue
- Present state of knowledge of on-farm conservation in partner countries synthesized and best practices analysed and made accessible to all stakeholders.
- A document on Best approaches/models for integration of traditional knowledge into national agricultural policies/plans/strategies developed and made available.
- The project developed a document detailing an approach to engage policy-makers in landrace conservation issues. The approach was employed in the project countries to develop specific action plans for integrating traditional knowledge and landrace conservation into national policy instruments.
- National management frameworks for the implementation of on-farm conservation strategies strengthened in some countries (e.g. Kenya) or supported in others (e.g. Ghana, Mali)
- Process for placing national policies on integrating traditional knowledge on landraces initiated in all eight countries
- IMPACTS
- No impacts to report. See 4.1.2 below for more details.

4. GEF EVALUATION OFFICE ASSESSMENT

4.1.1 Outcomes (use a six point scale 6= HS to 1 = HU)

A Relevance **Rating: S**

Were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies and country priorities?

Yes, the PAD clearly shows the consistency between the Project objectives and outcomes with CBD and GEF priorities as well as with national and regional policies and strategies.

B Effectiveness **Rating: S**

Are the project outcomes commensurate with the expected outcomes (as described in the project document) and the problems the project was intended to address?

According to the TE the Project achieved most of its outcomes and all products despite the difficulties inherent to a large multi-country Programme running for relatively short period of time and a relatively low budget.

In terms of achieved outcomes, a framework for analysis of best practices for conservation of crop landraces on-farm has been developed as part of the project. Through lessons learnt from several other projects around the world, a draft framework was developed and tested/ by most of the implementing countries during policy–makers’ workshops. Capacity development has been carried out throughout project implementation and was targeted at researchers,extension staff, farmers and policy makers. Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali and Zimbabwe have began the process of integrating traditional knowledge on landraces in national policy initiatives leading to national decision-making strategies on PGR at policy levels in accordance with article 6b of the CBD on which the GEF is required to take action.

The non-achieved outcomes are related with influencing policy. While policy-makers have been engaged the link between this project and the policy initiatives in these countries cannot be ascertained from the evidence provided. Although mechanisms to achieve it are in place it will take a longer time to influence the policy enviornment.

C Efficiency (cost-effectiveness) **Rating: S**

Was the project cost – effective? How does project’s cost/time versus outcomes equation compare to that of similar projects? Was the project implementation delayed due to any bureaucratic, administrative or political problems and did that affect cost-effectiveness?

The project was efficient in mobilization of cofinancing. Even though it was ambitious in terms of outcome expectations, it was able to achieve most of them effectively in a time bound manner.

4.1.2 Impacts

Has the project achieved impacts or is it likely that outcomes will lead to the expected impacts?
Most of the impacts of the project are expected in the future and are to be measured in the long term. They will derive from policies that will be enacted as the result of project activities influencing national legislations. The project time is too short for most impacts to be measured immediately especially those contributing in influencing or changing the policy context. Moreover, changes in policy do not translate necessarily in actual changes in the biodiversity, the environment or people livelihoods. Therefore, these final levels of change are yet even more distant.

4.2 Likelihood of sustainability. Using the following sustainability criteria, include an assessment of **risks** to sustainability of project outcomes and impacts based on the information presented in the TE. Use a four point scale (4= no or negligible risk to 1= High risk)

A Financial resources **Rating: MU** **What is the likelihood that the financial resources will be available to continue the activities that results in the continuation of benefits?**
The TE does not provide detailed information on this issue. It states that the Project provided funds to different organizations with different project-related purposes. Further, that at the time of Project closure the financial support from Governments to the national organizations responsible to carry-on the activities promoted by the project have not crystallized.
B Socio political **Rating: MU** **Are there any social or political risks that can undermine the longevity of project outcomes?**
There are risks as the Project results just reached some national organizations and political spaces. The bulk of work with farmers, farmers associations, etc. still remains to be done and it is dependent on the work of national organizations. The work of the national organizations will depend on the availability of funding resources presented above.
C Institutional framework and governance **Rating: MU** **Do the legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes pose any threat to the continuation of project benefits?**
The TE presents its analysis on this issue mostly in terms of things expected to happen such as "it is expected that support for government institutions involved in on-farm conservation research/practice will crystallize, by making it a part of their core activities. This is being attempted in some of the countries" or "in Benin, a permanent parliamentarian's forum involved in landraces conservation issues will be established as part of the section on natural resources". Similar situation with other Projects is evaluated less positively by the GEF EO than it appears in the TE
D Environmental **Rating: ML** **Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits?**
The TE does not addresses environmental issues. The risks associated to climate change impacts on dry areas are considered significant by most climate change scientists and clearly apply to the areas addressed in this project and the crops traditionally grown there.

4.3 Catalytic role

a. Production of a public good.
The frameworks, capacity building, exchanges and policy-development progresses produced by the Project are considered as public goods. Moreover, all these products were useful to strengthen these issues at different organizational and political levels in the different countries.
b. Demonstration
The Project did not have demonstration components, but it devoted significant efforts to the collection of good practices implemented by local farmers regarding conservation of crop genetic resources
c. Replication
The Project developed a framework to replicate the good practices mentioned above and also to incorporate them into national policies. The TE also mentions the replication of the Project activities to areas not covered by the Project. Several similar projects are being prepared in all the implementing countries. • In Benin, the project has extended the best practices surveys to all Northern provinces, with students researching on the status of other resources in other communities. • Kenya has initiated the preparation of a project on traditional seed systems. • Burkina Faso, Mali and Niger have obtained a substantial grant to expand their in-situ project • In Ghana, the plant genetic resources centres are planning for a systematic on-farm conservation programme using the methodology now established by the project. This will eventually be extended to four agro-ecological zones of the country and will serve as a back up for the ex-situ conservation programme.
d. Scaling up

Benin, Ghana, Kenya, Malawi, Mali and Zimbabwe have began the process of integrating traditional knowledge on landraces in national policy initiatives leading to national decision making strategies on PGR at policy levels in accordance with article 6b of the CBD on which the GEF is required to take action. The farmers expect that this may protect them from the invasion of GMOs.

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

A. M&E design at Entry Rating (six point scale): U
According to the TE, "the project was initially designed without an elaborated monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan. With a good M&E plan the project would have been well equipped to easily track performance towards the achievement of the objectives, hence the ease in production of good progress reports. It would have also ensured that any abnormality in project implementation was identified at the earliest stage and rectified/adjusted immediately and properly, allowing the project to follow the course planned and set." A brief analysis of the PAD confirmed the TE assessment.
B. M&E plan Implementation Rating (six point scale): U
The absence of a strong M&E system at the onset of the project and their use in adaptive management mark the issues to be considered for M&E implementation. The TE report notes regular progress reporting but absence of tracking of results. The TE indicates lack of easy tracking of performance towards accomplishment of objectives and identification of bottlenecks. It also indicates that it is not clear from the report that the project logframe was used as a tool for project implementation and how this was adapted during project implementation. Apparently project reports from the different countries were received with regularity but with difficulty because of a weak project coordination mechanism and this constrained oversight and monitoring. On the positive side, the TE indicates that: "however a number of elements such as the stringent reporting requirement (4 reports per year in addition to financial reports) imposed on all the participating teams and which was very tasking to the project management team in general, and the coordinator at IPGRI in particular, helped monitor more or less closely the development of activities in all the countries and mitigate the absence of current type of monitoring system. This also helped in the mitigation of difficult situations, which are usually inherent to this type of multi-states project"
C.1 Was sufficient funding provided for M&E in the budget included in the project document? Unable to assess. The PAD just includes a generic Project Coordination and Management line with a budget equivalent to 45% of the GEF contribution and 25% of the total budget. But there is no discrimination of budget areas within this large block.
C.2 Was sufficient and timely funding provided for M&E during project implementation? According to the TE there were general problems with fund disbursements due to difficulties with the transfer of funds, both between IPGRI and national partners and within countries (particularly Benin and Burkina Faso) and exchange rate problems (in Zimbabwe). No specific information is provided about how this affected M&E activities.
C.3 Can the project M&E system be considered a good practice? NO. the M&E System had several shortcomings.

4.5 Lessons and Recommendations

Project lessons and recommendations as described in the TE

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?

1. Projects gained tremendously with an elaborated Monitoring and Evaluation plan agreed upon during project design and identification phase. So, M & E plans should be accorded higher priority at both strategic and operational levels. Reporting alone could be tedious and tasking although vital for informing on the project performance while mitigating the deficiency of the project design.

2. A "project development" stage would allow for thorough preparation for the full project implementation phase especially when the project identified requires large investments. That would also help in checking the project design, and reducing the risk of implementation delays and the need for extension at the end of the implementation period. Also during that phase communication and reporting protocols and commitments are defined and agreed upon; realistic resource planning, budgeting and project accountability are determined. This project, because of its size would have benefited tremendously from a passage through such a stage which would have insured that all products developed are finalized.

3. A strong and well funded management /coordination structure is recommended especially for a project that involves countries in several sub-regions. This should be carefully crafted in the project design and also be the responsibility of the executing institution. A large scale multi-country project such as this one required such a robust coordination mechanism with steering committees and sub-regional coordinators, to stimulate/support exchanges and collaboration within and between the various countries and sub-regions.

4. There are obvious advantages in maintaining continuous links with known communities and build upon the working relationship that had been previously developed in other projects. The project searched for appropriate case study sites in a very strategic and practical manner. Priority was accorded to sites where the communities had previously hosted similar projects which were finishing or were still on-going. Cases studies developed in 'PLEC communities' wherever possible led to rapid appropriation of the '4-square methodologies' (that illustrates the status of the landraces on farm) by the communities, a better understanding, thus had a faster project implementation pace and a better ownership.

5. Avoiding the promotion of any single farmers' practice as being the "best" is a sound principle to apply for the conservation of on-farm genetic diversity. Although the project quantified and ranked practices in each case study, and some clearly had more impact than others, any attempt to promote individual traditional community-based practices as being 'best' is likely to lead to an overall erosion of landraces. Some of these practices are amenable to adaptation and commercialization in ways that fit well with modern society and can contribute to improving livelihoods by, for example, improving nutrition or enabling survival in exceptional and difficult circumstances. Others are less amenable to acceptance in modern societies, such as landraces that are believed to keep away evil spirits, or sustained by other traditional beliefs that may conflict with modern trends. Indeed creating an environment that recognizes, appreciates, respects and learns to build on the positive aspects of landraces and all the practices that lead to their conservation is probably the overarching best practice that can be achieved though policy adaptation.

6. Research that is intended to benefit farmers and other consumers must put emphasis on farmers' and consumers' needs and preferences and must begin with understanding the real situation on the ground. The project methodological framework offers a more focused way of getting baseline information/data on what makes farmers to want to continue keeping certain varieties. Its could allow breeders of new varieties and those carrying out seed distribution projects to understand farmers and society's needs and preferences before embarking on "un-focused" breeding work or wholesale seed distribution.

7. The benefits in terms of 'ownership' of new ideas and initiatives from early involvement of policy makers, private sector and NGOs are immediate and great. In this way these stakeholders will also gain the same understanding and experience as the scientists and the farmers. As tricky or difficult as this may seem, national teams should involve/engage policy makers, NGOs and private sector (for marketing and seed services) at an early stage. Their representatives should be involved right at the onset of the project activities such as in the surveys, in capacity building exercises, in the restitutions and analysis, long before policy discussions.

8 Creating an environment that is appreciative and supportive of the diversity of practices existing on-farm in relation to conservation of landraces is key. Indeed creating an environment that recognizes, respects and learns to build on the positive aspects of landraces and all the practices that lead to their conservation is probably the overarching best practice that can be achieved though policy adaptation.

List (or if detailed summarize) the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation
Urgent publication of project results and findings **1**. Bioversity International (IPGRI) should ensure that all remaining documents containing results and findings be systematically finalized and published without further delays. **2**. Bioversity International should take the opportunity of a related regional meeting in the near future (follow up phase), to include a wrap up session on this project to properly conclude it, share experience and also take the opportunity to associate other countries. **Support for a follow up expanded programme** **3**. Bioversity International, in partnership with FAO and in the framework of the Global Plan of Action (GPA on food and Agriculture Genetic Resources), should assist the countries in the region approach other donors including UNEP/GEF to set up as soon as possible a follow up regional programme with related projects to be implemented in a stepwise manner to cover other traditional crop varieties especially those suspected to be under threat, all traditional crop resources in arid and semi-arid areas in the countries, vulnerable traditional crops in other countries in Sub-Saharan Africa and elsewhere and to expand on the application of the policy harmonisation and implementation framework in all countries; continue to develop the required capacity for the programme at all levels, through the use and strengthening of appropriate training and research institutions **Other follow-up** **4**. Bioversity International, UNEP/GEF and the implementing countries should undertake an impact study (at a later date), in the implementing countries**,** in conjunction with the national agencies and the communities to assess the impacts of this project **5** The responsibility of national plant genetic resources centers should also include monitoring of the situation /presence of farmers' varieties/landraces in the communities and the need, if any, for re-introduction of resources in a given area.

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.

4.6.1 Comments on the summary of project ratings and terminal evaluation findings from other sources such as GEF EO field visits, etc.
There is an assessment of this TE by the UNEP EO. Their ratings coincide with the TE in most of the areas with the exception of the M&E System. The TE rated it as Unsatisfactory while the UNEOP EO rated it as Moderately unsatisfactory, claming that the stringent reporting system somewhat compensated by the lack of a well developed systems. UNEP EO rated the TE as Moderately satisfactory.

4.6.2 Quality of terminal evaluation report	**Ratings**
A. Does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	5
B. Is the report internally consistent, is the evidence complete/convincing and are the IA ratings substantiated?	5
C. Does the report properly assess project sustainability and /or a project exit strategy? Project sustainability was not well assessed. The risk analysis mixed problems faced by the Project with risks to outcomes after the end of the Project, and the final text is confusing. Financial and institutional sustainability are not well discussed.	3
D. Are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	5
E. Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	5
F. Does the report present an assessment of project M&E systems?	5

4.6.3 Assessment of processes affected attainment of project outcomes and sustainability.

Co-financing and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. **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, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?**
Actual co-financing was slightly higher than the one committed at the beginning (10% more). This co-financing consisted basically in 3 Projects funded by international donors (SDC, Netherlands, IFAD) and implemented by IPGRI. Co-financing was an essential component to implement the Project, and getting a slightly higher co-financing helped the Project.
Delays and Project Outcomes & Sustainability. **If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons responsible for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability, and if it did affect outcomes and sustainability then in what ways and through what causal linkage did it affect it?**
The Project suffered significant delays as it lasted 53 months instead of 36. These delays were caused by (i) difficulties with the transfer of funds, both between IPGRI and national partners and within countries (particularly Benin and Burkina Faso) (ii) communication problems (particularly with Malawi, where all telephone-based systems are unreliable at best) (iii) exchange rate problems (in Zimbabwe). The most affected countries were Burkina Faso and Zimbabwe. Resources from co-financing were critical to address the problems generated by the delay in fund transfers. There were also delays due to difficulties to identify Case Studies in several countries (Malawi, Kenya, Mali and Zimbabwe). These delays did not affect the achievement Project outcomes or impacts; in any case they would have been beneficial as the short implementation period was presented as one of the key reason to justify the lack of final impact.

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.	**Yes:**	**No:** **X**
Explain: There are no impacts to be assessed; the Project achieved a significant number of outcomes in terms of developing frameworks, exchanging them, having them applied by national organizations, strengthening policy-making processes and national strategic planning, etc. The actual impact on conservation of crop landraces by local farmers did not take place yet.		

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

1. 981 Regional PAD, Project Summary
2. PIR 2003, PIR 2004, PIR 2005
3. *Evaluation Report Assessment* on Farm Plant Genetic Resources UNEP EOU Quality assessment of the "Community Based Management of On-farm Plant Genetic Resources in Arid and Semi-Arid Areas of Sub-Saharan Africa" Terminal Evaluation Report".