

**United Nations Environment Programme**

**Terminal Evaluation  
UNEP GEF Project “Global Support to Facilitate the  
Early Development and Implementation of Sustainable  
Land Management Programmes and Projects under the  
GEF Operational Programme Number 15”**

**Medium-sized Project  
GF/1030-03-02**

**Prof Klaus Kellner**

**Evaluation and Oversight Unit**

**October 2007**

## Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations .....	2
Executive Summary .....	1
1. Introduction and Project Overview and Background .....	5
1.1. This Report .....	5
1.2. Project Description and Rationale .....	5
1.3. Project Activities and Duration .....	6
2. Scope, Objective and Methods .....	7
2.1. Budget .....	7
2.2. Methods of Evaluation .....	7
2.3. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation .....	9
3. Project Performance and Impact .....	10
3.1. Project Evaluation Parameters .....	10
A. Attainment of objectives and planned results .....	10
B. Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes .....	16
C. Achievement of outputs and activities .....	20
D. Catalytic role .....	25
E. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems .....	25
F. Preparation and readiness .....	27
G. Country ownership/Drivenness .....	29
H. Stakeholder participation/Public awareness .....	30
I. Financial planning .....	31
J. Implementation approach .....	32
K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping .....	33
4. Conclusions and Rating .....	34
5. Lessons learnt .....	39
6. Recommendations .....	40
ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE .....	42
ANNEX B: Questionnaire sent to workshop participants of the 9 regional workshops .....	61
ANNEX C: Questionnaire sent to steering committee members or representatives of agencies that helped at the 9 regional workshops .....	63
ANNEX D: List of participants/countries who were contacted for evaluation by interviews or e-mail questionnaire with feedback received .....	66
ANNEX E: BUDGET AND FINANCIAL PLANNING .....	69
ANNEX F: Documentation reviewed and used in this evaluation .....	72

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

ADB	Asian Development Bank
AfDB	African Development Bank
COP	Conference of the Parties
CRIC	Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the Convention
DSA	Daily Subsistence Allowance
EA	Executing Agency
EOU	Evaluation and Oversight Unit
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations
FMO	Fund Management Officer (UNEP DGEF)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GM	Global Mechanism
GTZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit
HQ	Headquarters
IA	Implementing Agency
IC	Incremental Cost
IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority and Development
IUCN	World Conservation Union
LD	Land Degradation
LFA	Log Frame Analysis
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MSP	Medium-sized Project
NAP	National Action Programme
NEPAD	New Partnerships for African Development
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
OP	Operational Programme
RAP	Regional Action Programme
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SRAP	Sub-regional Action Programme
TM	Task Manager (UNEP DGEF)
TOR	Terms of Reference
UN	United Nations
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEP	United Nations Environment Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNON	United Nations Office in Nairobi
WB	World Bank

## Executive Summary

1. An independent evaluation of this Medium-sized Project (MSP) was carried out on behalf of United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) - Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) from 3 September to 22 November 2007. This report describes the evaluation approach and findings.
2. The main objective of this project was to raise awareness, train and build capacities of relevant decision makers, but especially country United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and Global Environment Facility (GEF) Focal points, about what was, at project inception, the newly designated GEF focal area of land degradation, Operational Programme 15 (OP15), and facilitate the access to resources regarding the implementation of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) projects on national, sub-regional and regional levels. One of the key outcomes should include the strengthening of Implementing Agencies (IA's) and Executing Agencies (EA's) collaboration in the land degradation focal area, and enhance intra- and inter sub-regional exchange of experiences, best bet practices and on-going initiatives and activities related to SLM.
3. This evaluation was carried out by means of a range of interviews (mostly recorded) held with steering committee members that were appointed for this project and country representatives during the second week of the Conference of the Parties 8 (COP8) meeting for the UNCCD in Madrid from 10 – 15 September 2007, meetings and interviews with the UNEP/GEF project task manager (TM) and fund management officer, Ms Daya Bragante and Ms Elaine King respectively (17 and 18 September 2007) and an e-mail questionnaire that was sent out to steering committee members and participants who had attended one of the nine sub-regional training workshops that were held as part of this project.
4. This MSP was coordinated by UNEP in partnership with other agencies. The original project duration was scheduled to be 29 months (December 2003 to April 2006), which was twice extended to use unused funds to a period of 45 months till August 2007. The total budget was US\$ 971,500 with a GEF contribution of US\$ 721,500 and co-financing of US\$ 250,000 (in cash of US\$ 150,000 by Norway and in kind of US\$ 100,000 by UNEP, United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), etc). Leveraged financing of US\$ 25 000 was obtained from the Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ) to fund the Tunisia workshop.
5. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation focussed on the following main questions:
6. Has the project delivered capacity building exercises to the countries involved, enabling them to understand key concepts highlighted in the land degradation focal area strategy and OP15, as well as implement the UNCCD in a more effective way and further integrate priorities identified in Sub-regional Action Programmes (SRAPs) and Regional Action Programmes (RAPs) into national development plans?

- The participation by country stakeholders and IA's and EA's representatives during especially the nine sub-regional workshops held in different languages and addressing issues relevant to the regions to answer the above-mentioned question, was good. All relevant stakeholders were effectively trained and capacitated as stipulated by the objectives.
7. Have constructive partnerships been developed at all levels within and outside the project countries aimed at jointly developing and/or implementing sustainable land management programmes and projects?
- In many instances it was the first time that UNCCD and GEF focal points came together to address Land Degradation (LD) and SLM-related project factors in a more synergistic way. Partnerships were developed mostly during or shortly after the sub-regional workshops, but to a lesser extent with non-workshop participants and on a national, sub-regional and regional scale afterwards. The awareness and project proposal development on national scale related to Land Degradation (LD) and SLM were more effective in countries where partners already had good background knowledge about these activities. Although the outcomes of this project could have helped to enhance the implementation of SLM and LD activities from a national level to SRAPs and RAPs between countries, very few new projects were developed. However, through the interaction that took place amongst all the stakeholders at the workshops, this project helped in the formulation of SLM and LD priorities in already existing SRAPs and RAPs. Unfortunately many institutional changes occurred after the workshops, which lead to lesser impact and sustainability of new and existing project outputs over the long term.
8. Has the project been able to strengthen interagency collaboration in the land degradation focal area between UNEP, the GEF Secretariat, UNDP, the World Bank and GEF Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities, including International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD), Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) and the Regional Development Banks?
- The strengthening and collaboration between agencies as part of this project were, as mentioned above, mostly during or shortly after the sub-regional workshops. Due to the changes in the GEF strategy in general, this collaboration faded over time. Not enough communication existed between country representatives and national focal points to provide an explanation of the changes from GEF3 to GEF4.
9. Has the project developed a multilingual guide on OP15 as well as other tools to allow targeted beneficiaries to better understand GEF's requirements and priorities in the land degradation focal area? Is this guide able to clearly and practically assist developing countries in preparing GEF-eligible projects on sustainable land management?
- The documentation and presentations that were developed for the sub-regional workshops as well as reports afterwards were effective. The multilingual Operational guide was one of the main outputs of this project. A total of 8500 OP15 guides were printed in the six United Nations (UN) languages. The guide is

good and is still used by country focal points and consultants for project development related to LD and SLM activities. Unfortunately, many think the guide is outdated after the implementation of the new GEF4 strategy. The principles, however, stay the same. The project development guide needs to be updated.

10. How widely and effectively has the project been able to disseminate the OP15 project development guide?
  - The OP15 guide was effective for its time and within the GEF3 framework. The guide was also disseminated to at least all sub-regional participants. Unfortunately the internet website that was developed as part of a ‘help function’ for this project was not very functional, due to the changes within GEF and the decision to keep it on hold. The website could have been used to disseminate all the documents produced by this project and create more effective collaboration and communication between the IAs, EAs, country partners and national focal points with regard to LD and SLM issues.

### **Ratings**

11. The ratings for the 11 categories as defined by the TOR for this evaluation are given in Table 2. The overall rating for this project is Moderately Satisfactory (MS). Seven of the categories are rated as satisfactory, five as Moderately satisfactory and 4 as Unsatisfactory.
12. The appointment of the steering committee to help in the coordination, make inputs at all levels and give guidance for project implementation was effective.

### **Major lessons learnt and recommendations**

13. Some lessons learnt and recommendations regarding this and future similar projects include:
  - The period in which the nine sub-regional workshops (3½ months) had to be presented in the initial 29 month period that was planned for this project, was too short. Adaptations between workshops were therefore minimal. Although guidelines from the steering committee and GEF Secretariat had to be considered, there was too much interference with the original project design and implementation acting negatively on the creativity by the project team.
  - It is recommended not to extend projects and expect too many additional outputs too long after the main objectives of the project have been achieved, even if considerable savings could be made over the duration of the project. The funds that are left over in the budget should be used to adapt and improve the internet website, operational guide and training handbook and create follow-up activities to inform country participants and national focal points about new developments in LD and SLM and especially the changes that occurred from GEF3 to GEF4. This will also help to clear the current confusion of participants, enhance country ownership and help in the long-term sustainability of the project as many aspects of the OP15 guide are still relevant, also within the new GEF4 strategy. It is

important that the GEF Secretariat and the Steering Committee that was appointed for this project, take notice of this recommendation.

- A positive lesson was that the project management team used a number of experts and consultants to develop documents and help to make workshop more tailor made per region. This did not only increase the “critical mass” of efforts and capacity, but also enhanced the collaboration between country participants and representatives from IAs, EAs and other stakeholders.
- The inputs by the steering committee, especially towards the end of the project faded. The lesson is that the TOR of the steering committee was not absolutely clear. It is recommended to involve steering committee members in follow-up activities of this project if approved by the GEF Secretariat.
- Project managers and other stakeholders have to be constantly made aware, be trained and capacitated at national level regarding changes that may occur in e.g. GEF and other IAs and EAs regarding SLM and LD activities and initiatives. Good policy and regulatory frameworks have to be in place at national level to sustain and foster SLM in agriculture, forestry and other sectors and stimulate stakeholder participation.
- Regular meetings were held by the steering committee and good progress reports were delivered timely over the duration of the project, but no clear M&E plan was in place. It is recommended that a better M&E plan, according to the new GEF requirements and SMART approaches, has to be applied in similar projects in future. However, older generation MSPs, like this one, did not have to include a detailed M&E plan. The latter explains why this project also did not have a clear M&E plan that was according to the SMART requirements in place.

# 1. Introduction and Project Overview and Background

## 1.1. This Report

14. An independent terminal evaluation for this Medium-sized UNEP/GEF project (MSP), which was carried out from December 2003 to end of August 2007, was done to analyse and assess the impact and performance of this project regarding the achievements of the specific objectives and expected outcomes as mentioned below, and if the project lead to any positive and/or negative consequences. This report describes the evaluation approach, findings, some recommendations and lessons learnt according to the guidelines, prescriptions and Terms of Reference (TOR) as formulated by the Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU) of UNEP.

## 1.2. Project Description and Rationale

15. The Second GEF Assembly designated land degradation as a new focal area as a means to support the implementation of UNCCD. The GEF Council of May 2003 subsequently adopted the Operational Programme on Sustainable Land Management (OP15). OP15 provides a framework for the development of activities eligible for GEF funding to address the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on ecosystem function and services as well as on people's livelihood and economic wellbeing through sustainable land management. At the first meeting of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the UNCCD (CRIC) in November 2002, parties expressed their financial, technical and technological needs for combating desertification. Capacity-building remains the most immediate priority to effectively implement the Convention. The project aimed at bridging some crucial information and capacity gaps by providing the parties with technical tools and methodologies related to OP15 that will assist in implementing the Convention.
16. The project was implemented under the former GEF3 strategy with the specific purpose of providing the targeted beneficiaries with key information and training on the strategic priorities of the land degradation focal area and the Operational Programme 15 valid at the time of GEF3.
17. The overall goal of the project was stated as: *'facilitate early development and implementation of GEF programs and projects on sustainable land management through global information and training of the relevant decision-makers in addressing land degradation issues, and developing and implementing activities eligible for GEF funding under OP 15.'*

### **The specific objectives of the project were stated as:**

- a) Raise awareness about the newly designated focal area of land degradation and OP15 and facilitate the access of eligible countries to GEF resources by building their capacities to attain sustainable land management at the local, national, sub-regional and regional levels that generate global environment and sustainable development benefits.
- b) Strengthen intra and inter sub-regional exchange of experiences, best practices, on-going initiatives and activities related to sustainable land management.



- c) Strengthen interagency collaboration in the land degradation focal area between UNEP, the GEF Secretariat, UNDP, the World Bank and GEF Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities, including IFAD, FAO and the Regional Development Banks.

**The expected outcomes from this project included:**

- a) Acquisition of additional technical and human capacities from the countries involved in order to implement the UNCCD in a more effective way.
- b) Sub-regional workshops in order to involve sharing of experiences, best practices and on-going activities in sustainable land management of the participants, and strengthening constructive partnerships at all levels. Country collaboration at sub-regional and regional levels to jointly develop and/or implement sustainable land management programmes and projects and integrate priorities identified in SRAPs and RAPs into National development plans.
- c) Contribution towards the mainstreaming of sustainable land management-related issues into the programmes and country strategies of the GEF Implementing Agencies and some of the Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities.
- d) Development of the Operational Guide on OP15 in order to assist developing countries to prepare GEF eligible projects on sustainable land management.

**1.3 Project Activities and Duration**

- 18. The project duration was 29 months initially starting December 2003 to April 2006, which was later revised and extended to be completed at the end of August 2007, making a total duration of 45 months. An extension of the project from April 2006 to August 2007 was granted because of savings made during project implementation. The GEF Secretariat asked the project management to produce some additional documentation, reviews, workshops and “added value” outputs (see paragraph 94) with the saved money in the extended period.
- 19. The project was internally executed by UNEP in close collaboration with the GEF Secretariat and other GEF Implementing Agencies such as UNDP and the World Bank as well as relevant International Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities such as IFAD and FAO.
- 20. The project had the following main components:
  - a) Creation of an inter-agency steering committee that would provide guidelines for the project on an on-going basis and help in the preparation of workshop training material and other documentation.
  - b) Organisation of sub-regional training workshops, dissemination of a training handbook, workshop reports, proceedings, training material and presentations as well as any other documentation that could assist in the sub-regional workshops. The latter were developed and presented with the help of consultants, moderators and workshop presenters and facilitators.
  - c) Development of a multilingual Operational Guide on the GEF OP15 for the development of project proposals and accessing project funding from the GEF for Sustainable Land Management.

- d) Building of a multilingual internet website that could be used to access all the documentation that was developed by this project and presented at sub-regional workshops, act as a help desk and electronic forum to ensure follow-up participation and concerns or questions that might be raised by the country participants on OP15 as well as stimulate on-going communication.

## **2. Scope, Objective and Methods**

### **2.1. Budget**

21. The total project budget was US\$ 971,500 with GEF: US\$ 721,500 (74.26%), co-financing: US\$ 250,000 (in cash: US\$ 150,000 (15.44%) – Norway; in kind: US\$ 100,000 (10.29%) – UNEP, UNDP) and US\$ 25 000 leveraged funding by GTZ that was not paid to UNEP.

### **2.2. Methods of Evaluation**

22. The terminal evaluation started on the 3<sup>rd</sup> of September 2007 and ended on 30 November 2007. The evaluation took place over one month spread over 12 weeks with seven days of travel to Madrid, Spain, 3 days in Nairobi and 20 days desk study. The detailed Terms of Reference (TOR) for the evaluation are given in Annex A.
23. This terminal evaluation was conducted using a participatory approach and included a desk-top review of all the documentation that was developed throughout the project as well as interviews with the project management staff, stakeholders of participating countries, international bodies of Implementing Agencies (IA) and Executing Agency (EA) and members of the steering committee of this project, as well as any other key people and partners that participated in this project. The interviews with representatives of the IA and EA as well as some steering committee members and country representatives were carried out during the second week of the COP8 meeting for the UNCCD, which was held in Madrid (10 – 15 September 2007). Meetings and interviews were also held with UNEP/GEF project task management and with the fund management staff at the UNEP/GEF Headquarters in Nairobi (17 and 18 September 2007). An e-mail questionnaire with a covering letter was also sent to individuals who attended the nine different sub-regional training workshops that formed part of the objectives of this project. A separate e-mail questionnaire was also sent to steering committee members and representatives of agencies that participated in this project and helped in the organisation, funding, moderation, presentations or the development of project outcomes, documentation or reports. The persons that were interviewed, contacted or to whom e-mail questionnaires were sent, with their specific responses, are listed in Annex D.
24. The evaluator also liaised with the UNEP/EOU in Nairobi by telephonic interviews before COP8 and during a meeting at the UNEP/EOU Headquarters in Nairobi on Monday, 17 November 2007 to discuss logistic and/or methodological issues for the proper execution of this evaluation in an independent way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered.

25. The findings of the evaluation were also based on a desk review of documentation received from UNEP/EOU and UNEP/GEF (Annex F).
26. Most of the documentation that was reviewed was provided by the project's Task Manager (TM), as well as the project's Fund Management Officer (FMO) of UNEP/GEF. A report was written by the TM after each sub-regional workshop and minutes of each workshop are available. All this documentation is available on the internet website created for this project (see paragraph 93 and Annex F).
27. Feedback was provided by; members of the steering committee for this project, other relevant staff that were involved in the organisation, persons that helped with the moderation or development of documentation of workshop outputs, consultants and representatives of countries and international agencies that attended the nine sub-regional training workshops. The feedback was obtained by long-format or short-format personal interviews, of which some were recorded and an e-mail questionnaire that was returned to the evaluator in the week of 1 October 2007 (Annex C).
28. A total of 22 steering committee members/consultants/project team members were contacted and the outcomes documented. Seven (7) interviews were held, of which four were recorded and 15 e-mail questionnaires were sent out, of which only 3 responded positively. The positive response by steering committee members, consultants of representatives of international agencies was rather good, i.e. 54.54%. Less than half of the people (45.45%) did not respond or responded negatively, as they were too busy or did not return the questionnaire to the evaluator (Annex D).
29. Most of the interviews with steering committee members, agency representatives or other key stakeholders, including persons from countries, were held during the second week of the COP8 meeting in Madrid (10-15 September 2007). Although many of the country representatives who were at the COP8 meeting were not part of the group of participants that attended one of the nine sub-regional training workshops, the attendance by the evaluator at the COP8 meeting was very successful and formed an integral part of this evaluation. Very good contacts were made, new e-mail addresses were obtained from persons that did attend the workshops and people were made aware of the importance of the objectives and outcomes of this project.
30. By attending the COP8 meeting in Madrid, the evaluator was also able to meet and interview project stakeholders from different countries, obtaining their personal impressions. Communication between country representatives, IA, EA and other key persons regarding Land Degradation and SLM issues and activities was also stimulated during the COP8 meeting.
31. A total of 39 representatives from 33 countries were interviewed at the COP8 meeting in Madrid. Although most of the interviews were short (22) (5-10 minutes), some were much longer (8) (15-20 minutes) of which five were even recorded (Annex D). The most limiting factor during the interviews as well as the e-mail question response was the language barrier in some of the interviews.
32. A total of 342 e-mails were sent to members who participated in the nine regional training workshops. The names and e-mail addresses were obtained from the

workshop participant lists as provided by the TM. A total of 122 e-mails (35.67%) were returned stating that the e-mail address was unknown. 203 (59.36%) of the workshops participants to whom e-mails were sent did not respond at all. Only 17 (7.73%) of the 220 that did receive e-mail and country participants that attended any of the nine sub-regional training workshops returned the completed questionnaire to the evaluator. The number of e-mails sent, e-mails that were returned, participants that did not respond as well as those who did can be seen in Annex D.

33. The main limiting factor of the e-mail questionnaire was that the nine sub-regional training workshops had taken place a long time ago and that many of the persons that participated in these workshops from October 2004 to January 2005 had either changed their e-mail addresses, were no longer part of the “yahoo.com” network (many of workshop participants gave a “yahoo.com” e-mail contact address) or persons were no longer in the same institutional positions as during the time when the workshops were presented. Several new focal points came on board while their predecessors moved to new functions. Updated lists of GEF and UNCCD focal points can be found on respective GEF and UNCCD websites. The TM sent all workshop reports to the participants via the e-mail addresses provided to them at the workshops. Most e-mails that bounced back were checked by the TM, but due to the changes in e-mail addresses and difficulties with internet connectivity commonly experienced by government officials, follow-up procedures were problematic.
34. The recordings, either in an electronic or written format, the documented interviews and the e-mail responses to the questionnaires, are available from the evaluator on request and are not included in this report.
35. Examples of countries and/or names of persons that responded positively to this evaluation, either by interviews or e-mail mentioned in the report, are only examples. More countries or persons could have had the same views, but are not always mentioned in the evaluation report.

### **2.3. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation**

36. The objective of this terminal evaluation was to determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess whether the project led to any other positive or negative consequences. To the extent possible, the distribution and magnitude of any project impacts to date was documented and the likelihood of future impacts determined. The evaluation also assessed project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation focused on the following main questions:
  - Has the project delivered capacity building exercises to the countries involved, enabling them to understand key concepts highlighted in the land degradation focal area strategy and OP15 as well as implement the UNCCD in a more effective way and further integrate priorities identified in SRAPs and RAPs into national development plans?

- Have constructive partnerships been developed at all levels within and outside the project countries aimed at jointly developing and/or implementing sustainable land management programmes and projects?
- Has the project been able to strengthen interagency collaboration in the land degradation focal area between UNEP, the GEF Secretariat, UNDP, the World Bank and GEF Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities, including IFAD, FAO and the Regional Development Banks?
- Has the project developed a multilingual guide on OP15 as well as other tools to allow targeted beneficiaries to better understand GEF's requirements and priorities in the land degradation focal area? Has this guide been able to clearly and practically assist developing countries in preparing GEF eligible projects on sustainable land management?
- How widely and effectively has the project been able to disseminate the guide on OP15?

### **3. Project Performance and Impact**

#### **3.1. Project Evaluation Parameters**

37. The success of project implementation is rated on a scale from 'Highly Unsatisfactory' (HU) to 'Highly Satisfactory' (HS) (as described in this evaluation's TORs in Annex A). The project performance is assessed according to the eleven categories below, and a summary for each category with the rating is given in Table 3.
38. Reports and documentation reviewed are mentioned in paragraph 94 and Annex F.

#### **A. Attainment of objectives and planned results**

39. The evaluation regarding the attainment of the objectives and planned results according to effectiveness, relevance and efficiency was mainly carried out by taking the five main questions given as criteria and focus for this evaluation into consideration. To see whether these questions were efficiently achieved, it was also important to look at the specific objectives, expected outcomes and the components that were set for this project. All of these go hand in hand and have to be evaluated holistically against the achievement indicators identified for each objective. The indicators for this project are described by the MSP Brief.

#### **Effectiveness, relevance and efficiency**

40. The main objective of the project was to raise awareness and build capacity of country members to enable them to understand key concepts of SLM, highlighted in the land degradation focal area strategy of the GEF OP15, as well as implement the UNCCD in a more effective way. The awareness and capacity building activities had to focus

on the GEF and UNCCD focal points at country level. The acquired knowledge should enhance SLM projects on local, national, sub-regional and regional levels to generate global environment and sustainable development benefits.

41. According to one of the steering committee members and senior adviser to the GEF Secretariat, this project was “very ambitious”. It took a long time to get OP15 ‘off the ground’ and when it was finally adopted, as many people as possible in the shortest possible time had to be made aware and capacitated regarding the interpretation of OP15, its role in GEF and how to develop projects on national, regional and sub-regional level. According to the Senior Advisor of the GEF Secretariat that was interviewed, “everybody had to move quickly”. The timing of this project was therefore very important and the driving force of this project was mainly the GEF Secretariat.
42. Initially eight Sub-regional training workshops were planned, which included:
  - Two meetings in Africa (Anglophone + Francophone);
  - one meeting in Western Asia (Arabic/English);
  - one meeting in Central, Eastern Europe and Central Asia (Russian/English);
  - one meeting in Asian countries (English);
  - one meeting in the Pacific Islands (English);
  - one meeting in Latin America (Spanish); and
  - one meeting in the Caribbean (English).
43. An additional Sub-regional workshop was held in Geneva, Switzerland, due to the splitting of the Central Asian and Central and Eastern Europe workshops. The additional workshop in Geneva was held to accommodate country representatives from Central Asia, as their ground set up and background were different from the other targeted regions. All the workshops were tailor-made according to region and participants involved.
44. Eventually nine sub-regional training workshops of three days each were held in different regions in especially developing countries. The sub-regional training workshops were held within a very short time period of 3½ months (3 October 2004 to 21 January 2005) to accommodate as many countries and languages of that region as possible (Table 1). The nine workshops were attended by approximately 400 participants from 130 countries, including GEF Operational Focal Points, UNCCD Focal Points, regional coordinators of GEF, accredited NGOs and representatives of key sub-regional and country organisations.

Table 1: Countries represented, location and date of the nine sub-regional training workshops

<b>Countries</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Date</b>
1. Western Asian countries and Libya, Qeshm Island, Western Asian countries	Qeshm Island, Iran	3 – 5 October 2004
2. Francophone African countries	Tunis, Tunisia	11 – 13 October 2004

3. Anglophone African countries	Windhoek, Namibia	1 – 3 November 2004
4. Pacific Island countries	Nadi, Fiji	8 – 10 November 2004
5. Central Asian Republics	Almaty, Kazakhstan	22 – 24 November 2004
6. Spanish speaking countries	Natal, Brazil	7 – 9 December 2004
7. Caribbean Islands States	Kingston, Jamaica	13 – 15 December 2004
8. Central and Eastern European countries	Geneva, Switzerland	11 – 13 January 2005
9. Asian countries	Bangkok, Thailand	19 – 21 January 2005

45. Several presentations were made at the different sub-regional training workshops by persons from local IAs and EAs or workshop participants themselves. Some examples include the following:
- The Caribbean Environment Programme Integrating Watershed and Coastal Area Management in the Small Island Developing States of the Caribbean: *Linkages with Land Degradation* by the AMEP Programme Officer, Caribbean Environment Programme, UNEP - Caribbean Regional Coordinating Unit. Due to the UNEP office based in Kingston, Jamaica, persons from that office were invited to make a presentation on this project at the Jamaica Workshop.
  - The LADA approach and objectives of LADA, including causes of land degradation in Argentina, by the LADA Secretariat hosted by FAO, Rome, Italy. This presentation was made at the Latin America workshop (Natal, Brazil, 7-9 December 2004).
  - LDC-SIDS Targeted Portfolio Project for Capacity Building and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management by UNDP-GEF, December 2004, presented at the Jamaica Workshop and Pacific workshop (Nadi, Fiji, 8-10 November 2004).
  - The Global Environment Facility's Sustainable Land Management Approach, presented at the Kingston, Jamaica, training workshop, December 2004.
46. The sub-regional training workshops added a certain richness, as they brought different expertise from many backgrounds together regarding important matters for this project. Experts were able to give their own perspectives and participants could relate to these experts, as they were often known to them. Specific case studies were also discussed. These experts could also help country partners in future actions and the development of project proposals. All these actions created positive relationships between the participants at the workshops.
47. All the steering committee members and most participants who attended the sub-regional workshops as well as project team members, including consultants and training staff, found the sub-regional workshops very informative and effective. New contacts and alliances were established at the workshops. According to one of the steering committee members, representing the International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD), the workshops were helpful in two particular aspects, firstly, regarding the global benefits that could be yielded from GEF SLM operations and secondly, the incremental cost (IC) reasoning. The examples given during the

workshops were very helpful in explaining and discussing these two difficult aspects in OP15 project design. The material and documents produced were also good.

48. Assessments which were carried out by the participants after eight of the nine workshops regarding the effectiveness and usefulness of the workshops, expressed that 55% of the participants considered the workshops as 'very useful' and 44% judged it as 'quite useful'. The training programme and material were judged as 'very good' (46%) and 'good' (48%). Eighty-five (85%) of the participants mentioned that they would like to recommend it to their colleagues, institutions and others. In general, the participants indicated that they would be able to use the information acquired as well as the training material, not only in their daily work, but also in the development of projects at country level. Most candidates indicated that the workshops did improve their knowledge about LD and SLM-related challenges as well as the GEF's thinking and procedures regarding OP15. The GEF focal points also indicated that the workshops and information provided them with significant guidance and understanding of the GEF procedures and development of GEF projects. The workshops participants also highlighted the importance of sharing the experiences and dissemination of information, both at national and local level. This evaluation was carried out directly after the workshop presentations. Participants were then still very positive about the outcomes and information gained. This positive attitude however did not last very long for some participants when they returned to their specific countries.
49. Some steering committee members and country representatives interviewed for the evaluation expressed their concern that only minor adjustments were made from one workshop to the next and not enough practical examples, including field trips and the visit to certain project activities, were made due to a lack of time. The minor adjustments included the editing of some slides of the main power point presentation in order to take into consideration the targeted regions and address previous comments/queries for clarification. Some further information/examples from the region were also added to better explain key concepts and improve overall understanding. In addition, specific presentations on case studies in the targeted region were prepared for that specific workshop, tailor-made according to priorities of the region.
50. Although most participants attending the sub-regional workshops mentioned that the methodologies used during the workshops were effective. One member of the GEF Secretariat who was involved in the presentation of papers, also mentioned that short field trips to land-degraded areas might have been useful to explain the SLM activities at that particular focal area and its programme in a real setting. A lack in the adjustments and inclusion of the additional activities, such as field trips were most probably due to the short time-frame of each workshop and the time available for all nine workshops.
51. The awareness-raising and capacity-building exercises regarding the focal area of LD and SLM within OP15 were successful and complied with the achievement indicators. Some participants from Tanzania, Mali and even a representative of the GEF Secretariat, however, expressed their concerns regarding the GEF requirements and procedures, as they were often found to be too complex and cumbersome, especially regarding all the requirements of co-funding and M&E procedures.



52. After the workshops, some new project proposals with regard to LD and SLM issues in OP15 were developed by the country participants. The short-term impact of the workshops in some countries was therefore encouraging and contributed to the mainstreaming of SLM-related issues in national strategies. These project proposals were mainly developed by members of countries that already had a good background of LD and SLM approaches and where these activities formed part of the country priorities, such as the National Action Programmes (NAPs) of the UNCCD. The information gathered at the workshops led to a number of activities at country level. For example, the representative from the Ministry of Agriculture in Djibouti, who attended the sub-regional workshop in Tunisia, undertook an awareness campaign on LD through booklets, TV documentaries and training of local communities in his country after the workshop. Participants from Cote D'Ivoire and Togo, who also attended the workshop in Tunisia, used the presentation material and documents from the workshop to deliver further LD workshops which were financed by other GEF projects in their countries.
53. The training handbook, operational guide and training material that were developed by this project and which were also available during or after the workshops, laid a solid foundation and assisted the development of OP15-related project proposals (e.g. Egypt, Benin, Guinea, United Republic of Tanzania, Kenya, Uganda, Namibia, Ethiopia). The training handbook, as well as the operational guide on OP15, provided a step-by-step methodology on how to prepare project proposals from the early stages of the GEF project cycle of a concept idea until its eventual approval and implementation.
54. The long-term impacts of the project were not so good, mainly due to the changes that occurred in GEF during June 2006. Although LD and SLM issues were still very important in the countries that were represented in the workshops, the enthusiasm of the country partners to develop more project proposals in the GEF framework, after they were informed that OP15 was now "dead" or "closed" as mentioned by some members, was dampened. The fact that only limited funds were available for LD and SLM projects within the OP15 framework also had a negative impact on the long-term sustainability of their projects. Some countries (e.g. Benin, Guinea and Chile) mentioned that they did submit their projects to GEF, but no feedback was provided for long periods of time. Representatives from Trinidad and Tobago mentioned that the consultants who helped the countries to develop project proposals by using the training material and guidelines developed by this MSP, lost some interest and were hesitant to participate in further project development and implementation, due to the considerable time it takes to get an outcome by GEF after project proposals were submitted.
55. As mentioned in paragraph 33, many of the persons that were capacitated and trained through the sub-regional workshops had left their positions in the Departments and moved on to other employment. In these countries very little of the information that was gained through the workshops was passed on to the other members in the specific Departments who are now responsible for the UNCCD and / or act as GEF Focal points on national scale.

56. According to the task manager (Land Degradation) of the UNEP/GEF office, who helped with the training at the Namibian sub-regional workshop and the project management officer, the dissemination of information gained from the workshops to capacitate their own people to better understand the GEF process, co-funding procedures and how to develop projects that can be used to mainstream the LD and SLM activities into policy frameworks at national, sub-regional and regional scale, depended on the participants themselves when they returned to their countries.
57. Although not as effective as anticipated, the impact of this MSP project was much higher on national level than sub-regional or regional levels. According to most of the participants that were interviewed by this evaluation, very few cross-country and sub-regional initiatives took place after the workshops. In most cases, only the participants that attended the workshops benefited from the outputs.
58. The impact on grassroots and at local levels was also minimal and very little public involvement occurred. This was, however, not the aim of the project and the initiatives and impacts should form part of the projects developed at national level.
59. The relevance of the project and the immediate impact it had, cannot be disputed. The outcomes with all the activities that were conducted, including the documentation developed, were consistent with the Operational Programme strategies. The training handbook and Operational Guide addressed specific issues about LD and SLM on global, national and regional scales as well as the key principles of the GEF SLM Programme OP15 (see also paragraph 89) for more detail about the contents of these two main documents).
60. Another major achievement of this project was the strengthening of interagency collaboration in the land degradation focal area between UNEP, the GEF Secretariat, UNDP, the World Bank and GEF Executing Agencies, including IFAD, FAO and to some extent the Regional Development Banks. Good buy-in and participation were also created by the non-governmental organisations (NGOs) during the sub-regional workshops. However, the involvement by the Regional Banks through co-funding the workshops was not as successful as anticipated and happened only infrequently, such as the Asian Development Bank (ADB) who participated in the Bangkok, Thailand workshop in January 2005. Only limited support and contributions were made by the Regional Banks towards the funding of projects on national and regional level once the project proposals were developed (e.g. Uganda and Kenya).
61. For many GEF and UNCCD focal points and other workshop participants, this project gave them the first opportunity to meet the IAs and potential EAs in their countries, which also gave them some understanding of how these agencies could assist them in SLM and LD projects, not only financially, but also technically. This strengthening of partnerships at country level with all possible agencies, as part of the sub-regional workshops, was one of the major achievements of this project.
62. The cost effectiveness and the financial contribution (in-cash and in-kind) for this project are discussed elsewhere in this report, especially under section I.
63. One of the most important outputs of the project was the development of the multilingual Operational Guide on OP15 as well as other tools, such as the training

handbook, slides from power point presentations and lectures and reports by country experts to allow targeted beneficiaries to better understand GEF's requirements and priorities in the land degradation focal area. The guide will surely help country partners, but especially UNCCD and GEF focal points, to clearly and practically assist countries in preparing GEF eligible projects on SLM. The effectiveness and relevance of this guide are explained elsewhere in the evaluation report.

## **B. Assessment of sustainability of project outcomes**

64. This MSP was a “one-off” project with clear objectives and outcomes stated above. The outcome of this project did not depend on continued financial support, as the main aim was to provide support, train and capacitate the UNCCD and GEF focal points to facilitate the development and implementation of SLM Programmes and Projects under the GEF OP15.
65. Through the sub-regional workshops, the Operational Guide, training handbook and other documentation, including the workshop material produced under the watchful eye and guidance of the steering committee appointed for this project, the aim and outputs mentioned above were achieved, as mentioned under Section A.
66. The guide and the sub-regional workshops were also considered useful and relevant for the development and implementation of the current GEF Country Support Programme (CSP). This project also helped SLM and LD-related components of the Action Plan for the new Environment Initiative of the New Partnerships for African Development (NEPAD), facilitated by UNEP. It also helped to further mainstream environmental concerns into the national policies through the organisation of local awareness and training workshops similar to this project as mentioned in paragraph 94.
67. Additional documentation and reports were developed with the savings made throughout the project (see paragraph 94). One of the most important reports produced at the end of the project was the completion report regarding Scientific and Technical Support to UNEP-GEF MSPs: “Global Support to facilitate the early development and implementation of Land degradation programmes and projects under the GEF OP15” which was developed by the Overseas Development Group (ODG), University of East Anglia, UK. Initially, the project was supposed to facilitate the revision of the training handbook based on proceedings from the training workshops and contributions from all key stakeholders and focal points. But because of the intrinsic changes that occurred within GEF in transition to GEF4 during the project implementation, it was decided by the GEF Secretariat together with other steering committee members to keep it on hold instead. It was therefore decided by UNEP that it might be useful to prepare a 'synthesis document' that would build on the process, lessons learnt emanating from this project, as well as the new land degradation strategy developed for GEF4, and highlight recommendations for further training on sustainable land management with a view to assisting countries in developing and implementing SLM GEF funded projects. This report therefore gives some guidelines regarding the “way forward” after the completion of this project. Ten recommendations were discussed in the completion report developed by ODG of the University of East Anglia in United Kingdom, especially regarding future training needs and programmes under the following headings:

- Understanding LD (including causes and consequences and understanding the development impacts of LD);
  - Support to the new focal area strategy (including the integration across the natural and social sciences and how to promote the integration with major development issues in LD, such as poverty and inequality); and
  - Dealing with specific issues in the LD focal area (including frameworks for LD, maximise impacts which are cost-effective and technically acceptable, how to integrate monitoring plans of LD and SLM investments and how to capture benefits in other focal areas and development targets.
68. Some of these recommendations mentioned in the completion report deliberately overlap to emphasize the integrative, cross-disciplinary and multipurpose affect of project development and the effect on the monitoring and evaluation systems of projects. The report also mentions that sustainability can only be achieved by mainstreaming investments and policy initiatives in the LD focal area into development, as the new GEF4 strategy emphasises. The completion report effectively refers to the GEF focal area in LD of the new GEF4 strategy, which includes desertification and deforestation, based on the Millennium Development Goals and the UNCCD and the UN Forum on Forests.
69. In GEF3, interventions in the LD focal area focused on targeted capacity development and the implementation of innovative and indigenous SLM practices. These priorities resulted in a diverse portfolio of proposals experimenting, e.g. with programmatic partnership approaches or market-based financing mechanisms (e.g. payment for environmental services). Apart from their technical soundness, proposals were evaluated against their fit with the priorities outlined in national, regional and sub-regional action plans. An analysis of the GEF3 portfolio resulted in the recommendation for GEF4 to narrow the scope of interventions, in particular using the results of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment and Desertification Synthesis. The GEF4 priority areas will address the three direct drivers for terrestrial ecosystem degradation: land use change, natural resource consumption and climate change. Projects should incorporate the effect of climate change as an integral part of measure for SLM.
70. The LD focal area strategy and strategic programming for GEF 4 therefore accords with the Millennium Development Goals, especially poverty reduction and environmental sustainability, and is within the UNCCD and UN Forum on Forest. The goal of the LD focal area in GEF4 (desertification and deforestation) is very similar to GEF3, namely to arrest and reverse the current trends in LD. This will be accomplished though policies and practices conducive to SLM that, simultaneously generate global environmental benefits while supporting local, national, and social and economic development. Actions should contribute to national programs in the field of natural resource management, sustainable forest management, adaptation to climate change and integrated chemicals management that cut across disciplines and sectors to bring mutual benefits to the global environment and local livelihoods. This will ensure sustainability, replicability and harmony with national development goals.
71. GEF 4 is advocating a programmatic approach (by scope and topic) in view to avoid a plethora of stand-alone projects and to maximise synergies. GEF Council approved, in

June 2007, a strategic investment programme on SLM for Sub-Saharan Africa (SIP TerrAfrica -USD 150 M) with earmarked projects to be implemented by various GEF Agencies (including the three IAs and other EAs), a similar programme was developed for the Middle East and Northern Africa regions (MENARID, USD 35 M), as well as a Sustainable Forest Management programme (USD 50 M). Because of the GEF funds already committed to SLM in GEF 4 through these initiatives, it will be very difficult, if not impossible, to gain GEF approval for new projects not already included in these programmes in countries from these regions.

72. The outcomes of this MSP project were therefore not in vain, and will be sustained over the long term, as the basic principles explained and material used to make people aware and capacitate them regarding LD and SLM issues, are very similar between the GEF3 and GEF4 strategies and focal areas. However, as stated above, if any new projects are developed by the countries they should comply with the GEF4 strategic focus and objectives and form part of the programmes that are funded in the GEF4 cycle in the regions mentioned in paragraph 71.
73. The continuation and follow-up of the work that has been done by this project will depend on the collaboration between countries and the GEF Secretariat and project proposals developed at national and sub-regional level that may be considered for further financial support in the GEF4 strategy. More financial support and inputs by the Regional Banks e.g. Asian Development Bank (ADB) and African Development Bank (AfDB) are needed to ensure follow-up work of this project.
74. Many of the key stakeholders and participants suggested that follow-up workshops should be arranged by the UNCCD and GEF focal points at national level regarding the new GEF4 strategy for project development and financial support within GEF. This could be done at country level by the UNCCD and GEF focal points, possibly with continued involvement of UNEP who were responsible for this MSP, and the GEF Secretariat. As mentioned, many people that represented their country focal points at the sub-regional workshops are not in the same positions any longer and have been replaced by new personnel who do not have the necessary background and knowledge. It would therefore be in the interest, not only for the stakeholders and participants, but also for the GEF, that some follow-up work is undertaken in order to keep a continuous flow of the project benefits. New and updated information about changes within GEF, should be up-loaded on the GEF website ([www.theGEF.org](http://www.theGEF.org)).
75. These changes in institutional frameworks and governance since 2004/5 could have a major influence on the long-term sustainability of this project as expressed by representatives of the United Republic of Tanzania, Congo, Central African Republic, Malawi, Niger, Mali, Indonesia, Botswana and Iran.
76. Any social and political risks that may jeopardise the sustainability of this project over the long term will mostly lie at national, sub-regional and regional level and to a much lesser extent as a result of the GEF, UNEP, UNDP and other agency support. The sustainability will depend on the effective transfer of information on preparing SLM and LD projects to GEF focal points at national level.

77. The main financial risks expressed by most country representatives regarding the development of project proposals for the OP15 programme are the lack of co-funding contributions by the partners at national level (except for Namibia). The co-funding contribution seems to be a major problem in especially the developing countries. As mentioned, if the time between project submission, approval and implementation takes too long, funding agencies also tend to lose interest, as they see no progress over the short term. Many projects are also only funded over the short term, whereas the impacts and benefits of LD and SLM type of projects are often only seen over the long term. SLM projects therefore need long-term commitment, both from policy and funding agencies.
78. Apart for the co-funding problems experienced by the countries, the other main risk is the institutional framework and governance problem for reasons mentioned above. Appropriate policy and regulatory frameworks need to be in place to sustain and foster SLM in agriculture, forestry and across sectors. In many countries the UNCCD and GEF focal points are even in different Ministries at national level, e.g. the one is in the Ministry of Agriculture, whereas the other focal point is in the Ministry of Environment. Due to many other commitments and a heavy work load by the employees, less LD and SLM projects under the OP15 that involve contributions by all partners were developed. Taking the responsibility to assist and implement a project is also lacking, as too many persons from different institutions are involved, leading to a lack in synergy and coordination, and due to conflicting sectoral policies and regulations. This seems to be happening in Trinidad & Tobago, St Vincent and the Grenadines, Cambodia, United Republic of Tanzania, Djibouti, Cote D'Ivoire and Jamaica.
79. Representatives from Namibia and Uganda that were interviewed stated that the problems regarding LD and SLM projects, especially during the implementation phase, are mainly socio-economic, as many of the communities at local and grassroots level do not adopt the outputs that have been formulated for the projects. Many projects are also too much environmentally driven with less focus on the livelihood issues of the people on the ground. The local communities that are involved in the projects often do not experience the benefits of LD and SLM projects in their regions, such as improved livelihoods or the alleviation of poverty. To ensure the sustainability of SLM and LD projects, the needs of the communities at grass-roots level should therefore be better incorporated in project development. The latter was not always clear during the information transfer given during the workshops by this project.
80. Projects that are developed must be more target-driven and applicable on-the-ground. There are often a lot of LD and SLM projects with more or less the same objectives at a single site in a country funded by different donors, and because the same communities are often involved, the people are uncertain which project objectives to follow, which leads to a loss in enthusiasm and less impact in the end. This is due to a lack in synergy that exists amongst the project leaders and implementation officers involved in the different projects. Social awareness and political responsiveness are very important factors that will affect the sustainability of projects and shift approaches and thinking.

81. The political instability of neighbouring countries of, e.g., the United Republic of Tanzania, which include Congo, Rwanda and Burundi, causes an influx of refugees which also have a negative impact on the sustainability of SLM projects. The influx of refugees causes overpopulations in some regions which leads to higher pressure on the natural resources. SLM and LD issues become less important, as sanitation, potable water, food, fuel and medical assistance are higher on the priority list of the communities.
82. There are no or very little environmental and ecological risks involved in this project that could undermine the follow-up work, continuation and long-term sustainability of this project. Environmental and ecological risks will only become important when SLM and LD projects have been implemented (e.g., climate change, overpopulation, etc).
83. Many of the risks and problems mentioned above cannot be directly related to the execution of this project, as they refer to the countries themselves. These risks will, however, have an indirect effect on the development, implementation and sustainability of the SLM-related projects in the countries over the long term.

### **C. Achievement of outputs and activities**

84. The planned activities to achieve the outcomes included:
  - a) Creation of a steering committee and preparation of workshop training material. The steering committee comprising of the GEF Secretariat, the GEF Implementing Agencies, UNCCD Secretariat, the Global Mechanism, IFAD and FAO will oversee the elaboration of training material.
  - b) Development of a training kit that included thematic fact sheets for the participants and facilitation material for the trainers. The translation of the training kit and other material into the six UN languages, printing and distribution.
  - c) Organisation of at least eight Sub-regional workshops and three steering committee meetings. A total of nine Sub-regional workshops and four steering committee meetings were held (Table 1).
  - d) Dissemination of workshop reports and proceedings, translation into the six UN
  - e) languages and printing of copies, transfer of data to diskettes, CDs and distribution.
  - f) Development of an Operational Guide on OP15 to assist developing countries to
  - g) develop GEF eligible projects. Translation of the Operational Guide into at least
  - h) French, English and Spanish. Printing of 2000 copies of the operational guide in the
  - i) different languages.
  - j) Creation of a help desk and electronic forum for follow-up and feedback by a
  - k) multilingual internet website (English, French, Spanish), and mailing list. Distribution
  - l) of the Operational Guide on the website and other relevant documents. Create a forum

m) moderated by the experts involved in the training.

85. A training handbook as part of the training kit on the GEF's SLM approaches was developed with the help of two consultants by means of a consultative process between the GEF Secretariat and its partner agencies, including UNEP, UNDP, WB, UNCCD Secretariat, GM, IFAD and FAO. It was the first time that such a training handbook was developed for GEF's Operational Programmes. A power point presentation was prepared and presented at the workshops to accommodate all the topics of the training handbook. The training handbook was developed. The handbook included the three training modules with respective parts under each module to provide the country and agency participants with an overall background on LD and SLM, especially within the UNCCD framework, the objectives and key principles of the GEF SLM programme on OP15 and the GEF eligible SLM activities. These included capacity building, on-the-ground investments, targeted research activities and the monitoring and evaluation of SLM activities. The training handbook also included fact sheets of case studies on SLM projects in different countries. The training handbook was therefore a very good tool to be distributed during the nine sub-regional workshops. Unfortunately the training handbook was never completely finalised and distributed as an individual UNEP/GEF publication. This was mainly due to the changes that occurred in the new GEF4 approach since 2006. Due to these changes, this valuable training handbook was also not completely updated and finalised for publication on the multilingual internet website that was established by this project.
86. Facilitation material was developed in English and translated for the trainees in the languages where the workshops were presented, (i.e. French for Francophone countries and Spanish for hispanophone countries), which included strategic power point presentations e.g. the presentation developed by the GEF Secretariat, "Dealing with Land Resources in the GEF Focal Area on Land Degradation (Desertification and Deforestation)", which was used at the Namibia workshop. Other facilitation material included the presentations by the consultant from the Overseas Development Group (ODG), University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK at the UNCCD COP7 meeting in Kenya in 2005; "Sustainable Land Management in Practice: Developing proposals in GEF's focal area on land degradation" and "Sustainable Land Management in Theory and Concept". Much of the facilitation material was translated professionally.-
87. Several group exercises were carried out by the participants with the aim of following a participatory approach during the sub-regional training workshops and to involve the participants in the objectives and outcomes of the workshops. These included exercises on:
- Integrated Land Use Planning;
  - Impacts, Barriers (political and regulatory) and community involvement of LD and SLM;
  - Forestry: Causes and impacts of deforestation and the conservation of forest resources;
  - Agriculture: Policy, activities and capacity building;
  - the role of poverty alleviation and the role of policy, institutions and communities; and



- Discussion of how to synchronise the NAPs with the LDC-SIDS Project.
88. According to the project management team, only the training handbook and the OP 15 guide and the power point presentations (with the exception of Arabic and Chinese for power point) the documents mentioned above were translated into the six UN languages (English, French, Spanish, Arabic, Chinese and Russian) and were distributed to the participants and experts on paper, diskette and/or CD-Rom. The Operational Guide was translated into the six UN languages, i.e. English – 3000 copies, Russian – 500 copies, Arabic – 500 copies, Spanish – 2000, French - 2000 and Chinese – 500 copies, with a total of 8,500 books printed.
89. An Operational Guide on OP15 to assist developing countries to develop GEF eligible projects was developed with the help of Mr Robert C Gustafson, editor of “The Land Degradation and GEF Guideline to develop project proposals and accessing project funding from GEF for SLM under the auspices of the World Conservation Union (IUCN) and GEF. This guide was published in book format by UNON Publishing and Printing Services on the GEF’s behalf and is available on the multilingual internet website. According to a representative of the GEF Secretariat, this document was the most downloaded document on the GEF website before GEF4. The Operational Guide is divided into three sections:
- a) Section I: Introduction to the GEF, funding strategy, role players and the functions and roles of the agencies such as UNDP, UNEP, WB and other EAs and IAs with relevant websites of each. It also includes the role of GEF within the UNCCD framework as well as the role of the GM.
  - b) Section II: Presents some background issues on LD on global and regional scale as well as the GEF’s Programme Area on Land Degradation (Desertification and Deforestation). It also includes the mechanisms and pathways of funding for both LD and SLM projects and what aspects to consider when applying for funding, mainly within the GEF programme. It also includes a step by step approach of how to complete the project funding application, the roles of IAs and EAs and some key aspects of the project document.
  - c) Section III: Includes some Appendices such as the OP15 on SLM and some GEF templates for developing project proposals.
90. The above-mentioned OP15 Guide provides step by step guidance for anybody who would like “to do something about the degradation of land resources”. This publication is really impressive and serves its aim, not for this project alone, but for the development of any LD and SLM project proposals within GEF or other funding agencies. The guide is therefore frequently used by consultants that are employed by the countries when tasked to develop LD and SLM project proposals and is also used in the implementation of the new GEF4 approaches, even if outdated. Most persons interviewed or contacted by e-mail questionnaire know about this Operational Guide and have used it in one or other way. Only a few people, such as the representative of the GEF Focal Point of the Republic of Mauritius, who attended the Namibian workshop, did not know about the Guide. The Operational Guide document is undoubtedly one of the “flag ship” outputs of this project, especially for the time it was developed. Together with the training handbook and the information presented at

the sub-regional workshops, a good basis was laid regarding GEF's OP15 and how to access funding for SLM activities.

91. Some workshop participants however found the Operational Guide complicated and too time consuming to use, such as the representative of the Intergovernmental Authority and Development (IGAD) Secretariat in Djibouti and the representative from Tanzania. This has led to the appointment of consultants in the countries to help develop SLM project proposals as mentioned above due to a lack of time and over-commitment of personnel at the focal points in the countries.
92. The use of the Operational Guide also depended on the experience and prior knowledge of the participants that attended the different sub-regional workshops. For the representative from South Africa, who took over the function as UNCCD focal point only a few weeks before the sub-regional workshop in Namibia, the Operational Guide was very helpful in the start of his new position and functions of developing SLM type of projects. Participants from Uganda and Senegal, who had been the UNCCD focal points for many years with a lot of experience already, even before the workshops immediately used this Guide to promote LD and SLM activities and develop project proposals in their countries.
93. Although a help desk and electronic forum for follow-up and feedback operations as well as the distribution of the Operational Guide and other relevant documents was created in the form of a multilingual internet website (English, French, Spanish), it seems not to be very effective. As the activities of this project were directed by GEF Secretariat and other steering committee members including UNEP, the principal objective of the website ([www.unep.org/slm](http://www.unep.org/slm)) was initially to create an on-line community and interactive forum for SLM building on respective databases of all agencies involved (to be then extended to other relevant institutions) with a special access for focal points. Preliminary collaboration was held with the Global Mechanism (GM) through linkages to their research engine on SLM related investments (FIELD). However, because of the quick evolution of GEF and many initiatives being kept on hold until further clarification, it was decided again not to proceed with the website: (1) a project on knowledge management on SLM (which had been developed since 2005 but approved in 2007) led by UNDP took over this specific component; (2) the Country Support Programme has also contributed to bridge the IT gap by providing the GEF operational and political focal points with specific support in relation to GEF topics. Very few people know about this website, and those that do, have hardly used it. The website was published at the COP7 meeting in Kenya in 2005.
94. Due to the financial savings created by the project team (see section I), numerous additional activities such as meetings, reports and documents were financed through this project as instructed by the GEF Secretariat. These additional outputs, which were NOT planned or included in the initial project design, caused extra obligations and stress on the project team. These outputs included:
  - Completion Report for Scientific and Technical Support to SLM as prepared by the consultant of the Overseas Development Group (ODG), University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK in August 2007. This was the last output of this project. This report was used to prepare presentations (power point slides) for the two

training sessions on “SLM in Theory and Concept and SLM in Practice” that were held as side events at COP7 of the UNCCD on 19 and 20 October 2005 in Nairobi, Kenya.

- Report published in book format by UNON Publishing and Printing Services as a GEF output on the symposia and high level round table discussions with lessons learnt and case studies about “Sustainable Land and Water Management: A GEF Agenda for Combating Environmental Degradation and Promoting Sustainable Livelihoods”. The report formed part of the proceedings of the GEF SLM Forum that was held on 28 August 2006 in Cape Town, South Africa, as part of the GEF Third Assembly. The forum consisted of a half day of symposia followed by a high-level round table discussion. The symposia addressed the progress of GEF, its partners and member countries in dealing with land degradation and charting future directions, the role of science and community knowledge and action in the process of knowledge management for SLM, as well as the role of partnerships, institutional development, resource mobilization and investment. The round table discussions, which followed on the symposia, brought together technicians, administrators, politicians, NGOs and civil society to reflect on the future of SLM within the GEF by articulating directions for addressing critical issues in the evolution of the GEF in the light of global change. At least two of the Eight Millennium Development Goals (MDG) was addressed. The presentations at the symposia were made by representatives of the World Soil Information Center, the World Initiative on Sustainable Pastoralism (WISP), GEF, the GEF STAP, UNDP, FAO and IFAD. At the high level round table discussions on Sustainable Land and Water Management statements or remarks were made by Ministers of Environment from Tanzania, Nigeria and Burkina Faso, as well as the CEO of GEF and representatives of the WB, UNEP, NEPAD, FAO, IFAD, UNCCD and UNDP.
  - Proceedings of a Regional workshop on the Identification and Testing of Innovative SLM Approaches by Communities in Drylands of Africa that was held in Pietermaritzburg, South Africa, on 4 – 7 September 2006. This workshop was convened and organised by the TM of this project and UNEP.
95. After assessing the objectives and outputs that had to be achieved within a certain time period, it is clear that except for two actions, most of the outputs and objectives as specified for this project above (paragraph 84), including the nine sub-regional training workshops, were achieved by June 2005. The two activities that were not achieved included the side event on SLM activities that was scheduled for CRIC5 for UNCCD in Argentina, March 2007 and the finalisation of the internet website. Both these activities were put on hold due to the changes that occurred in GEF4. The updating and revision of the training handbook that were planned for December 2006 were replaced by the completion report developed by ODG (see paragraph 94). All the documentation that was published in the six UN languages as well as the additional outputs mentioned above were finalised by July/August 2007.
96. It is therefore concluded that most of the outputs were completed ahead of schedule and that the additional outputs that were produced using the budgetary savings were completed by July/August 2007. The risk factor with regard to the project management and project context for achieving the objectives was low. Except for the

fact that the time given for the organisation of the nine sub-regional workshops was very tight, no problems regarding the programme outputs, financial expenditures or institutional framework were encountered during the project execution.

#### **D. Catalytic role**

97. The project had a great catalytic effect on agencies and governments because it was the first time that UNCCD and GEF focal points as well as other country representatives came together to participate in sub-regional workshops to discuss and brainstorm the concepts and implications surrounding the OP15 of GEF. The project also enabled country representatives to; meet the relevant IAs and EAs that are responsible for SLM implementation, learn about the development of project proposals in this focal area and collect further information on what type of co-funding could be resourced directly from, or in partnership with, the different agencies. A certain “team work” between agencies was created and the work for SLM activities was now better “streamlined”.
98. Unfortunately, this catalytic role between all the partners (country, IAs and EAs and funding agencies) was not sustained due to the changes that occurred in GEF shortly after the sub-regional workshops, and feedback by GEF to countries that submitted projects under OP15 was slow.
99. A few project proposals eligible for GEF funding under OP15 were developed, either by the country representatives themselves or by consultants employed by the focal points in National Governments. Some donors even expressed their interest in being associated with such enterprises and contributed either financially, such as the GTZ (see paragraph 133 and Annex E), logistically, or in-kind, to the sub-regional workshops.
100. In some countries, such as Lebanon the persons that attended the workshops did, for example, duplicate the documentation and information that were supplied to them and distributed the copies and learning material to other participants in the country. Other workshop participants (e.g. University of the West Indies, Trinidad and Tobago), involved students in research projects about certain LD and SLM topics, whereas the representative from Egypt that was interviewed, had tried to translate the material into the local language.
101. As mentioned before, country participants were confused and their enthusiasm was suppressed when they found out that the GEF’s approach had changed just after the sub-regional workshops had ended and that very little or no funding was available in this programme for projects. This had a negative influence on what could have otherwise been a good catalytic impact of this project, and led to minimal replication and scaling-up of SLM and LD projects within the GEF framework.

#### **E. Assessment of monitoring and evaluation systems**

102. This project did not have a sound M&E plan as specified in Annex 4 of the TORs for this evaluation exercise, which includes the SMART approach and indicators to

monitor results and to track progress towards achieving project objectives. On the other hand, it was kept in mind that older generation GEF funded Medium-Size Projects, including this one, did not have to include a detailed M&E plan and log frame, but that the former GEF format for MSPs was used. An analysis of the M&E plan was provided in the MSP Brief, which included; quarterly progress and final reports that were to be delivered to UNEP. The assessment of the steering committee that was appointed for this project through the analysis of achievement of results based on the indicators related to the activities and outputs, and the evaluation by the participants and expert trainers that were involved in the sub-regional workshops.

103. During several interviews with the project management team it was mentioned to the evaluator that the minimum requirements for the design and implementation of an M&E, were not in place when this MSP was carried out. It was therefore not reasonable to evaluate the M&E of this project according to the current GEF SMART approach and indicators (Annex 4).
104. When the steering committee members were asked about the importance of an M&E plan regarding this project, either by interview or by e-mail questionnaire, it was evident that the M&E was not a real issue for this MSP. No problems occurred as a result of lack of a formally planned and presented M&E strategy for this project. Most of the outputs were produced and the objectives were reached. As stated by one of the steering committee members from UNDP (now the Director of UNEP-DGEF), it was not necessary to overload this project with a heavy M&E plan.
105. An evaluation sheet for the participants, helped in the assessment of the effectiveness of the workshops. Analysis of these evaluation forms was used to improve and adapt some of the presentation and material for other sub-regional workshops. It also included general questions regarding the outcomes of the workshops, such as what participants were going to do with the information gained during the workshop and how it would be distributed at national level.
106. The progress of this project was also closely monitored by the steering committee through teleconferences and e-mails as well as interactions at meetings held at COP7 and sub-regional workshops. The progress reports for the periods described in Annex G were developed for this project. The main outputs for the time periods are also indicated in Annex G. The progress reports were only for in-house review at the UNEP/GEF office. Three reports were produced during the life cycle of this project: two progress reports and one final report. Project progress reports and Fiscal Year (FY05) GEF Project Implementation Reviews were submitted to the steering committee meetings on a continuous basis. These were reviewed by the latter and included well justified ratings, objectively verifiable indicators and the status of the achievements according to the project objectives and outputs. A rating of the project execution performance and risks was also given in the PIR. The steering committee members and key persons from UNEP/GEF and the GEF Secretariat did provide inputs and guidelines to improve project performance and adapt needs as the project progressed. One such guideline by the GEF Secretariat was what additional outputs had to be done with the financial savings of the project after the completion of the sub-regional workshops.

107. The progress and final reports of the project also included reference to the problems encountered during the project implementation. From these progress and final reports, it was clear that no substantial/programmatic, institutional or financial problem was encountered throughout the project. The risk factor tables that formed part of the PIRs indicated that all activities of the project management, internal and external, which included a number of aspects such as management structure and implementation, budget and fund management, communication and stakeholder involvement, environmental conditions and local capacity, had a low risk rating.
108. Although no overall M&E system was in place, the tracking of results and progress towards project objectives throughout the project implementation period was carried out by consistent reporting as mentioned above. One of the shortcomings was that no long-term monitoring and follow-up programme to track the impact of this project after implementation especially at country level was in place.

## **F. Preparation and readiness**

109. The objectives and components of this project were clearly formulated in a detailed MSP Brief according to the Log Frame Analysis (LFA) format. The time frame of this project is mentioned in paragraph 18. The project was submitted in June 2003 and a positive project review from the GEF Secretariat recommending approval was received on 26-7-2003 (approval letter received on 10-08-2003). Comments from GEF Council & other Agencies were then addressed and all the ground work started, such as teleconferences and exchange with agencies' representatives, hiring of consultants, preparation of all training material, logistics for meetings' arranging of venues, etc. All this was very time consuming until the workshops started in October 2004.
110. All nine workshops were then held between October 2004 and January 2005. This was a very strenuous time for the project team, especially for the TM and is not recommended for this type of project. The project would have benefited from additional time between the workshops to allow in-depth analysis of the proceedings of each workshop for better and enhanced feedback in subsequent workshops. Nevertheless, the project management team with all the facilitators, mentors and expert presentations were able to prepare tailor made workshops in the Sub-regions with revised presentations and specific case studies in each needed language. The entire time frame in which all the nine sub-regional workshops were presented was therefore too short, which lead to only minor adaptations of material between workshops. Although the project management team advocated for more time in-between workshops in order to have enough time to incorporate new information and address concerns from previous workshops, it was a decision made by the steering committee members, in particular UNDP and the GEF Secretariat that "everything had to move quickly" as mentioned under paragraph 41.
111. The capacity of all the institutions and persons involved in the project was well addressed and within the framework of the objectives of this project. Many consultants, such as translators, editors, facilitators and moderators were employed by the project team to help with the sub-regional workshops and to develop reports, booklets and guidelines on time (Annexes A, D and E).

112. According to the implementation plan given in the MSP Brief and application, all activities had to be finalised within 29 months after project approval. This means that if the project started in December 2003, all activities had to be finished by April 2006, i.e. 29 months. The project was, however, extended till August 2007, which is a total of 45 months. The first revision was made on 15 June 2006 to extend the duration till the end of December 2006, following a request by the GEF Secretariat to use the savings from the project to fund additional outputs. This was mainly to fund the SLM Forum at the third GEF Assembly in Cape Town, August 2006, as previously explained.
113. It is evident that most of the objectives and outputs were achieved within the time frame set for this project, and no major delays occurred. The project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed.
114. The mandate and TOR for the steering committee that were established were clear and easily understood. The steering committee met four times and detailed minutes were taken at each of these meetings. The minutes were distributed among all the relevant partners. The steering committee gave clear guidelines to the project management team regarding; the project development and implementation, how to achieve the outputs, financial expenses, consultants to be appointed and any adaptations that were needed at critical times during the project's implementation. It also helped in the implementation of the Sub-regional workshops by giving guidance regarding the venues, donors (e.g., GTZ contribution), country involvement, the contents and development of training material, (e.g., the structure of the training handbook, which included the three modules and case studies as well as the OP15 Guide) and the involvement of the different IAs and EAs and individual experts at the different Sub-regional workshops (e.g., IFAD inputs on case studies and WB inputs on economics). The steering committee also arranged for representatives of the ADB and AfDB to attend their meetings so to ensure better involvement from the Banks.
115. At the steering committee meetings it was made clear that the GEF Secretariat insisted on high quality project outputs during the time period of the project and that UNEP should go ahead, together with partner agencies, in hiring suitable consultants to help with the preparation of the training material and other documentation. The steering committee therefore prepared the TOR for the consultants, including the timetables and budgets for each of the activities. The consultants also reported to the steering committee about their progress and involvement with regard to the sub-regional training workshops, meetings with IAs and EAs and the preparation of reports and other documents. All steering committee members that were interviewed during this evaluation reported that the work by the committee was very efficient and effective and made valuable contributions towards the project management and the execution of the project. It was found that the steering committee members were very honest about their reports of this project during the interviews and evaluation.
116. The project management staff also reported to the steering committee about the progress of the project, financial status, concerns and whether the participants considered the workshops as useful or not.
117. The steering committee was asked to set up an Interagency task force during the project execution. However, during the first meeting of the steering committee on 3

November 2003, where the TOR for the steering committee itself were discussed, the establishment of an additional Interagency task force for this project was regarded as superfluous, as it would be overlapping with the existing GEF Land Degradation task force already in place. The latter being supported by UNDP.

118. The role of the Global Mechanism (GM) was not clear to everybody involved in the project, especially the steering committee members and even GM personnel. The Programme Coordinator for Asia and the Pacific and GEF-related projects of the GM that was interviewed during the COP8 meeting in Madrid, indicated that the GM was never directly involved in this project. The project coordinator claimed that the GM was invited to the workshops and meetings, but they never participated. This was at a time that the GM underwent restructuring. Most of the steering committee members that were interviewed also indicated that the GM was not part of this project. The project management officer at UNEP, however, told the evaluator, that the GM was part of the SC and was therefore expected to play its role accordingly. A letter was written by the Director of UNEP-DGEF to the Director of the GM (26 July 2004) in which the GM was invited to the steering committee meetings and sub-regional workshops. The GM accepted this invitation and according to the attendance list of the steering committee minutes, two members of GM did indeed participated in the teleconference of the steering committee meeting on 28 January 2004. The GM also attended the sub-regional workshop that was held in Tunisia, and the GM offered to help with the website that was developed through this project by connecting it to the Field database website of the GM as mentioned above. It is therefore very strange that the prominent steering committee members were not aware of the GM's involvement in this project.
119. Although the project had met its original objectives and activities after the initial first 29 months of the project from December 2003 to April 2006, and most of the outputs of the steering committee were very positive and were of great help to the project, it is not clear why only four meetings took place and why no further steering committee meetings after 20 January 2005 were held, even after the extensions. More meetings by this committee could have provided further guidance about the follow-up procedures of participants that attended the sub-regional workshops, which were not carried out, as well as the internet website that was not finalised. Aspects such as the role of the GM and its involvement in connection with the SLM website to the GM Field database and website could then also have been clarified.

## **G. Country ownership/Driveness**

120. This project and especially the sub-regional workshops enhanced synergy between UNCCD and GEF focal points, contributing to the mainstreaming of SLM and LD projects at a national level.
121. From most of the interviews and returned responses from e-mail questionnaires, it is evident that this project did raise awareness about LD and SLM issues within OP15 at different levels in the partner countries, especially those that attended the sub-regional training workshops. One of the main problems was, however, that not all persons that attended the sub-regional training workshops were engaged in LD and SLM matters, and they often represented different Departments and Institutions in their countries, as mentioned in paragraph 78. Although primarily GEF and UNCCD focal points were



invited to the workshops, persons from, for example, the Department of Finances or Foreign Affairs or even Fisheries of a specific country attended the workshop. This could have been due to other commitments by the focal points at the time the workshops were held. It was however the task of the participants that attended the workshops, to pass on the knowledge gained to their particular national GEF and UNCCD focal points afterwards. This knowledge exchange only took place in some countries.

122. For some participants, such as the UNCCD focal point in South Africa and the Government of Suriname, the sub-regional workshop was very informative and it gave them the chance to meet colleagues from other countries also responsible for LD and SLM functions in their countries. Unfortunately, like in many other countries, the South African representative did not manage to create opportunities to make this programme a national priority and involve other partners to be actively involved in the development of LD and SLM projects within OP15.
123. In some countries the experiences and knowledge gained at the sub-regional workshops even inspired some departments to contribute to the development of broader, long-term Environmental Action Plans and mainstreaming of SLM initiatives to be in-line with the implementation of UNCCD, United Nations Convention on Biological Diversity (UNCBD), United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) and other International agreements and Conventions' Action Plans. In Namibia, for example, the SLM projects are already well defined and formed part of the policy framework within the Namibian Action Programme for Combating Desertification (NAPCOD) of the UNCCD. For Trinidad and Tobago, the outputs of this project contributed to the country's commitment to other international agreements such as the Koyto Protocol or the UNCBD and UFCCC in Morocco and Egypt. The project, however, contributed to a lesser extent in encouraging implementation of priorities emanating from SRAPs and RAPs (e.g. between Benin and Guinea).

## **H. Stakeholder participation/Public awareness**

124. One of the main achievements of this project was the good stakeholder participation. According to the final report presented by UNEP/GEF, approximately 400 participants from 130 countries attended the sub-regional training workshops. This included the GEF and UNCCD focal points, regional coordinators of GEF, accredited NGOs and representatives of key sub-regional organisations.
125. According to most steering committee members, facilitators and presenters of the workshops from the GEF Secretariat and IFAD, this project and especially the training workshops did strengthen intra- and inter sub-regional exchange of experiences, lessons learnt and best practices regarding LD and SLM activities. Good discussions took place between participants and the GEF during and after the workshops, also with regard to specific case studies, their implementation, impact and challenges. Unfortunately most of these actions were not sustained after the workshops and the collaborative activities between country representatives did not last for long in most instances.

126. The mechanism to present workshops in identified sub-regions in different languages also stimulated collaboration and discussions between participants, as the work and projects in the regions were similar and they could relate to each other regarding common problems and common solutions, discuss similar approaches and the involvement of institutions, legislation and scientific support. For example, all Anglophone speaking Sub Saharan countries went to the same workshop in Windhoek, Namibia.
127. Collaboration/interactions between the various stakeholders of the project, not only between participants at the sub-regional workshops, but also between project managers and the steering committee members and partner institutions were therefore very high and effective during the course of the implementation of the project.

## **I. Financial planning**

128. The evaluation of the financial planning considered the following information:
- Views from the steering committee members and project managers, either from recordings and/or interviews as well as e-mail questionnaire responses;
  - E-mail questionnaire responses by workshop participants;
  - Progress reports from project management and minutes from steering committee meetings; and
  - Analysis of income and cumulative expenditures as provided by the Fund Management Officer for this project at UNEP/GEF in Nairobi (Annex E).
129. No separate external financial audit was conducted on this project. The management of the project's finances was conducted by UNEP/GEF alone.
130. The total budget for the project, with contributions by the GEF Secretariat and co-financing in-kind and in cash, was US\$ 971,500 (see paragraph 21 for details). The cumulative expenditures for this project till the end of September 2007 were US\$ 752,756.24 (77.48%) (Annex E). This means a balance of US\$ 218,743.76 remained at the end of September 2007. There might still be minor payments to be made for some project outputs, including this evaluation, which will be deducted from the amount left in this project's account. These were not available when the terminal evaluation was carried out.
131. Taking into account the fear of exceeding the initial project budget (GEF allocation) due to the global dimension of the project and high number of participants, a thorough control of travel costs for all participants and consultants (including consultancy fees, translation services, printing options, which were systematically negotiated at a lower rate) was put into place. This contributed to the savings and helped in the funding of additional relevant activities mentioned under paragraph 94. Co-financing was also leveraged as mentioned. Savings also resulted from the fact that some expected participants did not attend workshops and therefore related costs were recovered.
132. It is very important to note that the US\$ 25 000 leveraged funding expected from GTZ were never paid to UNEP and are therefore not reflected in the financial statements as explained by Annex E. The GTZ contribution was mainly used to finance the sub-regional workshops carried out in Tunisia.

133. Taking the huge scope of this project with all the sub-regional workshops (travel, accommodation and other expenses), preparation of reports and workshops material, translations, consultations, development and printing of guidelines and other documentation into consideration, it is clear that the project managers tried to save money where possible. With all the savings that were realised through the duration of the project, it was still possible to produce additional reports and documentation (including brochures and posters) and arrange meetings and additional workshops that were not initially planned or part of the objectives and outcomes envisaged for this project. Except for the in-cash co-financing by GEF and Norway and the in-kind and leveraged funding obtained from UNEP and GTZ, no other grants or loans were obtained from any other organisation (IA, EA, ADB, AfDB, Governments, etc). All the additional support by the agencies mentioned was in the form of in-kind contributions for the planning and execution of the sub-regional workshops. The two primary donor agencies for this project were Norway and the GTZ. Additional outputs produced by this project can therefore be regarded as so-called “leveraged resources”, as they are resources produced beyond the commitments to the project itself. They were later mobilised as a direct result of the project. The contributions of these leveraged resources towards the project’s ultimate objective are mainly described in paragraph 94 of this report.
134. The co-financing from the Regional Banks and other agencies was very poor. At the end, all the project outcomes were financed by the project budget itself. Much more co-financing was expected from the Regional Banks and also Government country contributions.
135. All the expenses for the participants who attended the sub-regional training workshops, which included administration, travelling, accommodation, daily subsistence allowances (DSAs), workshop material, etc were paid from the project budget.
136. From the interviews held with some of the steering committee members, it is clear that pressure from the GEF Secretariat was put on the project management to achieve as many objectives and deliver as many outputs in the shortest possible time with the budget available.
137. Although a lot of savings resulted in a large amount still available in the budget of this project the overall financial planning was effective and the control of financial resources throughout the project’s lifetime good. The expenditures and disbursements are valid and contributed above all expectations towards the objectives and outputs of this project.

## **J. Implementation approach**

138. The project was developed through a consultative process between UNEP and leading implementing agencies: GEF Secretariat, UNDP, the WB, UNCCD Secretariat, FAO, IFAD and the GM to some extent. Additional partners such as the Government of Norway and the GTZ who co-funded the project and World Conservation Union (IUCN) also joined the process. GEF and UNCCD focal points who often represented

Ministries on Environment and Agriculture as well as representatives from key GEF accredited NGOs and sub-regional organisations were the main targets of the project.

139. The appointment of the steering committee and its objectives, which were already discussed under section F of this evaluation report, helped and made certain that the project implementation mechanisms as outlined in the MSP Brief were closely followed. The final programme of the sub-regional workshops was defined and approved by the steering committee and an in-depth review of the training material and other presentations relevant to a specific workshop discussed through consultative dialogue between all agencies represented at the steering committee meetings.
140. As mentioned before, the implementation approach was successful and to a great extent effective at the time the sub-regional workshops were held. As soon as the new GEF4 strategy was implemented in 2006, the effectiveness, knowledge gained and lessons learnt by the country partners during the training sessions were less effective as they failed to get updated information about the new GEF strategy from their GEF focal points at national level. Although most of the documentation developed through this project, such as the training handbook and the Operation Guide is still valid and countries may still benefit from it, (e.g. the SLM and LD project information, mechanisms to access funding or information on how to implement aspects such as capacity building, targeted research, monitoring and evaluation and the role of IAs and EAs in the mainstreaming into SLM activities on national, sub-regional and regional level), many believe that the documents available are now outdated after the implementation of GEF4. This is, however, only true to some extent, and the value of all the reports, booklets, publications, guidelines and training material is often not sufficiently acknowledged.
141. Although the timeframe for presenting the nine sub-regional training workshops was very tight (less than four months) due to pressure by the GEF Secretariat, the implementation approach and activities carried out during this project were very valuable and in accordance with the project's implementation mechanisms and framework outlined in the project document. It also required good financial planning to achieve all these outputs and implement the different activities that were applied in this project.
142. As far as the training handbook is concerned it would need a lot of work to be revised accordingly, whereas the Operational Guide could be more readily updated and revised to take into account new GEF strategies and requirements. But this was not required by GEF Secretariat.

## **K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping**

143. The UNEP project management team supplied all necessary administrative and financial support to this project. Several consultants were also employed to help with the development of reports, booklets and other documentation that contributed to the overall success of this project.
144. Since one of the main objectives was to create awareness and conduct training regarding the GEF and OP15 in the form of nine sub-regional training workshops at nine different locations in the world, requiring good coordination skills to get

everything organised in time, the support and backstopping by UNEP was very good. All steering committee members, consultants and workshop participants that were interviewed, or from which response was obtained through the e-mail questionnaire, were full of praise regarding the assistance, support and organisational skills of UNEP-DGEF Task Manager. A steering committee member and Senior Environmental Specialist for GEF at the WB even stated that: “it must have been hard on the people from UNEP who presented the workshops; the project manager did a very good job – all credit to her”. The fact that the Task Manager could speak at least three of the six UNEP languages was very convenient and definitely helped in achieving the objectives of this project.

145. The major constraint that could have influenced the effective implementation of this project and that was communicated to the evaluator was the short time in which the nine sub-regional workshops had to be presented. The time frame, period for sub-regional workshops and outputs, including the additional documents, forums and workshops, was according to the decision made by the steering committee for this project reflecting UNDP and the GEF Secretariat recommendations in particular.
146. The project was also carried out shortly after OP15 was adopted by GEF in March 2003. This contributed to the fact that no detailed directions about the real meaning, procedures and how to implement OP15 were already in place by the time the project was approved in December 2003. This could be one of the main reasons why the first sub-regional workshops only commenced in October 2004, as a lot of documentation and background information had to be developed first before the countries could be involved.

#### **4. Conclusions and Rating**

147. The evaluation TOR require an assessment of the different project criteria such as the project design, implementation and objectives and outputs achieved on a scale of rating from “highly satisfactory” (HS) to “highly unsatisfactory” (US). The ratings for the 11 criteria as well as some summary comments are given in the table below. The summary comments are extracted from the evaluation.

**TABLE 2: OVERALL RATINGS**

<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Evaluator's Summary Comments</b>	<b>Evaluator's Rating</b>	<b>EOU Ratings</b>
<b>A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)</b> Sub criteria (below)			<b>EOU agrees with the evaluator</b> <b>4</b>
A. 1. Effectiveness	Although this was a very ambitious project that had to be carried out over a short time to reach as many people as possible, the main objectives of the project were partly achieved. Changes in personnel at the national focal points after the workshops to disseminate the skills obtained and ensure long-term sustainability at country level over the long-term was less positive. There was a lot of pressure from the GEF Secretariat to finish the project in the shortest possible time. Not only UNEP as implementing agency was involved, but also many other IAs and EAs who helped in the organisation, exchange of expert knowledge and collaboration at especially the nine sub-regional training workshops. Awareness was raised and more than 400 people of 130 countries, mostly representing the UNCCD and GEF focal points, were capacitated. New contacts and alliances between the stakeholders and partners were established. Methodologies used were mostly effective. The achievements complied with the achievement indicators identified before and during this project. Some of the objectives, such as the internet website, were however not completely achieved.	<b>4</b>	
A. 2. Relevance	This MSP was relevant at the time of GEF3. It was carried out from December 2003, just after the GEF Council adopted the Operational Programme on SLM and LD, namely OP15 in May 2003. Unfortunately the implementation of the new GEF4 strategy in June 2006 had a negative effect on this project. However, the lessons learnt, material presented at the workshops and documentation produced through this MSP regarding SLM and LD activities and approaches, including the development of projects and accessing project funding, may still be relevant even in the new GEF4 strategy.	<b>5</b>	
A. 3. Efficiency	The project was efficient in many ways, as new collaboration and partnerships were established between countries and agencies. Some LD and SLM-related project proposals were developed after the sub-regional workshops. The information and documentation gathered at the sub-regional workshops, such as the OP15 Guide and training handbook, unfortunately only led to limited activities at national level. Only a few workshops participants passed on the information gained from the workshops to other members in their countries. The impact of the project to encourage implementation of priorities emanating from SRAPs was minimal. No follow-up procedure was in place to evaluate the impact of this project after the sub-regional workshops.	<b>4</b>	

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating	EOU Ratings
<b>B. Sustainability of project outcomes (overall rating)</b> Sub criteria (below)		<b>3</b>	<b>EOU agrees with the evaluator</b>
B. 1. Financial	The financial sustainability of this project over the long-term will depend on the inputs by the GEF and UNCCD Secretariats, national focal points and related agencies to create follow-up operations to train and capacitate the country partners in the new GEF4 strategy, incorporating the recommendations and guidelines made by the steering committee and the completion report. The development and implementation of LD and SLM-related projects will also depend on the availability of co-funding by agencies, if they fit into the newly created regional programmes and contributions by Regional Banks. The long-term financial sustainability was therefore not very satisfactory.	<b>3</b>	
B. 2. Socio-political	The main social and political risks that may jeopardise the sustainability of this project over the long term will mostly lie at national, sub-regional and regional level and to a much lesser extent as a result of the GEF, UNEP, UNDP and other agency support. Social awareness and political responsiveness to create long-term sustainability were not very satisfactory.	<b>3</b>	
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance	This is one of the main risks that will influence the long-term sustainability of this project, as so many changes in personnel occurred at country level, not only regarding the UNCCD and GEF focal points, but also from the different agencies since the sub-regional workshops in 2004/5. Appropriate policy and regulatory frameworks need to be in place to sustain and foster SLM projects. Due to a lack of synergy and coordination and conflicting sectoral policies and regulations, not enough projects are being developed and/or implemented. A lack of human capacity is experienced in many countries.	<b>3</b>	
B. 4. Environmental	No or very little environmental and ecological risks involved in this project that could undermine the follow-up work, continuation and long-term sustainability of this project.	<b>N/A</b>	
<b>C. Achievement of outputs and activities</b>	Most of the planned outputs and activities were achieved, except for the finalisation of the internet website and the training handbook,. A total of 8500 books were printed in the six UN languages. It was the first time that such an Operational Guide and training handbook were developed for GEF and OPs. The Guide was used by UNCCD and GEF focal points or consultants to develop some SLM-related projects. The training and other material produced, such as power point presentations, fact sheets and case studies, were effective and helped in the sub-regional training workshops. Unfortunately, due to time constraints, only a few adaptations were made from one workshop to the next. Not all expectations of the participants were met. Many additional outputs such as reports, other documentation, workshops and forums were however held after the workshops as part of this project. One other output that was not achieved includes the side event on SLM activities that was scheduled for CRIC5 for the UNCCD in Argentina, June 2005.	<b>5</b>	<b>EOU agrees with the evaluator</b>

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating	EOU Ratings
<b>D. Monitoring and evaluation (overall rating)</b> Sub criteria (below)	A good M&E plan according to the new SMART parameters was not implemented for this MSP. This project was developed and approved prior to the current GEF M&E policies. The progress of the project was monitored closely by the steering committee and project reports and portfolio reviews were submitted, which included justified ratings, objectively verifiable indicators and the status of the achievements according to the project outputs and objectives. Unfortunately, no long-term monitoring and follow-up programme to keep track with the impact of the programme after completion was in place.	5	EOU agrees with the evaluator
D. 1. M&E Design	See above		
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)	See above		
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities	See above		
<b>E. Catalytic role</b>	The project had a good catalytic effect on agencies and governments. Due to a lack of communication mainly by the national GEF focal points, country participants were not positive about the new changes in the GEF strategy. Country partners were also under the impression that little money was available in these programmes.	5	EOU agrees with the evaluator
<b>F. Preparation and readiness</b>	The time frame for especially the presentation of the nine sub-regional workshops was too short. Only few adaptations and inputs from participants could be incorporated from one workshop to the next. Nevertheless, the project management team could prepare tailor-made workshops with revised presentations in the different languages in the different regions. The capacity of the executing agency was well addressed and within the framework and objectives of this project. Many consultants were employed by the project team to help with the project outputs. The time frame of the initial project was 29 months (Dec 2003 – April 2006), which was extended twice till the end of August 2007, which means that the project was carried out over 45 months in total. No steering committee meetings took place after the last sub-regional workshop in January 2005. Changes from GEF3 to GEF4, which now follows a programmatic approach, were not effectively communicated.	4	EOU agrees with the evaluator
<b>G. Country ownership / Drivenness</b>	It is evident that this project did raise awareness about LD and SLM issues within OP15 on different levels in the partner countries, especially those that attended the sub-regional training workshops. It is not known why the persons that attended the workshops were not all engaged in LD and SLM matters, as they represented different departments and institutions in their countries. In a more positive way, people that were already engaged in LD and SLM projects at national level, the workshops helped in the further understanding and related challenges regarding already established projects and create bigger exposure to stakeholders at country level. The workshops were targeting at	3	EOU agrees with the evaluator



<b>Criterion</b>	<b>Evaluator's Summary Comments</b>	<b>Evaluator's Rating</b>	<b>EOU Ratings</b>
	UNCCD and GEF focal points (which was the innovative aspect of the project) in view to allow focal points coming from different institutions to further interact between themselves and enhance synergies and collaboration at national level. Some departments were inspired to contribute to the development of broader, long-term Environmental Action Plans and mainstreaming of SLM initiatives to be in line with the implementation of UNCCD, UNCBD, UNFCCC and other International agreements and Conventions' Action Plans (NAPs). Training and awareness about workshop outputs to other persons at country level was minimal. Follow-up workshops at country level by the national focal points are needed.		
<b>H. Stakeholders involvement</b>	Nearly 400 representatives from 130 countries participated in the sub-regional workshops. Good interaction between participants and country representatives, including IAs and EAs took place. Intra- and inter sub-regional exchange of experiences, lessons learnt and best practices regarding LD and SLM activities were strengthened, but only during the workshops and not afterwards. 55% of the participants considered the workshops as 'very useful' and 44% judged it as 'quite useful'. The training programme and material were judged as 'very good' (46%) and 'good' (48%) and 85% of the participants mentioned that they would like to recommend the lessons learnt to their colleagues, institutions and others. The latter however did not take place as anticipated.	<b>5</b>	<b>EOU agrees with the evaluator</b>
<b>I. Financial planning</b>	No separate external financial audit was carried out. Many savings were made during the project life cycle. Quite a large balance of US\$ 218,743.76 remained at the end of September 2007 with only minor outstanding payments still to be charged to this project. As requested by the GEF Secretariat and the steering committee, savings were used for additional relevant activities such as the SLM forum in South Africa, workshops, presentations at COP7 in 2005 and reports.	<b>5</b>	<b>EOU agrees with the evaluator</b>
<b>J. Implementation approach</b>	Many preparations had to be made from the approval of the project in December 2003 till the first workshop in October 2004, such as the development of training and presentation material, translation of documents and organisation of the workshops. The project was developed through a consultative process between UNEP and leading implementing agencies, GEF Secretariat, UNDP, the WB, UNCCD Secretariat, FAO, IFAD and the GM to some extent. Further partners such as the Government of Norway and the GTZ who co-funded the project and IUCN also joined the process. The implementation approach was successful and to a great extent effective at the time the sub-regional workshops were held.	<b>4</b>	<b>EOU agrees with the evaluator</b>
<b>K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping</b>	The UNEP project management team, which mainly consisted of the Task Manager and the Fund Management Officer, supplied all necessary administrative and financial support for this project. It took a lot of time and organisational skills from this	<b>5</b>	<b>EOU agrees with the evaluator</b>

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating	EOU Ratings
	team to organise all the workshops and get the additional documentation ready for publication on time. Due to the short time period in which all the workshops had to be completed, no proper follow-up actions and continued communication and collaboration actions were however implemented. The contact details of many of the workshop participants are, in many cases, no longer valid.		
	<b>Overall rating</b>	<b>4.2</b>	<b>4.3</b>

## 5. Lessons learnt

148. When planning projects, such as this MSP, caution has to be given that they are not too ambitious from the start and cannot be completed as initially planned. This project started in December 2003 and although the initial design for the project was good, the many preparations that had to be made, such as the preparations of the nine sub-regional workshops, the preparation of documentation, appointment of consultants, organisation of venues, logistical arrangements, as well as invitations to participants in the different countries, contributed to the fact that the design phase took over nine months. Then all nine sub-regional workshops had to be presented in only 3½ months, which resulted that these workshops were presented in a hurry and local needs could not be taken into consideration, such as visiting local study sites and using practical examples in the workshops or do more field trips. The work plan of the project must be well structured in order to complete all the activities well spread over the duration of the project and to serve all stakeholders as good as possible. Although the guidelines by the steering committee and GEF Secretariat for this MSP had to be taken into account they interfered with the design and implementation plan of the project, which had some negative impact on the outcomes in especially the early stages of the project.
149. When many people from many different countries from diverse backgrounds have to be trained and capacitated within a very short period of time, it is good to involve experts and representatives of IAs and EAs at the sub-regional workshops to increase the “critical mass” of effort and capacity. This also allows for good collaboration between all stakeholders at country and regional level. Since the project management staff consisted of only a few persons, it was a wise step to appoint a number of consultants who could help especially for the development of the documentation and the preparation of the sub-regional workshops, including the translation into the six UN languages, which formed the key outputs of this project. This is a positive lesson that can be learnt from this project.
150. Good policy and regulatory frameworks have to be in place at national level to sustain and foster SLM in agriculture, forestry and other sectors and stimulate stakeholder participation. This is especially true when significant changes occur in the governance and policy at national scale, as was the case in this project which lasted 45 months. It is important to constantly make project managers and other stakeholders aware, train and capacitate them at national level regarding changes that may occur in e.g. GEF and other IAs and EAs regarding SLM and LD activities and initiatives. It needs to bore in mind that not all national focal points have the same background, experience

and knowledge about LD and SLM issues and project development and therefore need to be constantly updated.

151. It is very important that the TORs are well-defined throughout the project duration for all project participants, especially the project management team, including the TM and the steering committee. The TORs for the steering committee for this project were not completely clear, especially towards the end of the project. The working of the committee was therefore not very effective as only few inputs were made after the last sub-regional workshop was held in January 2005. This led to inadequate monitoring and evaluation of the project outputs near the end of this MSP, especially in the extension period from April 2006 till August 2007. If funds remain at the end of a project and an extension to a project is considered, it should be borne in mind that additional resources should be allocated to ensure effective M&E, oversight and governance of the project. If, as was the case with this project, the extension is solely limited to the addition of a list of extra deliverables to the expected outputs of the project, then aforementioned aspects of project implementation will suffer.

## **6. Recommendations**

152. This project was completed in August 2007. It is therefore not necessary to make recommendations about improvements in project design and implementation at this stage. However, some recommendations are made that can be considered in future similar projects that may be carried out in follow-up activities by this or another GEF project. The recommendations include the following:
  - After the saved budget has been returned to GEF Secretariat, it is recommended that the savings be urgently used to update and improve the current internet website to stimulate country and stakeholder participation and to stimulate further SLM and LD activities in the new GEF strategy. Advertise the website created by this project more widely and maybe the GEF Secretariat or any other funding agency could contribute to the improvement of this important mechanism. This website can be linked to other websites, but it is important that GEF Secretariat does not let the good work that was produced by this project become redundant. The task manager of this project at UNEP can assist with this updating. The follow-up work should also include the adaptation and updating of the training handbook and SLM website towards the new programmatic approach of GEF4.
  - The GEF Secretariat can facilitate follow-up workshops at country level to help the national focal points to increase the country ownership and drivenness, especially due to the changes that occurred within the GEF strategies.
  - From the information gathered by this project, it is evident that a lot of changes in institutional frameworks and governance on national level occurred since this project was carried out in 2004/5, which had a major influence on the long-term sustainability of the outputs and objectives of the project. It is therefore recommended, that if countries are aware of such changes that occur due to institutional frameworks and governance, they should make more effort to distribute the information gained through the workshops to follow-up structures and staff to ensure better and long-term sustainability on national level.

- If follow-up activities of this project are approved by the GEF Secretariat, it is recommended to involve the steering committee members (past and present) of this project that have a good background about this project and the changes that have occurred and let them guide the process of further actions and follow-up activities. This can be supervised by UNEP and will increase the backstopping and long-term sustainability of the project.

## ANNEX A: TERMS OF REFERENCE

### **Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP GEF project “Global Support to Facilitate the Early Development and Implementation of Sustainable Land Management Programs and Projects Under the GEF Operational Programme Number 15.” Project Number: GF/1030-03-02**

#### **1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW**

##### **Project rationale**

Further to the designation by the Second GEF Assembly of land degradation as a new focal area as a means to support the implementation of UNCCD, the GEF Council of May 2003 adopted the Operational Programme on Sustainable Land Management. OP 15 provides a framework for the development of activities eligible for GEF funding to address the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on ecosystem function and services as well as on people’s livelihood and economic well being through sustainable land management. At the first meeting of the Committee for the Review of the Implementation of the UNCCD (CRIC), in November 2002, Parties expressed their financial, technical and technological needs for combating desertification. Capacity-building remains the most immediate priority to effectively implement the Convention. The project aimed at bridging some crucial information and capacity gaps by providing the Parties with technical tools and methodologies related to OP 15 that will assist in implementing the Convention.

The project was mainly implemented under GEF 3 with the specific purpose of providing the targeted beneficiaries with key information and training on the strategic priorities of the land degradation focal area and the operational programme n.15 valid at the time of GEF 3. Since then a completely revised framework focusing on a programmatic approach has been set up since the new GEF CEO came on board in June 2006.

The overall goal of the project was stated as: *‘facilitate early development and implementation of GEF programs and projects on sustainable land management through global information and training of the relevant decision-makers in addressing land degradation issues, and developing and implementing activities eligible for GEF funding under OP 15.’*

##### **The specific objectives of the project were stated as:**

1. Raise awareness about the newly designated focal area of land degradation, and OP 15, and facilitate the access of eligible countries to GEF resources by building their capacities to attain sustainable land management at the local, national, sub-regional and regional levels, that generates global environment and sustainable development benefits.
2. Strengthen intra and inter sub-regional exchange of experiences, best practices, on-going initiatives and activities related to sustainable land management.
3. Strengthen interagency collaboration in the land degradation focal area between UNEP, the GEF Secretariat, UNDP the World Bank and GEF Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities including IFAD, FAO and the Regional Development Banks.

##### **The expected outcomes from this project included:**

1. Acquisition of additional technical and human capacities from the countries involved in order to implement the UNCCD in a more effective way;
2. Sub-regional workshops in order to involve sharing of experiences, best practices and on-going activities in sustainable land management of the participants and strengthening constructive partnerships at all levels. Country collaboration at sub-regional and regional levels to jointly develop and/or implement sustainable land management programmes and projects and integrate priorities identified in SRAPs and RAPs into national development plans
3. Contribution towards the mainstreaming of sustainable land management related issues into the programmes and country strategies of the GEF Implementing Agencies and some of the Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities;
4. Development of the Operational Guide on OP15 in order to assist developing countries to prepare GEF-eligible projects on sustainable land management.

### **Relevance to GEF Programmes**

As part of the assessment of GEF's overall performance in its second phase of operation, a GEF Land Degradation Linkage Study was commissioned with the objective to assess the effectiveness of its support to land degradation. A total of 103 projects implemented by UNDP, UNEP and the World Bank were reviewed in a desk analysis and 35 were selected for more detailed analysis. The study recommended that land degradation components in GEF projects be further strengthened and that land degradation be addressed more directly. In response to these recommendations, the Second GEF Assembly, held in Beijing in October 2003, designated land degradation as a focal area and the subsequent GEF Council in May 2003 adopted an Operational Programme 15 on Sustainable Land Management that provides further guidance for funding under the new focal area.

### **Executing Arrangements**

The project was to be executed by UNEP in close collaboration with the GEF Secretariat, other GEF Implementing Agencies (UNDP and the World Bank), as well as relevant GEF Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities (IFAD and FAO). The implementation of the project was to be supervised by a steering committee comprising of the representatives of the above agencies. The steering committee would meet three times, in the margins of the first and fifth workshops, and at the end of the project. Additional agencies would be invited to attend the steering committee on an ad hoc basis. The Regional Development Banks would share their experiences in terms of initiatives and projects at national and sub-regional levels.

The representative of the African Development Bank (AfDB), the representatives of the SADC and IGAD and the representative of the host country were to be invited to attend the first steering committee meeting in the margins of the sub-regional Anglophone Workshop for Africa. This meeting was to review the programme, contents and information material of the workshops including the evaluation sheet in light of the comments raised by the participants. The representative of the Asian Development Bank (ADB) and the representative of the host country were to be invited to attend the second steering committee meeting in the margins of the sub-regional Workshop for East, South and South-East Asia. This meeting would assess the progress of the project implementation and outline the elements of the Operational Guide on OP15.

The eight representatives of the host countries, the representatives of the active Regional Coordinating units of UNCCD, ADB, AfDB, the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development (EBRD), the Inter-American Development Bank (IDB) and the five African sub-regional economic bodies (NEPAD framework) were to be invited to attend the third

steering committee meeting towards the end of the series of workshops. This meeting would discuss the Operational Guide on OP15 and validate it. The meeting would also set up an Interagency Task Force and would define its terms of reference. The main purpose of this Task Force was to maintain the momentum created by the project on mainstreaming of sustainable land management, after its completion, through e-mail exchange, the Internet help desk and electronic forum, and occasional meetings. The Task Force was to follow up the results achieved and evaluate the impacts of the Operational Guide on the development and implementation of sustainable land management activities at all levels. The Task Force would review it in light of GEF related strategies and new priorities of countries and regions. The Task Force would also ensure that information gathered by the trained GEF and UNCCD focal points would be adequately disseminated at local and country level to other key stakeholders and institutions that would be involved in the development and implementation of GEF related projects, through assistance of country offices of partner agencies.

The UNEP Regional Offices (Kenya, Mexico, Bahrain, Thailand) would assist in the organization of the corresponding sub-regional workshops providing expertise for the preparation of training material as well as facilities (in kind financing), if the workshop was hosted by the same country. The Global Mechanism would play a complementary role of resource mobilization by securing external co-financing for sustainable land management activities developed under OP15 through consultations with bilateral donors and the private sector.

### **Project Activities**

The project duration was initially 29 months starting December 2003 to April 2006, which was later revised and extended to be completed in the end of July 2007, making a total duration of 45 months.

The project was internally executed by UNEP/DGEF and had the following components<sup>1</sup>:  
:

- a) Creation of an inter-agency steering committee and preparation of workshop material;
- b) Organization of sub-regional workshops and dissemination of workshop reports and proceedings;
- c) Development of an Operational Guide on the GEF OP 15 on Sustainable Land Management will be developed by the GEF Secretariat;
- d) Building of a multilingual internet website.

### **Budget**

The total budget was US\$ 971,500 with GEF: US\$ 721,500, Co-financing: US\$ 250,000 (in cash: US\$ 150,000 - Norway; in kind: US\$ 100,000 – UNEP, UNDP, etc.)

## **TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR THE EVALUATION**

### **1. Objective and Scope of the Evaluation**

The objective of this terminal evaluation is to determine the extent to which the project objectives were achieved, or are expected to be achieved, and assess if the project has led to

---

<sup>1</sup> Please refer to the Project Document for the project's specific activities and indicators

any other positive or negative consequences. If possible the extent and magnitude of any project impacts to date will be documented and the likelihood of future impacts will be determined. The evaluation will also assess project performance and the implementation of planned project activities and planned outputs against actual results. The evaluation will focus on the following main questions:

- Has the project delivered capacity building exercises to the countries involved enabling them to understand key concepts highlighted in the land degradation focal area strategy and OP15 as well as implement the UNCCD in a more effective way and further integrate priorities identified in SRAPs and RAPs into national development plans?
- Have constructive partnerships been developed at all levels within and outside the project countries aimed at jointly developing and/or implementing sustainable land management programmes and projects?
- Has the project been able to strengthen interagency collaboration in the land degradation focal area between UNEP, the GEF Secretariat, UNDP the World Bank and GEF Executing Agencies with expanded opportunities including IFAD, FAO and the Regional Development Banks?
- Has the project developed a multilingual guide on OP 15 as well as other tools to allow targeted beneficiaries to better understand GEF's requirements and priorities in the land degradation focal area? Is this guide able to clearly and practically assist developing countries in preparing GEF-eligible projects on sustainable land management?
- How widely and effectively has the project been able to disseminate the guide on OP15?

It is important that the evaluator take into consideration the fact that this project was mainly implemented under GEF. A completely revised framework focusing on a programmatic approach has been set up since the new GEF CEO came on board in June 2006. The new framework has led to an increased number of Implementing Agencies, strengthened relationships between the GEF Secretariat and the countries, new strategic programmes and focal areas' priorities which will be substituting existing operational programmes which might be soon considered as outdated.

The project represented the first step of an overall process aimed to increase the awareness of GEF and CCD focal points about the newly established land degradation focal area (launched by the second GEF Assembly in Beijing, China in 2002) and OP15. It aimed to contribute to the creation of a foundation for further reflection on SLM and required interventions. Therefore the evaluator should further analyse and assess impacts of the project in this transition context.

## **2. Methods**

This terminal evaluation will be conducted as an in-depth evaluation using a participatory approach whereby the UNEP/DGEF Project management officer, representatives of the steering committee and other relevant staff are kept informed and regularly consulted throughout the evaluation. The consultant will liaise with the UNEP/EOU and the UNEP/DGEF Project management officer on any logistic and/or methodological issues to



properly conduct the review in as independent a way as possible, given the circumstances and resources offered. The draft report will be circulated to UNEP/DGEF Project management officer, representatives of the steering committee and the UNEP/EOU. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions.

The findings of the evaluation will be based on the following:

1. A desk review of project documents including, but not limited to:
  - (a) The project documents, outputs, monitoring reports (such as progress and financial reports and GEF annual Project Implementation Review reports) and relevant correspondence.
  - (b) Notes from the Steering Group meetings.
  - (c) Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.
2. Interviews with project management and technical support (names and contact details of all the key stakeholders are included in Annex 5). For this purpose the evaluator will attend the last week of the Conference of the Parties to UNCCD held in Madrid (to be held between the 4<sup>th</sup> and 14<sup>th</sup> of September) where she/he will have the chance to meet with key steering committee members, CCD focal points and other relevant participants.
3. Interviews and Telephone interviews with intended users for the project outputs and other stakeholders involved with this project, including in the participating countries and international bodies. The Consultant shall determine whether to seek additional information and opinions from representatives of donor agencies and other organisations. As appropriate, these interviews could be combined with an email questionnaire.
4. Interviews with the UNEP/DGEF project project management officer and Fund Management Officer, and other relevant staff in UNEP dealing with land degradation related activities as necessary. The Consultant shall also gain broader perspectives from discussions with relevant GEF Secretariat staff.
5. In order to acquaint himself/herself with GEF -if need be-, it might be useful for the evaluator to consult the GEF web site: [www.thegef.org](http://www.thegef.org).

### **Key Evaluation principles**

In attempting to evaluate any outcomes and impacts that the project may have achieved, evaluators should remember that the project's performance should be assessed by considering the difference between the answers to two simple questions "*what happened?*" and "*what would have happened anyway?*". These questions imply that there should be consideration of the baseline conditions and trends in relation to the intended project outcomes and impacts. In addition it implies that there should be plausible evidence to attribute such outcomes and impacts to the actions of the project.

Sometimes, adequate information on baseline conditions and trends is lacking. In such cases this should be clearly highlighted by the evaluator, along with any simplifying assumptions that were taken to enable the evaluator to make informed judgements about project performance.

### 3. Project Evaluation Parameters

The success of project implementation will be rated on a scale from ‘highly unsatisfactory’ to ‘highly satisfactory’. In particular the evaluation shall assess and rate the project with respect to the eleven categories defined below:<sup>2</sup>

#### **A. Attainment of objectives and planned results:**

The evaluation should assess the extent to which the project's major relevant objectives were effectively and efficiently achieved or are expected to be achieved and their relevance.

- *Effectiveness*: Evaluate how, and to what extent, the stated project objectives have been met, taking into account the “achievement indicators”. The analysis of outcomes achieved should include, *inter alia*, an assessment of the extent to which the project has directly or indirectly assisted policy- and decision-makers to apply information supplied by biodiversity indicators in their national planning and decision-making. In particular:
  - Evaluate the immediate impact of the project on its aim to bridging some crucial information and capacity gaps by providing the Parties with information related to OP 15 that will assist them in implementing sustainable land management
  - As far as possible, also assess the potential longer-term impacts considering that the evaluation is taking place upon completion of the project and that longer term impact is expected to be seen in a few years time. Frame recommendations to enhance future project impact in this context. Which will be the major ‘channels’ for longer term impact from the OP15 project at the national and international scales?
- *Relevance*: In retrospect, were the project’s outcomes consistent with the focal areas/operational program strategies? Ascertain the nature and significance of the contribution of the project outcomes to the UNCCD and the wider portfolio of the GEF.
- *Efficiency*: Was the project cost effective? Was the project the least cost option? Was the project implementation delayed and if it was, then did that affect cost-effectiveness? Assess the contribution of cash and in-kind co-financing to project implementation and to what extent the project leveraged additional resources. Did the project build on earlier initiatives, did it make effective use of available scientific and / or technical information. Wherever possible, the evaluator should also compare the cost-time vs. outcomes relationship of the project with that of other similar projects.

#### **B. Assessment of Sustainability of project outcomes:**

Sustainability is understood as the probability of continued long-term project-derived outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, e.g. stronger institutional capacities or better informed decision-making. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes. The evaluation should ascertain to what extent follow-up

---

<sup>2</sup> However, the views and comments expressed by the evaluator need not be restricted to these items.

work has been initiated and how project outcomes will be sustained and enhanced over time. In this case, sustainability will be linked to the continued use and influence of scientific models and scientific findings, produced by the project.

Four aspects of sustainability should be addressed: financial, socio-political, institutional frameworks and governance, and ecological (if applicable). The following questions provide guidance on the assessment of these aspects:

- *Financial resources.* Are there any financial risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the likelihood that financial and economic resources will not be available once the GEF assistance ends (resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and trends that may indicate that it is likely that in future there will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)? To what extent are the outcomes of the project dependent on continued financial support?
- *Socio-political:* Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- *Institutional framework and governance.* To what extent is the sustainability of the outcomes of the project dependent on issues relating to institutional frameworks and governance? What is the likelihood that institutional and technical achievements, legal frameworks, policies and governance structures and processes will allow for, the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? While responding to these questions consider if the required systems for accountability and transparency and the required technical know-how are in place.
- *Environmental.* Are there any environmental risks that can undermine the future flow of project environmental benefits? The TE should assess whether certain activities in the project area will pose a threat to the sustainability of the project outcomes. For example; construction of dam in a protected area could inundate a sizable area and thereby neutralize the biodiversity-related gains made by the project; or, a newly established pulp mill might jeopardise the viability of nearby protected forest areas by increasing logging pressures; or vector control intervention may be made less effective by changes in climate and consequent alterations to the incidence and distribution of malarial mosquitoes.

### **C. Achievement of outputs and activities:**

- Delivered outputs: Assessment of the project's success in producing each of the programmed outputs, both in quantity and quality as well as usefulness and timeliness.
- Assess the soundness and effectiveness of the methodologies used for developing the technical documents and related management options in the participating countries

- Assess to what extent the project outputs produced have the weight of scientific authority / credibility, necessary to influence policy and decision-makers, particularly at the national level.

#### **D. Catalytic role**

The terminal evaluation will also describe any catalytic or replication effect of the project. What examples are there of replication and catalytic outcomes that suggest increased likelihood of sustainability? Replication approach, in the context of GEF projects, is defined as lessons and experiences coming out of the project that are replicated or scaled up in the design and implementation of other projects. Replication can have two aspects, replication proper (lessons and experiences are replicated in different geographic area) or scaling up (lessons and experiences are replicated within the same geographic area but funded by other sources). If no effects are identified, the evaluation will describe the catalytic or replication actions that the project carried out.

#### **E. Assessment of Monitoring and Evaluation Systems:**

- **M&E design.** Did the project have a sound M&E plan to monitor results and track progress towards achieving project objectives? The Terminal Evaluation will assess whether the project met the minimum requirements for project design of M&E and the application of the Project M&E plan (Minimum requirements are specified in Annex 4). The evaluation shall include an assessment of the quality, application and effectiveness of project monitoring and evaluation plans and tools, including an assessment of risk management based on the assumptions and risks identified in the project document. The M&E plan should include a baseline (including data, methodology, etc.), SMART (see Annex 4) indicators and data analysis systems, and evaluation studies at specific times to assess results. The time frame for various M&E activities and standards for outputs should have been specified. The evaluator will have to keep in mind that older generation of GEF funded Medium Size Projects including this one did not include detailed M&E plans and logframes.
- **M&E plan implementation.** Was an M&E system in place and did it facilitate tracking of results and progress towards projects objectives throughout the project implementation period. Were Annual project reports complete, accurate and with well justified ratings? Was the information provided by the M&E system used during the project to improve project performance and to adapt to changing needs? Did the Projects have an M&E system in place with proper training for parties responsible for M&E activities to ensure data will continue to be collected and used after project closure?
- **Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities.** Were adequate budget provisions made for M&E made and were such resources made available in a timely fashion during implementation?
- **Long-term Monitoring.** Is long-term monitoring envisaged as an outcome of the project? If so, comment specifically on the relevance of such monitoring systems to sustaining project outcomes and how the monitoring effort will be sustained.

#### **F. Preparation and Readiness**

Were the project's objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within its timeframe? Were the capacities of executing institution and counterparts

properly considered when the project was designed? Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated in the project design? Were the partnership arrangements properly identified and the roles and responsibilities negotiated prior to project implementation? Were counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place?

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management(3) GEF guidance: UNEP DGEF

#### **G. Country ownership / drivenness:**

This is the relevance of the project to national development and environmental agendas, recipient country commitment, and regional and international agreements. The evaluation will:

- Assess the level of country ownership. Specifically, the evaluator should assess whether the project was effective in providing and communicating sustainable land management (SLM) information that catalyzed action in participating countries to improve related decision-making.
- Assess the level of country commitment to the generation and use of above mentioned information for decision-making during and after the project, including in regional and international fora.

#### **H. Stakeholder participation / public awareness:**

This consists of three related and often overlapping processes: information dissemination, consultation, and “stakeholder” participation. Stakeholders are the individuals, groups, institutions, or other bodies that have an interest or stake in the outcome of the GEF- financed project. The term also applies to those potentially adversely affected by a project. The evaluation will specifically:

- Assess the mechanisms put in place by the project for identification and engagement of stakeholders in each participating country and establish, in consultation with the stakeholders, whether this mechanism was successful, and identify its strengths and weaknesses.
- Assess the degree and effectiveness of collaboration/interactions between the various project partners and institutions during the course of implementation of the project.

- Assess the degree and effectiveness of any various public awareness activities that were undertaken during the course of implementation of the project.

### **I. Financial Planning**

Evaluation of financial planning requires assessment of the quality and effectiveness of financial planning and control of financial resources throughout the project's lifetime. Evaluation includes actual project costs by activities compared to budget (variances), financial management (including disbursement issues), and co- financing. The evaluation should:

- Assess the strength and utility of financial controls, including reporting, and planning to allow the project management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for a proper and timely flow of funds for the payment of satisfactory project deliverables.
- Present the major findings from the financial audit if one has been conducted.
- Identify and verify the sources of co- financing as well as leveraged and associated financing.
- Assess whether the project has applied appropriate standards of due diligence in the management of funds and financial audits.
- The evaluation should also include a breakdown of final actual costs and co-financing for the project prepared in consultation with the relevant UNON/DGEF Fund Management Officer of the project (table attached in Annex 1 Co-financing and leveraged resources).

### **J. Implementation approach**

This includes an analysis of the project's management framework, adaptation to changing conditions (adaptive management), partnerships in implementation arrangements, changes in project design, and overall project management. The evaluation will:

- Ascertain to what extent the project implementation mechanisms outlined in the project document have been closely followed. In particular, assess the role of the various committees established and whether the project document was clear and realistic to enable effective and efficient implementation, whether the project was executed according to the plan and how well the management was able to adapt to changes during the life of the project to enable the implementation of the project.
- Evaluate the effectiveness and efficiency and adaptability of project management and the supervision of project activities / project execution arrangements at all levels (1) policy decisions: Steering Group; (2) day to day project management in each of the country executing agencies and UNEP.

### **K. UNEP Supervision and Backstopping**

- Assess the effectiveness of supervision and administrative and financial support provided by UNEP/DGEF.
- Identify administrative, operational and/or technical problems and constraints that influenced the effective implementation of the project.

The *ratings will be presented in the form of a table*. Each of the eleven categories should be rated separately with **brief justifications** based on the findings of the main analysis. An overall rating for the project should also be given. The following rating system is to be applied:

HS	= Highly Satisfactory
S	= Satisfactory
MS	= Moderately Satisfactory
MU	= Moderately Unsatisfactory
U	= Unsatisfactory
HU	= Highly Unsatisfactory

Although the evaluator will be assisted throughout the evaluation activity by a UNEP project design specialist, ratings will be given only to the evaluator's work.

#### **4. Evaluation report format and review procedures**

The report should be brief, to the point and easy to understand. It must explain; the purpose of the evaluation, exactly what was evaluated and the methods used. The report must highlight any methodological limitations, identify key concerns and present evidence-based findings, consequent conclusions, recommendations and lessons. The report should provide information on when the evaluation took place, the places visited, who was involved and be presented in a way that makes the information accessible and comprehensible. The report should include an executive summary that encapsulates the essence of the information contained in the report to facilitate dissemination and distillation of lessons.

Evidence, findings, conclusions and recommendations should be presented in a complete and balanced manner. The evaluation report shall be written in English, be of no more than 50 pages (excluding annexes), use numbered paragraphs and include:

- i) An **executive summary** (no more than 3 pages) providing a brief overview of the main conclusions and recommendations of the evaluation;
- ii) **Introduction and background** giving a brief overview of the evaluated project, for example, the objective and status of activities;
- iii) **Scope, objective and methods** presenting the evaluation's purpose, the evaluation criteria used and questions to be addressed;
- iv) **Project Performance and Impact** providing factual evidence relevant to the questions asked by the evaluator and interpretations of such evidence. This is the main substantive section of the report and should provide a commentary on all evaluation aspects (A – F above).
- v) **Conclusions and rating** of project implementation success giving the evaluator's concluding assessments and ratings of the project against given evaluation criteria and standards of performance. The conclusions should provide answers to questions about whether the project is considered good or bad, and whether the results are considered positive or negative;
- vi) **Lessons learned** presenting general conclusions from the standpoint of the design and implementation of the project, based on good practices and successes or problems and mistakes. Lessons should have the potential for wider application and use. All lessons should 'stand alone and should:
  - Specify the context from which they are derived
  - State or imply some prescriptive action;

- Specify the contexts in which they may be applied (if possible who when and where)
- vii) **Recommendations** suggesting *actionable* proposals for improvement of the current project. In general, Terminal Evaluations are likely to have very few (only two or three) actionable recommendations. High quality recommendations should be actionable proposals that are:
  1. Implementable within the timeframe and resources available
  2. Commensurate with the available capacities of project team and partners
  3. Specific in terms of who would do what and when
  4. Contain results-based language (i.e. a measurable performance target)
  5. Include a trade off analysis, when its implementation may require utilizing significant resources that would have otherwise been used for other project purposes.
- viii) **Annexes** include Terms of Reference, list of interviewees, documents reviewed, brief summary of the expertise of the evaluator / evaluation team, a summary of co-finance information etc.. Dissident views or management responses to the evaluation findings may later be appended in an annex.

Examples of UNEP GEF Terminal Evaluation Reports are available at [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou)

### **Review of the Draft Evaluation Report**

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff are allowed to comment on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU collates the review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report.

All UNEP GEF Evaluation Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These incorporate GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment criteria and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator (see Annex 3).

### **5. Submission of Final Terminal Evaluation Reports.**

The final report shall be submitted in electronic form in MS Word format and should be sent to the following persons:

Segbedzi Norgbey, Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit  
 UNEP, P.O. Box 30552-00100  
 Nairobi, Kenya  
 Tel.: (254-20) 7624181  
 Fax: (254-20) 7623158  
 Email: [segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org](mailto:segbedzi.norgbey@unep.org)

With a copy to:

Shafqat Kakakhel, Officer-in-Charge  
 UNEP/Division of GEF Coordination  
 P.O. Box 30552-00100



Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: + 254-20-7624165  
Fax: + 254-20-7624041/4042  
Email: [Shafqat.Kakakhel@unep.org](mailto:Shafqat.Kakakhel@unep.org)

Daya Bragante  
Project management officer Land Degradation  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)  
PO Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 254 20 7623680  
Fax: 254 20 7624041  
Email: [daya.bragante@unep.org](mailto:daya.bragante@unep.org)

Dr. Mohamed F. Sessay  
Acting SPO  
Land Degradation Unit  
UNEP Division of GEF Coordination /  
Regional Office for Africa  
P.O. Box 30552, Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: + 254-20-7624294  
Fax: + 254-20-7624041 / 7624042  
Email: [Mohamed.Sessay@unep.org](mailto:Mohamed.Sessay@unep.org)

Carmen Tavera  
Portfolio Manager  
United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP)  
Division of GEF Coordination (DGEF)  
PO Box 30552-00100  
Nairobi, Kenya  
Tel: 254 20 7624153  
Fax: 254 20 7624041  
Email: [carmen.tavera@unep.org](mailto:carmen.tavera@unep.org)

The final evaluation report will be printed in hard copy and published on the Evaluation and Oversight Unit's web-site [www.unep.org/eou](http://www.unep.org/eou). Subsequently, the report will be sent to the GEF Office of Evaluation for their review, appraisal and inclusion on the GEF website. In addition, the final Evaluation report will be available on line as appropriate and disseminated to: The relevant GEF Focal points, Relevant Government representatives, UNEP DGEF Professional Staff, The project's Executing Agency and Technical Staff. The full list of intended recipients is attached in Annex 5 which corresponds to list of contacts; for other recipients it will have to be available on line.

## **6. Resources and schedule of the evaluation**

In accordance with UNEP/GEF policy, all GEF projects are evaluated by independent evaluators contracted as consultants by UNEP Evaluation and Oversight Unit (EOU).

The contract for the evaluator will begin on 3<sup>rd</sup> of September 2007 and end on 30 November 2007: one month spread over 12 weeks with 7 days of travel, to Madrid, Spain, 3 days in

Nairobi and 20 days desk study. The evaluator will submit a draft report on 26 October 2007 to UNEP/EOU, the UNEP/DGEF Project management officer, and key representatives of the executing agencies. Any comments or responses to the draft report will be sent to UNEP / EOU for collation and the consultant will be advised of any necessary revisions. Comments to the final draft report will be sent to the consultant by 9 November 2007 after which, the consultant will submit the final report no later than 22 November 2007.

The evaluator will after an initial telephone briefing with EOU and UNEP/GEF, travel to Madrid, Spain and meet with project partners and representatives of the project steering committee and the intended users of the project's outputs at the beginning of the evaluation.

The evaluator should have the following qualifications:

The evaluator should not have been associated with the design and implementation of the project. The evaluator will work under the overall supervision of the Chief, Evaluation and Oversight Unit, UNEP. The evaluator should be an international expert in land management with a sound understanding land degradation, desertification. The consultant should have the following minimum qualifications: (i) experience in UNCCD related projects (ii) experience with management and implementation of research projects and in particular with policy-related monitoring and assessments that generate knowledge and information relevant to decision-making; (iii) experience with capacity building; and (iv) experience with project evaluation. Knowledge of UNEP programmes and GEF activities is desirable. Fluency in oral and written English is a must.

## **7. Schedule Of Payment**

The consultant shall select one of the following two contract options.

### **Lump-Sum Option**

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 30% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. A further 30% will be paid upon submission of the draft report. A final payment of 40% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual Special Service Agreement (SSA) of the evaluator and IS **inclusive** of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses.

### **Fee-only Option**

The evaluator will receive an initial payment of 40% of the total amount due upon signature of the contract. Final payment of 60% will be made upon satisfactory completion of work. The fee is payable under the individual SSAs of the evaluator and is NOT inclusive of all expenses such as travel, accommodation and incidental expenses. Ticket and DSA will be paid separately.

**The consultant's choice of payment option will be specified in the signed contract with UNEP.**

In case, the evaluator cannot provide the products in accordance with the TORs, the timeframe agreed, or his products are substandard, the payment to the evaluator could be withheld, until such a time the products are modified to meet UNEP's standard. In case the evaluator fails to submit a satisfactory final product to UNEP, the product prepared by the evaluator may not constitute the evaluation report.

## **Annex 1. OVERALL RATINGS TABLE**

Criterion	Evaluator's Summary Comments	Evaluator's Rating
<b>A. Attainment of project objectives and results (overall rating)</b> Sub criteria (below)		
A. 1. Effectiveness		
A. 2. Relevance		
A. 3. Efficiency		
<b>B. Sustainability of Project outcomes (overall rating)</b> Sub criteria (below)		
B. 1. Financial		
B. 2. Socio Political		
B. 3. Institutional framework and governance		
B. 4. Ecological		
<b>C. Achievement of outputs and activities</b>		
<b>D. Monitoring and Evaluation (overall rating)</b> Sub criteria (below)		
D. 1. M&E Design		
D. 2. M&E Plan Implementation (use for adaptive management)		
D. 3. Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities		
<b>E. Catalytic Role</b>		
<b>F. Preparation and readiness</b>		
<b>G. Country ownership / drivenness</b>		
<b>H. Stakeholders involvement</b>		
<b>I. Financial planning</b>		
<b>J. Implementation approach</b>		
<b>K. UNEP Supervision and backstopping</b>		

## RATING OF PROJECT OBJECTIVES AND RESULTS

Highly Satisfactory (HS): The project had no shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Satisfactory (S): The project had minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): The project had moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): The project had significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Unsatisfactory (U) The project had major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The project had severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives, in terms of relevance, effectiveness or efficiency.

**Please note:** Relevance and effectiveness will be considered as critical criteria. The overall rating of the project for achievement of objectives and results **may not be higher** than the lowest rating on either of these two criteria. Thus, to have an overall satisfactory rating for outcomes a project must have at least satisfactory ratings on both relevance and effectiveness.

## RATINGS ON SUSTAINABILITY

A. Sustainability will be understood as the probability of continued long-term outcomes and impacts after the GEF project funding ends. The Terminal evaluation will identify and assess the key conditions or factors that are likely to contribute or undermine the persistence of benefits after the project ends. Some of these factors might be outcomes of the project, i.e. stronger institutional capacities, legal frameworks, socio-

economic incentives /or public awareness. Other factors will include contextual circumstances or developments that are not outcomes of the project but that are relevant to the sustainability of outcomes..

#### Rating system for sustainability sub-criteria

On each of the dimensions of sustainability of the project outcomes will be rated as follows.

Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability.

All the risk dimensions of sustainability are critical. Therefore, overall rating for sustainability will not be higher than the rating of the dimension with lowest ratings. For example, if a project has an Unlikely rating in either of the dimensions then its overall rating cannot be higher than Unlikely, regardless of whether higher ratings in other dimensions of sustainability produce a higher average.

### **RATINGS OF PROJECT M&E**

Monitoring is a continuing function that uses systematic collection of data on specified indicators to provide management and the main stakeholders of an ongoing project with indications of the extent of progress and achievement of objectives and progress in the use of allocated funds. Evaluation is the systematic and objective assessment of an on-going or completed project, its design, implementation and results. Project evaluation may involve the definition of appropriate standards, the examination of performance against those standards, and an assessment of actual and expected results.

The Project monitoring and evaluation system will be rated on ‘M&E Design’, ‘M&E Plan Implementation’ and ‘Budgeting and Funding for M&E activities’ as follows:

Highly Satisfactory (HS): There were no shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Satisfactory(S): There were minor shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Satisfactory (MS): There were moderate shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU): There were significant shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Unsatisfactory (U): There were major shortcomings in the project M&E system.

Highly Unsatisfactory (HU): The Project had no M&E system.

“M&E plan implementation” will be considered a critical parameter for the overall assessment of the M&E system. The overall rating for the M&E systems will not be higher than the rating on “M&E plan implementation.”

All other ratings will be on the GEF six point scale.

GEF Performance Description	Alternative description on the same scale
HS = Highly Satisfactory	Excellent
S = Satisfactory	Well above average
MS = Moderately Satisfactory	Average
MU = Moderately Unsatisfactory	Below Average
U = Unsatisfactory	Poor
HU = Highly Unsatisfactory	Very poor (Appalling)

### **Annex 3 Review of the Draft Report**

Draft reports submitted to UNEP EOU are shared with the corresponding Programme or Project Officer and his or her supervisor for initial review and consultation. The DGEF staff and senior Executing Agency staff provide comments on the draft evaluation report. They may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions. The consultation also seeks agreement on the findings and recommendations. UNEP EOU collates the review comments and provides them to the evaluators for their consideration in preparing the final version of the report. General comments on the draft report with respect to compliance with these TOR are shared with the reviewer.

### **Quality Assessment of the Evaluation Report**

All UNEP GEF Mid Term Reports are subject to quality assessments by UNEP EOU. These apply GEF Office of Evaluation quality assessment and are used as a tool for providing structured feedback to the evaluator.

The quality of the draft evaluation report is assessed and rated against the following criteria:

<b>GEF Report Quality Criteria</b>	<b>UNEP EOU Assessment</b>	<b>Rating</b>
A. Did the report present an assessment of relevant outcomes and achievement of project objectives in the context of the focal area program indicators if applicable?		
B. Was the report consistent and the evidence complete and convincing and were the ratings substantiated when used?		
C. Did the report present a sound assessment of sustainability of outcomes?		
D. Were the lessons and recommendations supported by the evidence presented?		
E. Did the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?		
F. Did the report include an assessment of the quality of the project M&E system and its use for project management?		
<b>UNEP EOU additional Report Quality Criteria</b>	<b>UNEP EOU Assessment</b>	<b>Rating</b>
G. Quality of the lessons: Were lessons readily applicable in other contexts? Did they suggest prescriptive action?		
H. Quality of the recommendations: Did recommendations specify the actions necessary to correct existing conditions or improve operations ('who?' 'what?' 'where?' 'when?'). Can they be implemented? Did the recommendations specify a goal and an associated performance indicator?		
I. Was the report well written? (clear English language and grammar)		
J. Did the report structure follow EOU guidelines, were all requested Annexes included?		
K. Were all evaluation aspects specified in the TORs adequately addressed?		
L. Was the report delivered in a timely manner		

**GEF Quality of the MTE report = 0.3\*(A + B) + 0.1\*(C+D+E+F)**

**EOU assessment of MTE report = 0.3\*(G + H) + 0.1\*(I+J+K+L)**

**Combined quality Rating = (2\* 'GEF EO' rating + EOU rating)/3**

The Totals are rounded and converted to the scale of HS to HU

Rating system for quality of terminal evaluation reports

A number rating 1-6 is used for each criterion: Highly Satisfactory = 6, Satisfactory = 5, Moderately Satisfactory = 4, Moderately Unsatisfactory = 3, Unsatisfactory = 2, Highly Unsatisfactory = 1, and unable to assess = 0.

#### **Annex 4: GEF Minimum requirements for M&E**

##### **Minimum Requirement 1: Project Design of M&E<sup>3</sup>**

All projects must include a concrete and fully budgeted monitoring and evaluation plan by the time of Work Program entry (full-sized projects) or CEO approval (medium-sized projects). This plan must contain at a minimum:

- SMART (see below) indicators for project implementation, or, if no indicators are identified, an alternative plan for monitoring that will deliver reliable and valid information to management
- SMART indicators for results (outcomes and, if applicable, impacts), and, where appropriate, corporate-level indicators
- A project baseline, with:
  - a description of the problem to address

<http://gefweb.org/MonitoringandEvaluation/MEPoliciesProcedures/MEPTools/meptstandards.html>

- indicator data
- or, if major baseline indicators are not identified, an alternative plan for addressing this within one year of implementation
- An M&E Plan with identification of reviews and evaluations which will be undertaken, such as mid-term reviews or evaluations of activities
- An organizational setup and budgets for monitoring and evaluation.

### **Minimum Requirement 2: Application of Project M&E**

- Project monitoring and supervision will include implementation of the M&E plan, comprising:
- Use of SMART indicators for implementation (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- Use of SMART indicators for results (or provision of a reasonable explanation if not used)
- Fully established baseline for the project and data compiled to review progress
- Evaluations are undertaken as planned
- Operational organizational setup for M&E and budgets spent as planned.

**SMART INDICATORS** GEF projects and programs should monitor using relevant performance indicators. The monitoring system should be “SMART”:

1. **Specific:** The system captures the essence of the desired result by clearly and directly relating to achieving an objective, and only that objective.
2. **Measurable:** The monitoring system and its indicators are unambiguously specified so that all parties agree on what the system covers and there are practical ways to measure the indicators and results.
3. **Achievable and Attributable:** The system identifies what changes are anticipated as a result of the intervention and whether the result(s) are realistic. Attribution requires that changes in the targeted developmental issue can be linked to the intervention.
4. **Relevant and Realistic:** The system establishes levels of performance that are likely to be achieved in a practical manner, and that reflect the expectations of stakeholders.
5. **Time-bound, Timely, Trackable, and Targeted:** The system allows progress to be tracked in a cost-effective manner at desired frequency for a set period, with clear identification of the particular stakeholder group to be impacted by the project or program.

### **Annex 5 : List of key people to be contacted for the final evaluation of the MSP/OP15**

#### **Project team:**

Daya Bragante (Task Manager) : [daya.bragante@unep.org](mailto:daya.bragante@unep.org)

Elaine King (Fund Management Officer): [elaine.king@unep.org](mailto:elaine.king@unep.org)

#### **Steering Committee Members and Agencies representatives:**

Walter Lusigi (GEF Secretariat): [wlusigi@thegef.org](mailto:wlusigi@thegef.org)

Andrea Kutter (GEF Secretariat): [akutter@thegef.org](mailto:akutter@thegef.org)

Sam Wedderburn (World Bank): swe

Enos Esikuri (World Bank) : [eesikuri@worldbank.org](mailto:eesikuri@worldbank.org)

Erick Fernandes: [efernandes@worldbank.org](mailto:efernandes@worldbank.org)

Parviz Koohafkan (FAO): [parviz.koohafkan@fao.org](mailto:parviz.koohafkan@fao.org)

Sheila Mwanundu (IFAD): [s.mwanundu@ifad.org](mailto:s.mwanundu@ifad.org)

Telahigue Naoufel (IFAD): [n.telahigue@ifad.org](mailto:n.telahigue@ifad.org)

Daniele Ponzi (AfDB) : [d.ponzi@afdb.org](mailto:d.ponzi@afdb.org)

Maryam Niamir-Fuller (UNDP): [maryam.niamir-fuller@undp.org](mailto:maryam.niamir-fuller@undp.org)

Ndegwa Ndiangui (UNCCD Secretariat): [nndiangui@unccd.int](mailto:nndiangui@unccd.int)

Simon Rietbergen (IUCN): [simon.rietbergen@iucn.org](mailto:simon.rietbergen@iucn.org)

**Other Partners:**

Alexander Kastl (GTZ, Tunisia): [pan.gtz@gnet.tn](mailto:pan.gtz@gnet.tn)

**Consultants:**

Michael Stocking: [M.Stocking@uea.ac.uk](mailto:M.Stocking@uea.ac.uk)

Elena Ferretti: [elferretti@virgilio.it](mailto:elferretti@virgilio.it)

Jennifer Olson : [olsonjj@msu.edu](mailto:olsonjj@msu.edu)

Leonard Berry : [berry@ces.fau.edu](mailto:berry@ces.fau.edu)

**Focal Points and other participants**

The lists of participants to sub-regional training workshops that will be made available to the evaluator will provide full details of GEF and CCD Focal points who attended them as well as other participants such as GEF accredited NGOs.

## ANNEX B

### Questionnaire sent to workshop participants of the 9 regional workshops

#### Questionnaire

##### Terminal evaluation of the project

“Global Support to facilitate the Early Development and Implementation of Sustainable Land Management Programs and Projects under the GEF Operational Programme Number 15”.

The training workshop was mainly presented by Ms Daya Bragante of UNEP and other partner agencies and/or consultants from your region.

Please answer the following questions under the following headings briefly and send back by e-mail to Prof Klaus Kellner at : [Klaus.Kellner@nwu.ac.za](mailto:Klaus.Kellner@nwu.ac.za), before/on 1 October 2007. Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

#### **Question 1**

Did you attend one of the sub-regional workshops for above mentioned project?

#### **Question 2**

If YES, please give details about the following:

- (a) What workshop did you attend? Where and when?
- (b) Who did you represent when attending the workshop?
- (c) Were the methodologies used during workshop effective? Briefly explain.
- (d) What assistance did you receive from UNEP or other agencies for the workshop?
- (e) Did you share the workshop outputs with other persons in your institution and how?
- (f) Please give your contact details (at the time of the workshop and current).

#### **Question 3**

Did the training workshop contribute in **raising awareness** regarding the focal area of land degradation, sustainable land management (SLM) issues and the GEF procedures and approaches? Please motivate your answer briefly.

#### **Question 4**

Did the training workshop contribute to the **capacity building activities** on local, national, sub-regional and regional level regarding land degradation and SLM issues? Please motivate your answer briefly.

#### **Question 5**

Did the training workshop strengthen intra- and inter sub-regional exchange of experiences, lessons learnt and best practices regarding land degradation and SLM activities? Please motivate your answer briefly.

#### **Question 6**

Did the training workshop strengthen **interagency** collaboration, such as between UNEP, the GEF secretariat and GEF executing agencies, UNDP, World Bank, FAO, IFAD, IUCN, GM, Regional banks, etc.? Please motivate your answer briefly.



**Question 7**

Did the training workshops contribute towards **mainstreaming** of sustainable land management related issues into programmes and country strategies? Please motivate your answer briefly.

**Question 8**

Did the workshops and collaboration with other workshop participants lead to effective partnerships on national, sub-regional and regional levels? Please motivate your answer briefly.

**Question 9**

Are you aware of the **guide** that was developed in this project for developing project proposals and accessing project funding from the GEF for SLM?

If YES, to what extend are you or somebody in your Department/Section/Institution or anybody else (e.g. consultant) using the guide?

**Question 10**

Are you aware of the land degradation and SLM **website** that was developed after the workshop to assist participants in the development project proposals, contribute to active collaboration and communication between partners and make documentation available?

If YES, please explain how and to what extend you did utilize the website?

**Question 11**

Did you, any other agency or consultant prepare any project proposals regarding land degradation and SLM for your country after the workshop and to what extend did this training workshop help you in this preparation?

**Question 12**

Briefly explain to what extent the following four (4) risks could threaten the sustainability and the outcomes of any land degradation or SLM project developed or applied for:

- (a) Financial resources
- (b) Socio-political (including stakeholder awareness, capacity and ownership)
- (c) Institutional framework and governance (including accountability and transparency)
- (d) Environmental risks that could undermine the project benefits

**Question 13**

Was the training workshop presented for this project relevant to the National development and environmental agenda in your country and did it contribute to the country commitment towards international agreements? Please motivate your answer briefly.

**Question 14**

Please give any other important information about the training workshops that was not covered by the questions above.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME. Klaus Kellner

## ANNEX C

### Questionnaire sent to steering committee members or representatives of agencies that helped at the 9 regional workshops.

#### Questionnaire

##### Terminal evaluation of the project:

“Global Support to facilitate the Early Development and Implementation of Sustainable Land Management Programs and Projects under the GEF Operational Programme Number 15”.

The training workshop was mainly presented by Ms Daya Bragante of UNEP and other partner agencies and/or consultants involved in a particular region.

Please answer the following questions under the following headings briefly and send back by e-mail to Prof Klaus Kellner at : [Klaus.Kellner@nwu.ac.za](mailto:Klaus.Kellner@nwu.ac.za), before/on 1 October 2007. Thank you very much for your time and assistance.

#### Question 1

Did you attend one of the sub-regional workshops for above mentioned project?

#### Question 2

If YES, please give details about the following:

- (g) What workshop did you attend? Where and when?
- (h) Who did you represent when attending the workshop?
- (i) What was your contribution at (or for) the workshop?
- (j) Were the methodologies used during workshop effective? Briefly explain.
- (k) What assistance did you receive from UNEP or other agencies for the workshop?
- (l) Did you share the workshop outputs with other persons in your institution and how?
- (m) Please give your contact details (at the time of the workshop and current).

#### Question 3

Did the training workshop contribute in **raising awareness** regarding the focal area of land degradation, sustainable land management (SLM) issues and the GEF procedures and approaches? Please motivate your answer briefly.

#### Question 4

Did the training workshop contribute to the **capacity building** activities on local, national, sub-regional and regional level regarding land degradation and SLM issues? Please motivate your answer briefly.

#### Question 5

Did the training workshop strengthen intra- and inter sub-regional exchange of experiences, lessons learnt and best practices regarding land degradation and SLM activities? Please motivate your answer briefly.

#### Question 6

Did the training workshop strengthen **interagency** collaboration, such as between UNEP, the GEF secretariat and GEF executing agencies, UNDP, World Bank, FAO, IFAD, IUCN, GM, Regional banks, etc.? Please motivate your answer briefly.

**Question 7**

Did the training workshops contribute towards **mainstreaming** of sustainable land management related issues into programmes and country strategies? Please motivate your answer briefly.

**Question 8**

Did the workshops and collaboration with other workshop participants lead to effective partnerships on national, sub-regional and regional levels? Please motivate your answer briefly.

**Question 9**

Are you aware of the **guide** that was developed in this project for developing project proposals and accessing project funding from the GEF for SLM?

If YES, to what extend are you or somebody in your Department/Section/Institution or anybody else (e.g. consultant) using the guide?

**Question 10**

Are you aware of the land degradation and SLM **website** that was developed after the workshop to assist participants in the development project proposals, contribute to active collaboration and communication between partners and make documentation available?

If YES, please explain how and to what extend you did utilize the website?

**Question 11**

Did you, any other agency or consultant prepare any project proposals regarding land degradation and SLM for your country after the workshop and to what extend did this training workshop help you in this preparation?

**Question 12**

Briefly explain to what extent the following four (4) risks could threaten the sustainability and the outcomes of any land degradation or SLM project developed or applied for:

- (a) Financial resources
- (b) Socio-political (including stakeholder awareness, capacity and ownership)
- (c) Institutional framework and governance (including accountability and transparency)
- (d) Environmental risks that could undermine the project benefits

**Question 13**

Was the training workshop presented for this project relevant to the National development and environmental agenda in the countries and did it contribute to the country commitment towards international agreements? Please motivate your answer briefly.

**Question 14**

Were the inputs by the steering committee members or consultants effective and assist in the workshop outputs? Was the project management effective and did it adapt according to the project outputs and training workshops in the different regions?

**Question 15**

Are you are aware of the Interagency Task Force that that set up for this project and what were the contributions of this Task Force?

**Question 16**

Will these workshops lead to the implementation of project activities regarding land degradation and SLM activities in the countries?

**Question 17**

Was the project cost effective and what co-funding was received (in-kind and in-cash) for the project and sub-regional workshops? Any contributions from the Regional Banks towards this project?

**Question 18**

Were the project objectives and components clear, practicable and feasible within the timeframe of the project?

**Question 19**

Was a proper Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan in place and help in the project activities?

**Question 20**

Was the supervision and backstopping (administrative and financial) by UNEP effective and sufficient?

**Question 21**

Please give any other important information about the project or training workshops that was not covered by the questions above.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR TIME.

Klaus Kellner

## ANNEX D

### List of participants/countries who were contacted for evaluation by interviews or e-mail questionnaire with feedback received

Country/Agency/ Institution	Name	Interview with/out recording (short/long) or E-mail send	Feedback by interviews or E- mail response (Positive or Negative/no response)
<b>Steering committee members/consultants/p roject team members</b>			
1. World Bank	Enos Esikuri	Recording	Positive
2. GEF Secretariat	Walter Lusigi	Recording	Positive
3. UNEP/GEF	Daya Bragante	Interview (long)	Positive
4. UNEP/GEF	Mohamed Sessay	Recording	Positive
5. UNEP/GEF	Elaine King	Interview (short)	Positive
6. UNDP	Maryam N-Fuller	Recording	Positive
7. Global Mechanism	Rochan Cooke	Interview (long)	Positive
8. IUCN	Simon Rietbergen	E-mail	Negative – but referred to other IUCN members
9. GEF Secretariat	Andrea Kutter	E-mail	Positive
10. World Bank	Sam Wedderburn	E-mail	Negative
11. World Bank	Erick Fernandes	E-mail	Negative
12. FAO	Parviz Koohafkan	E-mail	Negative
13. IFAD	Sheila Mwanundu	E-mail	Negative
14. IFAD	Telahique Naoufel	E-mail	Positive
15. AfDB	Daniele Ponzi	E-mail	Negative
16. UNCCD Secretariat	Ndegwa Ndiangui	E-mail	Negative
17. Consultant	Michael Stocking	E-mail	Positive
18. Consultant	Elena Ferreti	E-mail	Positive
19. Consultant	Jennifer Olson	E-mail	Negative
20. Consultant	Leonard Berry	E-mail	Positive
21. Moderator (Tunisia workshop)	Mourad Turki	E-mail	Negative
22. Partner	Alexander Kastl	E-mail	Negative
<b>Total : 22</b>		<b>E-mail : 15 Interview/ Recordings : 7</b>	<b>Positive : 12 (54.54%)</b>
			<b>Negative : 10 (45.45%)</b>
<b>Countries met at COP 8 of UNCCD</b>	<b>Representatives of countries</b>	<b>Interview and/or recording</b>	

<b>(10-15 Sept. 2007)</b>	<b>interviewed</b>	<b>(short/long)</b>	
1. Chad	Maibe Komandje	Interview (short)	
2. Central African Rep	M M C Manzangue	Interview (short)	
3. Congo	M Alexis Minga	Interview (short)	
4. Niger	Hassane Saley	Interview (short)	
5. Mali	M M Gakou	Interview (short)	
6. Tunisia	Mohamed M Mlika A Kallala	Interview (short)	
7. Senegal	Gogo B N Macina	Recording	
8. Guinea	Christine Sagno D Diawara	Recording Interview (short)	
9. Iran	Naser Moghaddasi	Interview (short)	
10. Benin	A Z Aivohozin	Interview (short)	
11. Marocco	Mohamed Ghanam	Interview (short)	
12. South Africa	Moleso Kharika	Interview (long)	
13. Namibia	Sem Shikongo	Recording (Tel)	
14. Kenya	Samson Bokea	Interview (long)	
15. Tanzania	Michael Kadebe Rith H Mollel	Interview (long)	
16. Malawi	W W M Simwela	Interview (short)	
17. Unit Rep of Tanzania	R Mollel	Interview (short)	
18. Lesotho	M J Nthimo & N M Mota	Interview (short)	
19. Egypt	Ismail A G Hussein	Recording	
20. Botswana	E Otsogile	Interview (short)	
21. Trinidad-Tobago	J G Farrel & K Roach	Interview (long)	
22. Barbados	N Scholar-Best	Interview (long)	
23. Grenada	A Thomas	Interview (long)	
24. St Lucia	M G Andrew	Interview (long)	
25. St Vincent and the Grenadines	E Jackson	Interview (long)	
26. Gabon	M L L Ebobola	Interview (short)	
27. Chile	Mario Lagos Subiabre	Interview (short)	
28. Brazil	José Roberto de Lima	Interview (short)	
29. Switzerland	M M Krebs Martin Sommer	Interview (short)	
30. Indonesia	M T Abdul Latif	Interview (short)	
31. Cambodia	Koum Saron	Interview (short)	
32. China	Jia Xiao Xia	Interview (short)	
33. Uganda	Stephen Muyawa	Recording	
<b>Total : 32</b>	<b>Total : 39</b>	<b>Interviews (short) : 21</b>	
		<b>Interviews (long) : 8</b>	
		<b>Recordings : 5</b>	
<b>Number of E-mails with questionnaire sent to participants that attended regional workshops (ws)</b>	<b>Returns (address unknown)</b>	<b>No of ws participants that did NOT return questionnaire</b>	<b>No of participants that completed questionnaire and returned</b>

<b>Switzerland ws</b> 11-13 January 2005			
16	4	11	1
<b>Fiji ws</b> 8-10 November 2004			
25	10	15	0
<b>Tunisia ws</b> 11-13 October 2004			
68	19	45	4
<b>Iran ws (West Asia)</b> 3-5 October 2004			
40	14	24	2
<b>Namibia ws</b> 1-3 November 2004			
62	28	29	5
<b>Brazil ws</b> 7-9 December 2004			
44	13	31	0
<b>Jamaica ws</b> 13-15 December 2004			
47	18	24	5
<b>Thailand ws</b> 19-21 January 2005			
35	14	21	0
<b>Kazakhstan (Central Asia)</b> 22-24 Nov 2004			
5	2	3	0
<b>Total</b>			
342	122	203	17
	<b>35.67%</b>	<b>59.35%</b>	<b>7.73%</b>

## ANNEX E

### BUDGET AND FINANCIAL PLANNING

#### Analysis of expenditures for project GFL-2328-2770-4723

		2003	2004	2005		2006	2007	Total GEF &
		GEF	GEF	GEF	Cofinance	GEF	GEF	cofinance
1201	Prepare Training Handbook -.Jennifer Olson	10,000.00						10,000.00
1201	Prepare User Guide for LD projects - IUCN		20,000.00					20,000.00
1202	Prepare reports from workshops - Elena Ferretti		2,174.20	(27.48)				2,146.72
1203	Prepare Operational Guide on OP15 - Elena Ferretti		12,000.00					12,000.00
1681	Symposia & CRIC Argentina travel					4,466.41	7,526.75	11,993.16
3201	Anglophone workshop in Africa - Namibia		108,177.99	(97,782.01)	86,493.86			96,889.84
3202	Francophone workshop in Africa - Tunis		107,441.90	(63,164.39)	63,506.14			107,783.65
3203	Workshop in Western Asia - Iran		34,962.19	(2,822.93)		5,202.19		37,341.45
3204	Workshop in Central/Eastern Europe & Central Asia - Kazakhstan & Geneva		60,631.45	27,783.92				88,415.37
3205	Workshop in Asia - Bangkok		59,882.35	(3,138.87)		1,339.78	469.75	58,553.01
3206	Workshop in Pacific - Fiji		40,982.51	2,178.78				43,161.29
3207	Workshop in Latin America - Brazil		5,948.29	31,434.08		(7,262.00)		30,120.37
3208	Workshop in Caribbean - Kingston		33,041.34	2,466.23		3,282.00		38,789.57
3209	Training during COP7 UNCCD			4,102.87				4,102.87
3210	SLM Forum at GEF Assembly					91,368.34		91,368.34
5201	Translate workshop training materials into Arabic - Ehab Metwaly		4,419.12					4,419.12
5201	Translate workshop training materials into Spanish - Maria Ochoa		4,000.00	4,500.00				8,500.00
5201	Translate workshop training materials into Russian - Alexy Triumfov		4,000.00	954.00				4,954.00
5201	Translate workshop training materials into Chinese - Shanshan Hu		4,000.00					4,000.00
5201	Translate workshop training materials into French - Laurence Monard			4,500.00				4,500.00
5201	Editing - J. A. Gale		1,000.00					1,000.00
5201	Print 3000 guides in English		7,521.18					7,521.18
5201	Print 500 guides in Russian			1,710.00				1,710.00
5201	Print 500 guides in Arabic			3,372.00				3,372.00
5201	Print 2000 guides in Spanish			5,480.00				5,480.00
5201	Print 2000 guides in French			5,480.00				5,480.00



5201	Print 500 guides in Chinese			2,587.00			2,587.00
5204	Update Training Handbook - Overseas Development Group			14,000.00		5,988.88	19,988.88
5204	Regional workshop on identification and testing of innovative SLM approaches - CIS			6,000.00	9,400.00	6,500.00	21,900.00
5206	Printing of Sustainable Land and Water Management					4,678.42	4,678.42

<b>Total cummulative expenditures for project at September 2007</b>		<b>10,000.00</b>	<b>510,182.52</b>	<b>(50,386.80)</b>	<b>150,000.00</b>	<b>107,796.72</b>	<b>25,163.80</b>	<b>752,756.24</b>
---------------------------------------------------------------------	--	------------------	-------------------	--------------------	-------------------	-------------------	------------------	-------------------

**Cumulative expenditures  
GFL-2328-2770-  
4723**

	<b>GEF GFL</b>	<b>Cofinance QGL</b>	<b>Total</b>
2003	10,000.00	-	10,000.00
2004	510,182.52	-	510,182.52
2005	(50,386.80)	150,000.00	99,613.20
2006	107,796.72	-	107,796.72
2007	<u>25,163.80</u>	-	<u>25,163.80</u>
	<u>602,756.24</u>	<u>150,000.00</u>	<u>752,756.24</u>

**Per  
Prodoc 721,500.00 250,000.00 971,500.00**

## Annex Co-financing and Leveraged Resources

### Co-financing (basic data to be supplied to the consultant for verification)

Co financing (Type/Source)	IA own Financing (US\$)		Government (US\$)		Other* (US\$)		Total (US\$)		Total Disbursement (US\$)	
	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual	Planned	Actual
- Grants					150,000 721,500	150,000 721,500				
- Loans/Concessional (compared to market rate)										
- Credits										
- Equity investments										
- In-kind support	100,000 (UNEP)	None	None	None						
- Other (*)										
- GTZ						25,000 (not shown in financial report by UNEP/ GEF)				
-										
-										
-										
-										
<b>Totals</b>	<b>100,000</b>	<b>None</b>			<b>871,500</b>	<b>871,500</b>			<b>971,500</b>	<b>752,756</b>

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

#### **Leveraged Resources**

Leveraged resources are additional resources—beyond those committed to the project itself at the

time of approval—that are mobilized later as a direct result of the project. Leveraged resources can be financial or in-kind and they may be from other donors, NGO's, foundations, governments, communities or the private sector. Please briefly describe the resources the project has leveraged since inception and indicate how these resources are contributing to the project's ultimate objective.

## **ANNEX F**

### **Documentation reviewed and used in this evaluation.**

1. UNEP/GEF Medium-Sized Project Brief and Implementation Report with project information, objectives & outcomes, relevant LFA's, risk factor table, implementation of M&E plan funding strategy, etc.
2. Land Degradation and the GEF: A guide to developing project proposals and accessing project funding from the Global Environment Facility for Sustainable Land Management. Publication written and edited by Robert C. Gustafson and published in book format by UNON Publishing and Printing Services on behalf of GEF. Publication written and edited by Robert C. Gustafson and published in book format by UNON Publishing and Printing Services on behalf of the GEF.
3. Training Handbook on the GEF's SLM approach.
4. Report of the Sustainable Land and Water management Forum that was held on 28 August 2006 in Cape Town, South Africa, as part of the GEF Assembly. Publication edited by L. Berry & W. Lusigi and published in book format by UNON Publishing and Printing Services.
5. Reports and presentations (power point slides) for the two training sessions on SLM in Theory and Concept and SLM in Practice that were held as side events at COP7 of the UNCCD on 19 & 20 October 2005 in Nairobi, Kenya.
6. Half-yearly progress and Final reports of the project (3).
7. Minutes of the steering committee meetings (4).
8. Documentation and presentations (power point slides) used at the 9 regional training workshops.
9. Evaluation forms that were completed by participants who attended the regional training workshops.
10. Minutes of the 9 sub-regional training workshops (in the particular language of the workshop).
11. Recommendations report that was prepared by Michael Stocking of the Overseas Development Group, University of East Anglia, Norwich, UK on August 2007.
12. Workshop proceedings of a regional workshop on the Identification and Testing of Innovative SLM Approaches by Communities in Drylands of Africa that was held in Pietermaritzburg, South Africa on 4 – 7 September 2006.
13. Fiscal Year (FY) 05 GEF Annual Portfolio Review reports

14. Some papers and presentations (power point slides) presented by experts at the different regional training workshops, such as the Paper (No 96) prepared by Stefano Pagiola *et al.* (2004) of the World Bank : “Paying for Biodiversity Conservation Services in Agricultural Landscapes” (p.27) and presented at the that was presented at the regional workshop in Natal, Brazil, 7-9 December 2004.
15. Lists of participants with addresses and contact (e-mail) details at the time of the 9 regional training workshops.
16. Examples of exercises that were carried out at the regional training workshops.
17. Financial analysis of expenditures for the project
18. Other project-related material produced by the project staff or partners.

All of the above mentioned documentation and much more are available from Ms. Daya Bragante of UNEP, who has kept a large number of neatly arranged files of all the records that elude to this project. This includes all the letters, minutes, reports, proof of the all the communication between participants that attended the sub-regional workshops and consultants, etc. etc. All this documentation was not assessed during this evaluation.

## ANNEX G

Number of progress reports, time periods and outputs per report discussed

No of Progress reports	Time periods	Outputs/services
1	January 2004 – June 2005	1. First version of training handbook
		2. Training material guides
		3. Nine sub-regional work-shops
		4. Four steering committee meetings
		5. Website – ongoing
2	July 2005 – August 2007	6. Training material guide – completed
		7. Training session at COP7 of UNCCD
		8. Sustainable Land and Water Management Forum
		9. Regional workshop in Pietermaritzburg
3	September 2007	10. Completion report by ODG
		11. Final report for the entire project