





MINISTRY OF AGRICULTURE

Terminal Evaluation Report

THE GAMBIA SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT PROJECT -

SIP: Participatory Integrated Watershed Management Project (PIWAMP)

GEFSEC # 3368-GM

MAY 2016

Contents

PRO	DJECT IDENTIFICATION TABLE	v	
EXEC	CUTIVE SUMMARY	vi	
١.	INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND	1	
П.	SCOPE, OBJECTIVES AND METHODS	3	
0	Overall objective/purpose	3	
Μ	1ethodology	3	
III.	PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT	5	
A.	ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES AND PLANNED RESULTS	5	
	Relevance		5
	Effectiveness		6
	Achievement of Outputs and Activities		7
	Outcomes and Impacts		. 10
	Gender equity and women empowerment		.13
	Efficiency		. 14
	Delays		. 14
В.	. SUSTAINABILITY	15	
	Financial Sustainability		. 15
	Socio-political Sustainability		. 15
	Technical		. 15
	Institutional Sustainability		. 15
	Environmental Sustainability		.16
C.	CATALYTIC ROLE AND REPLICATION	18	
D	STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION/ PUBLIC AWARENESS	28	
Ε.	COUNTRY OWNERSHIP/ DRIVENNESS	30	
G	PREPARATION AND READINESS	31	
H.	I. IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT	32	
I.	MONITORING AND EVALUATION	32	
J.	FINANCIAL PLANNING AND CONTROL	35	
К.	. AfDB and IFAD SUPERVISION AND BACKSTOPPING	35	
J.	CO-FINANCING	36	
VI. C	CONCLUSIONS AND RATINGS	36	
Х.	RECOMMENDATIONS	39	

ANNEXES	42
ANNEX 1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR)	42
ANNEX II: A List of Interviewees and Evaluation Timeline	44
ANNEX III: Bibliography	47
ANNEX IV: SLMP Financial Information by Component	48
ANNEX V: Comprehensive list of knowledge products	49
ANNEX VI: The Expertise of the Evaluators	50

List of Tables

Table 1: Achievements Summary for Component 1: the SLM Institutional Strengthening up to TE	7
Table 2: Achievements Summary for Component 2: Watershed/Landscape Management up to TE	9
Table 2: Production of major food crop from SLMP sites by Region	.13
Table 3: Participatory Monitoring data collection tools	. 20
Table 4: Service providers to the SLMP	. 29
Table 5: SLMP Expenditure by component of base cost at appraisal and Completion in US \$.35
Table 6: Summary Ratings	.36
Annex Table 1: Annual Expenditure by Component	.48
Annex Table 1B: SLMP Actual Expenditure at PCR by Component against Planned at Appraisal	.48

List of Figures

Figure 1: Location Map of The Gambia	4
Figure 2:Protected lowland area with causeway in Salikenne, NBR (954.4ha)	11
Figure 3:Protected area with foot bridge and dykes in Kayai, CRRN (117.8ha)	11
Figure 4: Fass Abdou, Contour bunds and road, CRR/S (239.3ha)	11
Figure 5: Area Protected through SLMP Intervention by Agricultural Region	11
Figure 6: Crop yield comparism for SLMP intervention areas	12

LIST OF ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

AAIG	ActionAid International The Gambia
ACT	African Conservation Tillage Network
ADF	African Development Fund
AES	Agricultural Engineering Services
AfDB	African Development Bank
ANRP	Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy
ANRWG	Agriculture and Natural Resources Working Group
ARD	Agricultural Regional Directorate
AWPB	Annual work Plan and Budget
CA	Conservation Agriculture
CAP	Community Action Plan
CC	Climate Change
CEES	Communication Education Extension Services
CFA	Community Field Assistants
Chosso	Strengthening Climate Resilience of the National Agricultural Land and Water Management
	Development Project
CPCU	Central Project Coordination Unit
CRR	Central River Region
DCD	Department of Community Development
DOA	Department of Agriculture
DOF	Department of Forestry
DPS	Deputy Permanent Secretary
DPWM	Department of Parks and Wildlife Management
DWR	Department of Water Resources
EIA	Environmental Impact Assessment
ESIA	Environmental and Social Impact Assessment
ESMP	Environmental and Social Management Plan
FASDEP	Food and Agriculture Sector Development Project
FFS	Farmer Field School
FO	Farmer Organization
GAMSIF	Gambia SLM Investment Framework
GANAD	Gambia National Agricultural Databank
GCAV	Gambia Commercial and Value Chain Management Project
GEAP	Gambia Environmental Action Plan
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GOTG	Government of The Gambia
GMD	Gambian Dalasi
GRTS	Gambia Radio and Television Services
HTS	Horticulture Technical Services
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IKS	Indigenous Knowledge System
LRR	Lower River Region
MDFT	Multi-Disciplinary Facilitation Team
MDG	Millennium Development Goal

MOA	Ministry of Agriculture
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NARI	National Agricultural Research Institute
NAWFA	National Women Farmers Association
NBR	North Bank Region
NCB	National Competitive Bidding
NDMA	National Disaster Management Agency
NEA	National Environment Agency
Nema	National Land Management Development Management Project
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRM	Natural Resources Management
NSC	National SLM Steering Committee
NTC	National Technical Committee
NTF	Nigeria Trust Fund
PAGE	Programme for Accelerated Growth and Employment
PIWAMP	Participatory Integrated Watershed Management Project
PM&E	Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPCR	Pilot Programme on Climate Resilience
PRA	Participatory Rural Appraisal
PRSP	Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper
PS	Permanent Secretary
PSC	Project Steering Committee
P2RS	Programme to Build Resilience to Food and Nutrition Insecurity In The Sahel
RAD	Regional Agricultural Directorate
SL	Shortlisting
SLM	Sustainable land Management
SLMP	Sustainable Land Management Project
SP	Service Provider
TA	Technical Assistance
TER	Terminal Evaluation Report
UA	Unit of Account
URR	Upper River Region
VDC	Village Development Committee
VFA	Village Farmer Association
VISACA	Village Savings and Credit Associations

PROJECT IDENTIFICATION TABLE

Project ID:	GEFSEC # 3368-GM
Title:	Sustainable Land Management. SIP: Participatory Integrated Watershed Management Project
Location:	36 sites with 6 in each Agricultural Region in The Gambia
Start Date:	September 2011
End Date:	June 2015
Mid-Term Evaluation:	12 June -02 July, 2014
Implementing Agency:	African Development Bank
Technical Support:	IFAD
Executing Agency:	Government of The Gambia – Ministry of Agriculture
Budget (US\$):	4.4 million

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Sustainable Land Management Project (SLMP), was a four-year incremental investment by the Global Environmental Facility (GEF) to the tune of US\$ 4.4 million aimed at ensuring that the Participatory Integrated Watershed Management Project (PIWAMP) activities contribute to the realization of optimal global environmental benefits including: land degradation, conserving biodiversity and improving the adaptive response to climate change. The development objective was to improve livelihoods through the promotion of community-based watershed/landscape management approaches to enable resource poor-communities to reverse declining land productivity. It was relevant particularly due to significant agricultural productivity and biodiversity losses caused by land degradation. It had three broad components: sustainable land management institutional strengthening; community-based watershed/landscape management and project management. The design of the components was clear with both the goal and specific objective achievable. The interventions were in line and consistent with the policy frameworks at macroeconomic, sectoral levels and with international conventions.

The project targeted 66,000 resource poor farmers including women and youths in 36 communities within the six agricultural regions of The Gambia. The project registered significant physical achievements with outcomes and outputs surpassing appraisal targets for most of the planned interventions. In this regard the following were achieved: establishment of SLM platforms at national and regional levels hinged on an Investment framework for SLM interventions–GAMSIF (2016-2020); 68,441 direct beneficiaries comprising 34,259 (50.1 %) females and 34, 182 (49.9%) males surpassing the appraisal target of 66,000 direct beneficiaries; 6, 250.66 ha put under cultivation from SLMP intervention sites with 3,258.36 ha of upland (52%) and 2,992.3 ha of lowland (48%) with CRRS having the largest area protected/cultivated in both upland and lowland. A total of 3,258.36 ha were halted from soil erosion through the construction of upland bunds against an appraisal target of 7,500 ha registering 43%.

Seventy two (72) micro-projects were implemented in the 36 identified SLMP communities ranging from lowland and upland infrastructures for water and soil retention to access roads, woodlots and fruit tree nurseries. In the domain of natural resources restoration achievements include: anti-hippo barriers with a total length of 1,350m and height of 1.5 m were constructed in eight communities; improved vegetative cover (898 ha) in degraded woodland and rangelands against an appraisal target of 600ha and thus registering 149% of the target. SLMP achieved 3,738 ha of improved vegetative cover and restoration in habitat diversity in 13 protected areas against an appraisal target of 1,500 ha achieving 250% of the target. These protected areas provide important habitats for rare and endangered species of global importance as well as spawning and nursery ground for fish and birds.

Beneficiary communities have lauded the benefits and positive impact of the SLMP interventions on their physical, socio-economic, health, education and other mundane aspects of their daily lives. The construction of conservation bunds, inter-village roads, bridges and causeways and other micro-projects have resulted in such benefits as: protection from floods; access to increased cultivable lands resulting in increased income from sales of produce, increased safe access to other communities, rice fields, schools, clinics; reduced hungry season from 6 - 7 months to 1 - 3 months; As an example of the positive impact of the conservation bunds, a popular village well was protected from contamination from run-off water for the very first time in so many years. In their own words, "SLMP has transformed our lives".

The overall rating of the SLMP is provided in the following Table.

Overall Rating of SLMP

Evaluation Areas	Evaluation Criteria Areas				
Assessment of Project Results	Project Outcomes and Objectives				
	Relevance: The SLMP objectives have been in line and consistent with the macroeconomic, sectoral policy frameworks and international conventions	Highly Satisfactory			
	Effectiveness: The SLMP established the relevant institutional frameworks, formulated the GAMSIF, implemented 72 micro projects comprising lowland and upland soil and water controlled infrastructure, improved degraded woodlands and improved vegetative cover in 13 protected sites.	Satisfactory			
	Efficiency: The level of attainment of physical implementation commensurate the level of resource utilization in the realization of the outputs and outcomes in the components.	Satisfactory			
Assessment of Risks to Sustainability	Likelihood of sustainability of outcomes 4 dimensions of risks to sustainability:				
of Project Outcomes	Financial risks Tangible increases in income, improvements in food security and security from loss due to flooding at household level and formulated the GAMSIF.	Likely (L)			
	Socio-political risks Village Development Committees and farmer associations have had their organizational capacity and technical skills on sustainable land management enhanced. CAPs have been formulated based on the priorities of communities.	Likely (L)			
	Institutional Framework and governance risks Structures at village (VDC), regional (RADs, TAC) and national levels (ANRWG) have been involved in both the design and implementation of SLMP interventions.	Likely (L)			
	Environmental risks Climate change and environmental sustainability have been embedded in the investments of the project.	Likely (L)			
Catalytic Role	Catalytic Role The formulation of the GAMSIF pivotal for SLM mainstreaming; public awareness with greater feasibility of incorporating CA in their field activities; community CAPs which could be further developed into projects; and, Study tour to Burkina Faso.				
Assessment of M&E System	Assessment of M&E Design M&E System				
M&E Plan Implementation		Moderately Satisfactory			
	Moderately Unsatisfactory				

Monitoring of long-term changes	onitoring of ng-term langesContribution to establishment of long-term monitoring systemRelevant SLMP project data to be incorporated into the GANAD developed with 22 outcome indicators harmonized for GNAIP and agricultural sector projects to enable synergy in monitoring outcome and outputs.				
	Accomplishment/shortcoming Provided data for progress reporting and for some indicators in TE. However, the low literacy and numeracy skills of secretaries resulted in only few keeping timely, comprehensive and accurate data.				
	Sustainability of system Linked with the national systems of the GANAD which will allow monitoring of progress on key indicators	Satisfactory			
	Use of the system as intended Provided progress reporting on indicators for measuring project outcomes and outputs	Satisfactory			
Assessment of processes affecting attainment of project results	<u>Preparation and Readiness</u> High level commitment and participation by senior government staff in the design. Project goals and component were clearly articulated and consistent with macroeconomic and sector policies.	Satisfactory			
project results	<u>Country Ownership/Drivenness</u> Consistency and congruence with national strategies and relevant conventions ratified;	Satisfactory			
	<u>Stakeholder Involvement</u> Public service provided capacity building (TOT) and step down to beneficiaries and private contractors constructed upland and lowland structures and fencing.	Satisfactory.			
	<u>Financing Planning</u> Government and Bank disbursement and procurement rules were adhered to.	Satisfactory			
	GEF Agency supervision and backstopping AfDB (executing) and IFAD (Technical) support fielded 10 missions to guide implementation	Highly satisfactory			
	Co-financing PIWAMP (AfDB, IFAD, GoTG and beneficiaries provided co-financing of 17,575,922.40 US\$	Highly satisfactory			

Key Lessons to be learned from SLMP comprise:

Timeliness of procurement: Where there is seasonality in construction, concerted efforts should be made to undertake and complete all procurement processes to avoid any delay in implementation during the short time window for construction.

Beneficiary involvement: In the implementation of interventions such as restoration of natural resources comprising woodlands, protection of habitats and infrastructure maintenance, it is essential that beneficiaries are fully involved and in the driver's seat .

Sourcing SLM TA locally/internationally: It is prudent to first seek expertise locally/nationally rather than first seeking international TA. SLMP lost valuable time trying to recruit international expertise as was planned, but which did not materialise and thus the project had to resort to local advertising and recruiting of a local as TA.

Experience in the area of assignment: Need to ensure that the contractors are fully informed of the specific site and area to be covered to avert unnecessary community disagreement over the area (size) and location of the woodlot.

Database on contractors: availability of a database on contractors will facilitate referencing and tracking particularly of the poor performers and their blacklisting

Capacity in conservation agriculture: Training by the National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI) of critical mass of farmers and front line extension workers to acquire skills in conservation agriculture (through modules and equipped with user friendly reference materials) is pivotal to sustainable adoption of SLM practices.

Recommendations/proposed comprise:

• Gambia Sustainable Land Management investment Framework (GAMSIF)

During the formulation of the GAMSIF, the team experienced marked absence of updated reference materials on soils/land use characteristics/determinants, with the most comprehensive reference material on soil/land developed in the 1970's (LRS 22); there is urgent need to develop an updated Land Resources Study. This can inform effective watershed planning and mapping. MOA should work with ongoing projects such as *Nema/Chosso*, GCAV and FASDEP to support this exercise.

As the spring board for up-scaling SLM in the immediate to medium term, urgent efforts should be made towards launching the GAMSIF and subsequently to mobilizing resources for its implementation. In this regard the MOA (for launching the GAMSIF) and the tapping resources from the Pilot Programme on Climate Resilience (PPCR) need to be pursued.

• Conservation Agriculture

In the bid to promote Conservation Agriculture and to facilitate implementation of the GAMSIF, there is urgent need to articulate a mechanization policy to guide conservation agriculture and sustainable SLM practices, formulation of a mechanization policy should be given urgent attention. The Ministry of Agriculture should mobilize funds from ongoing projects such as *Nema/Chosso*, GCAV and FASEDP in this regard.

Given the critical role of conservation agriculture in restoring and maintaining soil fertility, greater focus needs to be paid to continue training more farmers and extension workers on conservation agriculture. These capacity building interventions are consistent with *Nema/Chosso/P2RS* and should be supported.

• Natural Resources Management

Given that the SLMP has provided equipment (tractor –mounted chisel ploughs) and rippers (animal drawn) for CA activities, Nema/Chosso/P2RS should continue the process and support NARI to conduct the demonstration trials relevant for possible up-scaling of appropriate tillage practices nationwide.

The woodlots and enrichment plantings have only been established with the SLMP, these gains need to be sustained through continued support in annual fire belting of woodlots and forests to minimize the destruction of recurrent bush fires and by additional plantings of bamboo. Similarly, farmer managed

natural regeneration of indigenous tree species should be encouraged. The Department of Forestry should spearhead these efforts with support from *Nema/Chosso* and other sources.

Beneficiaries of the SLMP anti-hippo barriers have experienced reduction in the human/wildlife conflict with minimized destruction of their rice crops. However, the lengths of the protection/barriers in most sites need to be increased for greater effectiveness. Given the relevance of these barriers, the MOA needs to work with the DPWM to support prone rice growing areas with support by ongoing project with intervention in rice production e.g. *Nema/Chosso/P2RS*, GCAV and FASDEP.

In the Complimentary PIWAMP project, energy saving devices comprising stoves using alternative energy were piloted. In this regards, communities which entirely depend on forest resources as their primary source of energy need to be targeted through interventions in alternative renewable sources of energy like bio-gas and new improved cooking stoves.

• Community Awareness and Literacy

The SLMP has In light of the need to "announce the successes" of the SLMP to a wider audience and for sustained interest in SLM practices, produced a number of videos. Most of these are narrations in local languages without subtitles. It is recommended that subtitles are edited on the videos and aired through the GRTS for nationwide dissemination. In addition, the CEES could be contracted by one of the on-going projects to organize video shows using mobile vans at the SLMP targeted communities and new ones with similar interventions identified by the on-going projects.

The SLMP has built the capacity of farmer organizations and VDCs in organizational management and management. However most of the beneficiaries have low numeracy and literacy skills. In recognition of the empowering nature of functional literacy and numeracy, it is recommended that such projects attach functional literacy and numeracy activities to the work of the SLMP committee secretaries. This would facilitate data collection at the village level and further engender a collective sense of ownership as records would enhance village meetings.

I. INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

1. The Sustainable Land Management Project (SLMP) grant agreement was signed on 17 December 2010 between the Government of The Gambia (GoTG) and the African Development Bank (AfDB) acting as the Implementing Agency for the Global Environment Facility (GEF) funds whilst IFAD provided as appropriate some technical support. The total GEF funds budgeted for implementing the Work Plan and Budget from September 2011 to December 2014 was USD 4.4 million as an incremental financing for the Participatory Integrated Watershed Management Project (PIWAMP) which was jointly funded by the AfDB and IFAD. SLMP had a nationwide coverage and targeted 66,000 direct beneficiaries. The first disbursement was received by the Project in September 2011 and at project closure the disbursement rate stood at 99.6%. The initial date for the final disbursement was 30 June 2014, but it was extended to 29 June 2015 so as make up for the lost grounds due to the delays in the recruitment of the key SLMP TA.

2. **The key objectives** of the SLMP were to improve livelihoods through promotion of community-based watershed/landscape management approaches, enabling resource-poor communities to reverse declining land productivity and overcome the causes and negative impacts of land degradation on the structure and functional integrity of The Gambia's lowland and upland ecosystem resources.

3. **Project Components:** The project consisted of three components viz:

Component 1 – SLM Institutional Strengthening

Sub-Component 1.1 - which included SLM Institutional Strengthening through the establishment and operation of the Gambia National SLM platform;

Sub-component 1.2 - establishment and operation of six Regional SLM Platforms;

Sub-component 1.3 - Formulation of the Gambia SLM Investment Framework (GAMSIF)

Sub-component 1.4 - development of the SLM knowledge base and information system;

Sub-component 1.5 - assisting in the development of appropriate policies on agricultural mechanization; and

Sub-component 1.6 - building the capacity of key planning and advisory support service providers.

4. The envisaged outputs of this component were:

- An operational national level SLM Platform comprising a multi-level partnership of stakeholder institutions promoting SLM within The Gambia ;
- Six operational Regional level SLM Platforms established and comprising multi-level stakeholder partnerships promoting SLM within their areas of jurisdiction, meeting on a regular basis;
- An agreed Gambian SLM Investment Framework providing a national level strategic planning framework;
- A set of detailed recommendations for the development of a Gambian SLM Knowledge Base and Information System.

- A minimum of 10 senior policy makers and technical experts with an enhanced knowledge of the pros and cons of different tillage techniques and using this to develop an informed policy for future agricultural mechanisation within The Gambia.
- A minimum of 36 ward level Multi-disciplinary Facilitation Teams (MDFTs) with the skills and experience required to work with rural communities in the planning, implementation and monitoring of community based watershed/landscape management plans and the promotion of a community-based participatory watershed/landscape management planning approach.

5. **Component 2 – Community-Based Watershed/Landscape Management**

Sub-Component 2.1- focused Community based Natural Resource Assessment and Watershed Landscape Management Planning;

Sub-component 2.2 - Ensuring Food Security; Addressing Poverty and Land Degradation through Community Based SLM Investments in SLM;

Sub-component 2.3 - participatory impact monitoring and evaluation;

Sub-component 2.4 - institutional capacity building for community-based watershed management planning; and

Sub-component 2.5 - Validation and demonstration of conservation agriculture tools and techniques for upland farming.

- 6. The outputs associated with this component are:
 - A minimum of 36 village areas having undertaken a base line assessment of the degradation status of their natural resources and prepared community-based watershed/landscape management and investment plans for SLM interventions;
 - A minimum of 36 village areas in which the interrelated problems, of land degradation, rural poverty and food insecurity, are addressed by implementing a variety of innovative field level SLM practices, and related micro-investment proposals as part of an overall village watershed/landscape management plan.
 - A minimum of 36 village areas where the environmental and socio-economic impact of implementing watershed/landscape management plans are regularly monitored and assessed.
 - A minimum of 36 villages with village development committees and operational watershed/landscape management sub-committees with the organisational and technical skills required to plan, implement and monitor field level SLM activities within their area of jurisdiction
 - A minimum of 42 farmer centred conservation agriculture validation trials and demonstrations conducted with the aim of identifying and disseminating locally appropriate CA practices with potential for addressing the problems of excess runoff and soil erosion in the uplands and sedimentation in the lowlands.

Component 3: Project Management and Coordination

7. The PMU has been maintained from the PIWAMP, which is still continuing the implementation of the IFAD financed activities, with additional staff i.e. two field supervisors and an accounts clerk. The members of the PMU working on the SLMP include the overall Project Coordinator, National SLM Coordinator, the Financial Controller, an Accountant, the Upland and Lowland field coordinators, an M&E Officer and also a Community Development Officer and an assistant. In total fourteen (14) members of the PIWAMP PMU, including drivers, worked directly on the GEF financed components. The PIWAMP Steering Committee maintains the oversight functions for the SLMP. The national SLM coordinator and the two field supervisors were appointed through a competitive process in 2011. The Project Management team was further reinforced with the coming on board of the SLM TA during year three of project implementation.

8. The output for this component complemented the programme management arrangement established under PIWAMP. The complementary activities financed under the project included the following: (i) the preparation of progress and financial reports, and carrying out annual audits of the GEF PIWAMP component related expenditures; (ii) carrying out M&E including a full baseline study and subsequent assessments to determine the project's local and global environmental impact; (iii) the fielding of supervision missions; and (iv) carrying out the mid-term review and project completion study.

II. SCOPE, OBJECTIVES AND METHODS

9. The GEF funding was expected to realize major environmental and socio-economic benefits through investments in Sustainable Land Management interventions aimed at restoring, sustaining and enhancing the protective and productive functions of the lowland and upland ecosystems. The lowland and upland sustainable crop, livestock, forestry and eco-tourism activities that were supported are expected to result in a significant increase in the returns from livelihood activities at the community and individual household levels. This in turn was expected to have a positive impact on food security at various levels and also contribute to the alleviation of rural poverty.

10. The SLMP TE Mission was conducted between 10th March to 8thApril 2016 (under the guidance and direction of the Task Team Leaders of AfDB & IFAD) and was undertaken by a team of Consultants comprising an Agricultural Economist (team leader) and an Institutional and Rural Development Expert.

Overall objective/purpose

11. The **overall objective/purpose** of the study is to provide a comprehensive and systematic account of the performance of the SLMP by assessing its project design, process of implementation, achievements vis-a-vis project objectives endorsed by the GEF including any agreed changes in the objective during project implementation, and any other results. The evaluation will also synthesize lessons learned that may inform the design of future sustainable land management interventions or related initiatives. Details of the scope/specific tasks of the Terminal Evaluation .and the ToRs of the evaluators are in annex 1

Methodology

12. The team *reviewed* all relevant project documents including the following: GEF Project Brief, AfDB Appraisal Report, Aide Memoires/Supervision Reports, AWPBs for SLMP – GAMSIF, Audit reports, Training reports, Local and International Visits reports, Progress Reports, Service Providers reports, SLMP TA Reports including minutes of NSC/NTC meetings and related correspondence and, Videos.

13. The Evaluation Team prepared an Inception Report which was shared with the AfDB and IFAD. They also held *in-depth discussions* with project staff including members of the PMU and related MoA Departments and Units, MoFEA, GEF Focal Point for The Gambia at the NEA, bilateral donor agencies. *Meetings* were also held with key implementing partners, including the SLMP TA during which they provided updates on their activities as at TE.

14. The team undertook *site visits* to sampled sites in all the regions (see map): WCR/ *Foni Bintang* - Kassagne (Woodlot, mangrove establishment, oyster culture); LRR/*Kiang Central* - Bamako (Causeway, footbridge, dyke, woodlot); LRR/*Jarra East*- Madina Sarahulay (Contour bunds, tree planting); CRR-S/Niamina West-Sarra Seydou (Upland bunds, access road, livestock watering point) and CRR-S/*Lower Fuladu East*-Darru (Inter-village road, dyke, water retention structure); CRR-N/ *Niani-* Kayai (Access Road, contour bund, anti-hippo dyke); NBR/Jokadu – Dasilami (Dyke, causeway, woodlot) and NBR/ *Central Badibu-* Salikenne (Water retention dyke, causeway, woodlot) and URR/*Basse-* Kumbija (Access Road, contour bunds) to visit project interventions, where focused group discussions were held with beneficiaries and other key stakeholders.

15. A *Skype group* call was convened on Wednesday, 30th March 2016 with the AfDB Task Manager for SLMP and IFAD's Technical Specialist¹ to discuss the inception report, followed by a second *Skype group call* on 4th May, 2016 with IFAD's Technical Specialist to discuss the first draft findings and reactions to the comments. The team employed the Review of Outcome to Impact (ROtI) in the analysis.



Figure 1: Location Map of The Gambia

¹ The AfDB represented by Olagoke Oladapo and IFAD by Paxina Chileshe

III. PROJECT PERFORMANCE AND IMPACT

A. ATTAINMENT OF OBJECTIVES AND PLANNED RESULTS

Relevance

Land resources² provide the basis for most of the productive activities for the majority of the 16. population of The Gambia. However, land degradation has been a major challenge to sustainable agricultural production and productivity and consequently a major inhibitor to enhancing food security and reducing poverty. This is attributed to rapid population growth, inappropriate land use practices culminating in the loss of soil productivity (erosion in uplands and sedimentation in lowlands); loss of vegetative cover; reduction in quality and quantity of fresh water resources; reduced natural biodiversity and resilience; and increased carbon dioxide and reduced carbon sequestration. The project's goal and purpose are aimed at addressing the inter-linked problems of rural poverty, food insecurity and land degradation through the development and promotion of innovative sustainable land management technologies and community based participatory/landscape management planning approaches, meet the aim of restoring, sustaining and enhancing the productive and protective functions of The Gambia's upland and low ecosystem resources. In this regard, the SLMP has been relevant and consistent with both the macroeconomic and sectoral policy frameworks, notably The Gambia Environmental Action Plan (GEAP II, 2009-2018), the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP II-2007-2011) and the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy (ANRP 2009-2015). Testimonies by beneficiaries during the Project Completion Report (PCR) and the Terminal Evaluation (TE) field visits indicated that the project addressed key needs of land degradation, natural resources deterioration, access and hardships resulting from flooding of settlements following heavy downpours of rain.

17. The various national action plans related to the UN conventions on biodiversity, desertification and climate change have all been prepared by national experts following a participatory stakeholder consultation process at the national, regional and district levels. The national strategies for poverty alleviation and food security have also been prepared in a similar manner. This consultative process ensured that the various strategies and action plans are aligned to The Gambia's development priorities and can be delivered in accordance with its devolved institutional structure. The proposals for both the GoTG/IFAD/AfDB PIWAMP and the GEF component are consistent with the priorities outlined in these strategies and action plans. Thus, there is a very high level of Gambian ownership of the specific interventions proposed for GEF grant support.

18. The project responds to and is fully consistent with the environmental and rural development priorities of the Government of The Gambia. It represents a major advance in implementation of the Gambia Environment Action Plan (Phase I 1992-2001, and Phase II 2009-2018), which aims at integrating environmental concerns into the country's overall social and economic development strategy. It is fully in line with the Government's Agricultural and Natural Resources Management Sector Policy (2009-2015), which recognizes the central role of communities in management of their natural resources. In fact, natural resources management is the backbone of the Government's effort to develop agriculture both to meet the growing demand for food and to increase the incomes of the rural poor. Furthermore, it is fully synchronized with the Government's Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP, 2007-2011) and the associated Strategy for Poverty Alleviation (SPA-II), which aims at eradicating poverty by promoting economic growth and enhancing the productive capacity and social protection of the poor and vulnerable.

² Land Resources comprise soil, water, vegetation and wildlife

19. Furthermore, Project implementation is driven by the country's national priority programmes such as The PAGE and successor the SDGs, Vision 2020; Vision 2016 – 2020, which are all related to enhancing the capacity and output of the productive sectors (agriculture, fisheries, industry, trade, tourism and infrastructure) and mainstreaming poverty related cross-cutting issues into poverty reduction, respectively.

20. The GoTG has also developed the Gambia National Agriculture Investment Plan (GNAIP) as the investment strategy underpinning the recently signed CAADP compact. The GNAIP combines policy, institutional, infrastructure and technology related measures to address the multiplicity of supply-side constraints to enhance the growth potential of The Gambia's agriculture. Improvement of water management and management of other shared resources are two of the key pillars of the GNAIP. This project supports the GNAIP through its expected outcomes of improving water management and addressing land degradation issues in the low lands and up lands with the aim of improving agriculture productivity.

21. The project is a major step in implementing the Government's National Action Programme to Combat Desertification (NAP, 2000) under the UNCCD (ratified in 1996), which identifies among its priorities: (i) implementation of priority measures in order to achieve immediate and visible impact and to maintain momentum; (ii) intensifying and up scaling pilot programmes related to land management in upland areas, and (iii) capacity building with communities and other stakeholders.

22. PIWAMP to which SLMP was complementary financing had the objective to significantly increase land productivity on a sustainable basis. PIWAMP's Project Coordination Committee provided overall policy guidance to the SLMP, approved AWP&B prior to submission to the AfDB and IFAD; key staff including the Coordinator, the Financial Controller, M&E officials, Community Mobilization officials, lowland and upland coordinators provided overlapping services to the SLMP. The PIWAMP had three components: (i) watershed management; (ii) capacity building; and, (iii) project management. The GEF grant for SLMP allowed incremental investment for: (i) field level sustainable land management functions and formulation of the GAMSIF; (ii) enhanced institutional capacity for SLM; and, (iii) coordinated participatory planning and dialogue on improved natural resources management between concerned stakeholder communities and institutions.

23. PIWAMP focused on upland conservation and lowland development activities driven by demand from targeted communities. At Completion in 2014 it established and registered as legal entities 89 Village Farmer Associations, 55 Ward Farmer Associations and 6 District level farmer associations. It constructed 81,486 m of dykes (106% of target), 3,335 m of spillway (138% of target), 1984 m of footbridges (66% of target), 22.7 m of causeways (22.7% of target), 157 m of contour bunds (22% of target), 692 gulley plugs (82% of target) and 191 km of inter-Village roads (95.5% of target).

Effectiveness

24. The logical framework of the SLMP follows the theory of Change or the Review of Outcome to Impact (ROtI) model for GEF. It provides a lucid strategy for the project following a logical hierarchy with activities linked to clear tangible outputs and output linked to outcomes. The Outcomes are also clearly linked to the Impacts. The project has Eight Global Environmental Benefits (GEBs) as follows: (i) Soil erosion and other forms of soil degradation controlled; (ii) Water management and salinity controlled in lowland rice growing areas; (iii) Improvement in vegetative cover with a corresponding increase in woodland/forest; (iv) Protective function restored with restoration of lowland mangrove woodlands; (v) Improvements in vegetative cover with corresponding restoration in habitat diversity of semi natural vegetation with potential as wildlife/natural reserve; (vi) Improvement in vegetative cover with restoration in livestock carrying capacity of degraded upland rangelands; (vii) Reduction in sedimentation within the lowland areas (rice production sites); and (viii)

Fall in demand for fuel wood as a result of switching to the use of efficient stoves with reductions in carbon emissions.

25. During design the baseline situation, projection of the expected highlighting means of verification and indicative assessment tools were clearly spelled out. However during implementation, the M&E did not use some of the assessment tools e.g. LADA. Furthermore, the baseline survey conducted at the commencement of the SLMP did not address the quantitative data requirements for potential sites with key indicators such as erosion rates; sedimentation and salinization in the specific/targeted sites not provided for and followed up by the M&E during implementation. The evaluation assessed activities, outcomes and impacts in a hierarchical order as follows:

Achievement of Outputs and Activities

26. Component 1, focused on capacity building aimed at promoting SLM with national and regional institutions as the principal target. The key achievements as presented in Table 3 comprise the National SLM Steering Committees (NSC), National SLM Technical Committees (NTC) which have held the planned sessions. The SLM consultative forum and ARD regional consultative forum targeted at the regional Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) have also been held (67 %) with all the sessions required. The planned field trips, international study tours and study on current SLM knowledge base and information system have also been conducted. However, the policy workshop for the validation of mechanization policy was not held as its formulation was not feasible due to the high attrition of policy level staff in MOA.

Act	ivity	Unit	Appraisal Target	TE Achievement	% achievement of Appraisal at TE
1	National SLM Steering Committee	Number	18	18	100
2	National SLM Technical Committee	Number	13	13	100
3	National SLM Consultative Forum	Number	6	4	67
4	Office equipment and computers	Number	6	6	100
5	ARD SLM Consultative Forum	Number	36	36	100
6	Field trips	Number	1	1	100
7	Study of current Gambian SLM Knowledge base and information systems	Number	1	1	100
8	International study tour for 10 senior policy makers/technical experts	Number	1	1	100
9	Policy workshop	Number	1	0	0
10	ARD level training workshop on SLM	Number	30	30	100
Ave	arage Achievement Component One		113	102	90

Table 1: Achievements Summary for Component 1: the SLM Institutional Strengthening up to TE

27. Other important achievements under Component 1 comprise the formulation of the Gambia SLM Investment Framework (GAMSIF) which was completed in September 2014. Although it is yet to be formally approved by Government, the project has mobilized funding from TerrAfrica for its launching and the

development of the GAMSIF Communication and Advocacy Strategy (GCAS). Also accomplished, is the Induction Training for 48 participants from 6 regional technical committees on watershed delineation and mapping; TOT for 60 SLM Technical Committee members; development of a training Manual on SLM for regional technical committees and conduct of Step Down Training for farmers in all six ARDS including community planning assessment. The step down training was attended by 16 members of the VDC in each of the targeted villages who also participated in the assessment. In total, 576 VDC members participated comprising 50% each of male and female.

28. Component 2, Community-based Watershed/Landscape Management constituted the core of the project. It focused on developing the capacity of individual communities to assess the degradation status of their local natural resource; prepare watershed/landscape management plans and micro investment project portfolios in a fully participatory manner for restoring, sustaining and enhancing the productive capacity and protective functions of these resources. Table 4 provides a summary of achievements in Component 2. Key achievements comprise: village/community level briefing/sensitization meetings, participatory planning workshops, and discovery-based field learning exercises. Step down trainings were conducted for farmers in all 6 ARDs; Community Action Plans (CAPs) developed for each of 36 villages; and, a village farmer association formed in each village for implementing the Community Action Plan. The priorities in the CAPs constituted the investments as micro projects in the 36 selected sites. A total of 72 micro projects were implemented with CRRS having 35% of the portfolio.

29. Whilst initial interventions under this subcomponent focused on upland and lowland infrastructure for erosion controls and soil fertility enhancement, water retention and improved market access; the Joint Supervision Mission³ advised the project to focus on natural resources restoration in line with the Results Framework of the project. This resulted in the subsequent reduction of most of the targets set in the output by 25% and eliminating the intervention on aquatic weeds. Subsequently, the restoration of natural ecosystems (forests, woodlands and mangroves), the resolution of conflict between farmers and wildlife, the set-up of nurseries of forest and productive plants, the promotion of ecotourism for economic diversification and wildlife habitat restoration gained momentum and registered significant achievements. Investments in the micro-projects resulted in the following achievements:

- Lowlands water management 6,667m of dykes in 8 communities (Daru, CRRS; Bambako, LRR; Kanuma, NBR; Bullok, WCR; Penyem, WCR; Sitanunku, NBR; Darsilami, NBR; and Njawara, NBR). 114m of foot bridges constructed in 2 communities (54 m at Kayai, CRRN and 60 m at Bambako, LRR) and 9,200 m of causeways in 3 communities (2000 m at Salikene, NBR and 400 m Bambako, LRR and Jakoto, CRRS (6,800m).
- Upland management and conservation farming 63.6km of upland bunds constructed in 11 sites/communities (13 km Badari, URR; 1.9 km (9 ramps) Kumbija, URR; 1.7 km (4 ramps) Bakadaji, URR; 9.0km (5 ramps and 30 Irish crossings) Daru, CRRS;11.2 km (50 ramps) Galleh Manda, CRRS; 15.3 km Fass Abdou, CRRS; 3.8 km (8 ramps and 12 Irish crossings) Bati Njol, CRRN; Jakoto, CRRS; Kanuma, NBR, 1.6 km Bulok, WCR and, 0.2 km Kayai, CRRN).
- Village nurseries and community forest management 13,673 seedlings (i.e. 68ha) currently managed at 6 regional forestry nurseries; 12,712 of seedlings survived from the annual tree planting exercises; 36 villages nurseries establishment with about 7,200 various indigenous plant species

³ 4-11th February, 2014

raised. Farmers were also trained on nursery and tree management, and equipped with garden tools such as watering cans.

- Nursery Preparation and Tree Planting Programme with the Department of Forestry
- Market Access- 52.9km of inter-village roads in 9 communities (Kumbija, URR; Galleh Manda, CRRS; Daru, CRRS; Fass Abdou, CRRS; Bati, CRRN; Mamut Fana, CRRS; Sukuta, CRRN; Kayai, CRRN and, Kanuma, NBR).
- Human wildlife conflict resolution anti-hippo barriers with a total length of 1350m and height of 1.5 m were constructed in 8 communities; improved vegetative cover (898 ha) in degraded woodland and rangelands against an appraisal target of 600ha and thus registering 149% of the target. SLMP achieved 3,738 ha of improved vegetative cover and restoration in habitat diversity in 13 protected areas against an appraisal target of 1,500 ha achieving 250% of the target. These protected areas provide important habitats for rare and endangered species of global importance as well as spawning and nursery ground for fish and birds.

Ac	tivity		Appraisal	TE	% of Appraisal at TE
1	Community participatory assessment and & planning workshops	Number	36	36	100
2	Community capacity building/training/technical support	Number	30	30	100
3	Report and map preparation	Number	36	36	100
4	Exchange visits	Number	36	36	100
5	Micro-project portfolios in Western ARD	L/Sum	12	12	100
6	Micro-project portfolios in North Bank ARD	L/Sum	12	9	75
7	Micro-project portfolios in Lower River ARD	L/Sum	12	8	67
8	Micro-project portfolios Central River North ARD	L/Sum	12	8	67
9	Micro-project portfolios in Central River South ARD	L/Sum	12	25	208
10	Micro-project portfolios in Upper River ARD	L/Sum	12	15	125
11	Participatory impact monitoring at individual community level	Number	126	72	53
12	Participatory impact monitoring at ARD level intra community meeting	Number	24	6	25
13	Participatory impact monitoring support at ARD level	Number	64	64	100
14	Digital cameras for ARD focal points	Number	8	8	100
15	Training the village watershed/landscape management committees	Number	108	108	100
16	Community level training in the use of LD assessment tool	Number	108	0	Zero
17	VDC organizational capacity building	Number	108	36	33
18	ARD level awareness raising and sensitization	Number	42	42	100

Table 2: Achievements Summary for Component 2: Watershed/Landscape Management up to TE

19	Production of briefing materials on SLM approaches	L/Sum	12	12	100
20	Validation trials and farmer demonstrations with tractors	Number	6	3	50
21	Validation trials/ farmer demonstrations with animal drawn equipment	Number	6	3	50
	Average Achievement Component Two		822	569	69

30. Achievements also included development of the Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Manual which was validated. As part of the participatory impact monitoring and evaluation, forms were developed and Visitor's books provided to Village Secretaries for completion. Secretaries were also provided with calculators, measuring tapes and weighing scales. However, only few of the Secretaries kept regular records. Notable exceptions were the Secretary at Darsilameh (NBR) and Daru (CRRS) who manifested excellent record keeping in English and Wolof respectively. On the validation and demonstration of Conservation Agriculture tools and techniques for upland farming, the project acquired 6 tractor mounted Ndume ploughs (chisel ploughs) and 36 animal drawn rippers to promote minimum tillage. Although the tillage equipment have been distributed to ARDs and to the 36 sites; no demonstrations or trainings has been conducted up to the TE. Given the importance of sustainable tilling practices for the maintenance of soil productivity the demonstrations and subsequent results will provide useful learning opportunities and information for the mechanization policy and should be pursued.

31. Component 3 comprises project management and focused on progress reporting, audits, the baseline surveys (ESMP and Socioeconomic), up to the TE. In this regard, seven out of eight progress reports were prepared, 3 out of 4 annual external audits conducted and both baselines studies conducted.

Outcomes and Impacts

32. The implementation of the SLMP culminated in positive outcomes and impacts for beneficiaries with the following tangible results: Establishment of SLM platforms at national and regional levels hinged on an Investment framework for SLM interventions for the medium term –GAMSIF (2016-2020). The project registered 68,441 direct beneficiaries of the project as at TE comprising 34,259 (50.1 %) females and 34, 182 (49.9%) surpassing the appraisal target of 66,000 direct beneficiaries.

33. An estimated 6, 250.66 ha was protected and put under cultivation from SLMP intervention sites with 3, 258.36 ha of upland (52%) and 2992.3 ha of lowland (48%). Figure presents the cultivated area by region and ecology (Upland and lowland) and shows that CRRS has the greatest area protected/cultivated in both upland and lowland. According to the figures a total of 3,258.36 ha were halted from soil erosion through the construction of upland bunds against an appraisal target of 7,500 ha registering 43%.

34. The three Google images show two protected lowland areas - Salikenne, NBR (954.4ha) with causeway; Kayai, CRR-N with foot bridge and dykes (117.8ha) and in the upland contour bunds and road in Fass Abdou CRR-S (239.3ha).



Figure 2: Protected lowland area with causeway in Salikenne, NBR (954.4ha)



Figure 3: Protected area with foot bridge and dykes in Kayai, CRRN (117.8ha)



Figure 4: Fass Abdou, Contour bunds and road, CRR/S (239.3ha)

35. The structures helped slow down speed of run off and diverted water protecting settlements from flooding. Data on flood disaster (NDMA records for CRRS and URR for 2011/12 and 2012/2013) indicate that 87 houses collapsed as a result of flooding before SLMP intervention compared to only 23 collapsing under similar flood conditions with the project. The structures also increased water infiltration ensuring greater moisture retention and maintained soil fertility. Beneficiaries reported increased crop production from fields due to increased yields and area under cultivation.

Figure 5: Area Protected through SLMP Intervention by Agricultural Region



36. Similarly, 2,992.3 ha of lowland was controlled from salinity and provided with capacity for water retention against an appraisal target of 1,500 ha and thus registering 200% of the target from lowland structures comprising causeways, dykes and footbridges. In addition the structure provided access to previously inaccessible fertile lands enabling cultivation on greater area at higher yields with transportation of inputs and outputs to crop fields greatly enhanced.

37. Yield increments were registered for all the crops covered under SLMP Interventions. Rice for which appraisal estimates exist for comparison with current yields registered an increase of 20% compared to the target of 1.4mt/ha. Figure 6 presents data on crop yields for in all the regions in which the project intervened and compared yields at inception (2011/2012) and those obtained for 2013/14. The table shows yield increments for all the crops and for all the regions. The highest yield increment was from rice in NBR, with an almost two fold increment from 853 kg/ha in 2011/2012 to 2497 Kg/ha in 2013/2014. Overall, yield increments were higher for rice, followed by groundnuts. The yield increment is attributable to the project infrastructure for salinity and water control, reduced erosion due to run-off and access roads. These have culminated in greater moisture retention; maintain soil nutrients and easier and timely access to field for timely agronomic operations.

Figure 6: Crop yield comparism for SLMP intervention areas



Source: NASS 2011/2012 and SLMP

38. According to data from the project on 2013/14, crop production from both the lowland and upland in the six regions totaled at 2,171.1 Mt. Table 1 provides data on production from the four principal crops: rice, millet, maize, sorghum and groundnuts and shows that the largest crop produced is groundnuts (972.7 Mt) mostly (98%) from the upland of CRRS. The second highest production is millet (562.7 Mt) again from the

upland in CRRS. In the case of rice (524.9 Mt), the increased production is attributed to the infrastructural development (dykes, causeways, spill ways and foot bridges) in the lowlands particularly from the NBR (327.1 Mt). While it has not been feasible to compare current production, with the baseline, the increases in yields has been a key determinant in the enhanced production. Given the significance of the aforementioned crops for household food security it could be inferred that, because the interventions in the targeted areas reduced soil erosion, restored fertility water retention and improved access to expanded area, particularly in the lowlands, higher yields, crop outputs and improved food security were obtained. Testimonies during the TE, particularly from beneficiaries of upland conservation structures indicated significant improvements in their food security status, with a reduction of the hungry months from 6 - 7 months to, on the average 3 months. Income from the initiated oyster culture using racks and from protection due to anti-hippo barriers are yet to stream in after harvest.

#	Region	Crop Proc	Crop Productions (Metric tons)				
_		Rice	Millet	Maize	Sorghum	Groundnuts	
1	CRRS	72.210	462.972	39.934	53.773	958.172	
2	CRRN	102.850					
3	LRR	6.231					
4	NBR	327.080	63.679	9.610			
5	WCR	16.527	18.612			14.550	
6	URR		17.440	7.438			
Tota	als	524.898	562.703	56.982	53.773	972.722	

Table 2: Production of major food crop from SLMP sites by Region

Source: SLMP Project Closure Report, 2015

Gender equity and women empowerment

39. Project intervention focus, particularly the lowlands, is the traditional domain of women, where they account for 90% of rice production. By intervening in this area, the project has deliberately targeted the females. The project registered 68, 441 direct beneficiaries, 50.1% of which (34,259) were female. Key infrastructure (footbridges, access roads, causeways) provided by the project ensured reduced travel time, convenience, security and access to social amenities such as markets and health centers as well as to crop fields. Also important as an interventions are the establishment of village woodlots= source of for fuel cooking and the anti-hippo barriers +

40. The project's participatory approach ensured women's active involvement in the planning and implementation of activities. The project ensured representation of women by insisting on 50% membership in all committees and decision making bodies. This resulted in all SLMP Committees having equal female representation. Women were targeted in the capacity building interventions notably: the MDFTs training as

TOT for 72 participants with eight females constituting 11% of participants; training on SLM for 180 farmers 55% of which were female; training in nursery management and tree production skills for 72 participants 50% of who were female; and, village development organizational capacity building in 36 villages for 216 VDC members comprising 50% female.

Efficiency

41. The project registered significant physical achievements with outcomes and outputs surpassing appraisal targets in most cases. Annex Iv, Table IB provides financial information on SLMP including expenditure at PCR by component against planned at appraisal. It revealed that more resources were deployed in component 2 (115%) which is the core of the project and therefore required more investment. Expenditure on component 1 and 3 at PCR were less than planned at appraisal at 66% and 56% respectively. Prudent planning and co-financing with PIWAMP allowed savings on the two components. The project adopted a participatory approach promoting interventions that are simple, low-cost and replicable and within the priorities of the communities. By anchoring SLMP on PIWAMP, resources were saved for project management and most of the associated overheads with the project employing only essential staff and utilizing the Project Steering Committee (PSC) to provide policy guidance to implementation. Similarly, the recruitment of a national TA allowed savings and made more resources available for investment activities.

42. The SLMP achieved the full complement of staff as par appraisal, with no changes during the period of implementation; the only exceptions being several changes of Coordinator at PIWAMP. The PMU prepared progress reports, AWP&B and procurement plans according to Gambia Government and AfDB guidelines with vetting by the PSC before eventual submission to the AfDB. The project employed an M&E System which used indicators from the logical framework.

Delays

43. A number of delays were experienced by SLMP from effectiveness to first disbursement, recruitment of TA for SLM and in the implementation of the demonstration tillage on conservation agriculture as follows:

- Delay in the start- up of project implementation with a prolonged duration of six months between project signing and effectiveness and three months between effectiveness and first disbursement. This delay was attributed to changes in Project Coordinator at PIWAMP during this period, which culminated in the SLMP continuing one year after the completion of PIWAMP.
- The recruitment of the TA for SLM which was critical to the institutional strengthening (Component 1) and guiding the micro-project interventions of beneficiaries (Component 2) was delayed until December, 2013 as two previously identified candidates were unavailable. The project resorted to hiring a national who performed exceptionally and passed on much needed skills to counterpart staff in IT and Google mapping software.
- The demonstration trials of the tillage equipment (tractor mounted and animal drawn) by NARI with farmers from the 36 sites could not be fully implemented as the equipment arrived late and coincided with institutional instability at the PIWAMP PMU.-
- The Implementation of micro projects on natural resources restoration and biodiversity was delayed due to initial focus PIWAMP-like interventions such as inter-village roads, upland bunds and lowland structures such as dykes, causeways, spillways and footbridges.

B. SUSTAINABILITY

Financial Sustainability

44. Beneficiaries have begun to realise tangible and potential increases in income, security from floods and enhanced food security from the SLMP interventions. They have also established in most cases sustainable funding mechanisms through community resource mobilisation for sustenance of the investments. There are already established VISACAs country-wide (with varying degrees of success) which can be approached for funding to upscale successful investments by beneficiaries. The synergy between VISACAs and other IFAD funded projects have been established and the linkage facilitated through the Country Programme Approach adopted by IFAD. This guarantees a win-win situation for both institutions.

45. The establishment of the national SLM platform partnership will facilitate the financial sustainability of the project through mainstreaming the concepts and principles of SLM into the environmental management, and economic development, plans and policies of those institutions with administrative and technical responsibility for economic development, environmental preservation, and land use, within The Gambia.

46. The GAMSIF has been completed and when launched and *the buy in obtained from* donors, would open a window for SLM investments to sustain the related activities. Similarly, sustained resource availability to continue will need to be addressed by local authorities, central government and other donors buying-in into SLM. The *Nema/Chosso* and P2RS projects can ensure continuity of the SLM activities.

Socio-political Sustainability

47. All the Village Development Committees (VDCs) and farmer organizations supported would continue their activities in the project area post SLMP, and *Nema* plans to consolidate and leverage on the gains made by SLMP in identifying and working with these village based groups. Nema uses the watershed planning approach and could consolidate this in the SLM groups by strengthening them for enhanced group cohesion and build up the social capital.

48. The involvement of the different land users and management groups (farmers, herders, foresters etc.) in a variety of participatory assessment and planning activities has increased the ability of the participating communities to control their own natural resources and to promote local ownership as they realise the benefits accruing to them as direct users of the land resources at the local level. These benefits will ensure that communities sustain the project.

49. The participatory planning process involving all groups, especially women and youth has empowered them as their contribution to project design and implementation allows them to express their needs, provide insights into problem analysis and ultimately the development of Community Action Plans (CAPs).

Technical

50. The project has built the capacity of implementing technical partners and beneficiaries. Thus the technical sustainability of its interventions - especially engineering works such as causeways, bunds, roads etc. but also on tree planting and management and on ecotourism - by raising the awareness of the beneficiary communities on the need for self-monitoring and self-maintenance of the structures.

Institutional Sustainability

51. The project institutional capacity building activities of all the key stakeholders will facilitate sustainability of the SLM. At the national level, the members of the PSU have skills that can be harnessed to support SLM activities even after project closure.

52. At the regional level, the RADs are the entry points for all agricultural related interventions and with enhanced skills and knowledge of SLM they can continue to provide support to community SLM activities. Similarly at the regional level are the MDFTs who have been exposed to SLM techniques and skills and have been instrumental in the development of CAPs. Their continued involvement with communities is their mandate and as frontline extension workers they are readily placed to offer technical assistance to the various communities engaged in SLM activities.

53. At the village level are the VDCs, which are the entry points at community level. VDCs are strong statutory institutions and have led development activities at village level. They have good governance structures, with established and functioning executives as evidenced through minutes, financial records (bank accounts) and constitutions/bye laws. The VDCs are engaged in resource mobilisation and support development initiatives. The project has encouraged communities to



mobilise resources to effect intermittent minor repairs to damaged SLMP infrastructures. There is available evidence that most communities have community resource mobilisation strategies even before the advent of the project. They have also been sensitised by the project that after project closure they should be in a position to hire the services of Service Providers (SPs) based on the engagement between them and SPs engendered by the project.

54. The established Village Farmers' Associations (VFAs) which need to be strengthened through further training and linkage with existing Apex Farmer Associations are also sustainable institutions(statutes, procedures, registration, finance and fund raising mechanisms) as their functions within the village provides potential for continuous village development through the participatory approach, post SLMP.

55. Institutional sustainability could also be ensured mainly through operational National SLM and regional platforms. Streamlining and alignment with existing functional structures (e.g. ANRWG of the NEA at national, regional, and village levels through the TACs) will be critical in this respect.

Environmental Sustainability

56. **Climate Change and Environment**: The CC and environmental sustainability of the project are embedded in the nature of the investments, such as access roads, bridges, dykes etc. as well as in the capacity building, awareness raising and policy work included in the work plan. Sustainable natural resources management and environmental sustainability have been strengthened through the forest regeneration and biodiversity investments which need to be invigorated at post SLMP.

The Social and Environmental Management Plan (ESMP)

57. The ESMP for the PIWAMP/SLM project was developed by the NEA and validated in April 2010. The National Environment Management Act (NEMA) 1994 mandates the NEA as the lead institution to enforce environmental standards in accordance with this Act & EIA Regulations.

58. This Act dictates that all agricultural projects classified under category B adhere to regulated environmental standards, within this context of an ESMP which is in line with IFAD's Policy on environmental safeguards and AfDB's environmental categorization, which is 2 for the SLMP. This implies the likelihood of site specific environmental and social impacts that can be minimized by the application of mitigation measures in the ESMP.

59. The ESMP ensured potential negative adverse environmental impacts and social risks related to project activities were identified and assessed. For example, it was observed that the improved road linking Tampoto and Kanuma in the NBR had affected the flow of water downstream which resulted in the inundation of some compounds within the village. Three Irish crossings were therefore recommended by the NEA monitoring team and constructed to allow easy flow of excess runoff water downstream. Similarly, at Bambako in LRR, observations were that the cement content in the mixture for the bridge construction was inadequate resulting to the exposure of iron materials use in the construction. In addition, the beam and the supported metal were not adequately protected from rusting as the paint used was not anti-corrosive as it stretches over a very concentrated saline water body. At the social level, the project activities generated lots of benefits to the communities, mainly expanding their access to improved cultivable areas resulting in increased production and income. To minimize the human/wildlife conflict, hippo barriers were constructed in Kayai (CRR-N) and Touba Demba Sama (CRR-S). Likewise, communities where logging was observed were advised to desist from such activities and to plant more indigenous trees to replace the logged ones. Gun owners were also advised to license their guns for rational small animal killing and scaring of wild animals to prevent crop damage

60. The ESMP contains an Environmental and Social Impact Assessment (ESIA) with a view to fully establish impacts of the activity on the environment and society in general; such impacts are defined for the entire life cycle of the activity. An ESIA is effectively performed where the project activities have a definite geographic location; this is not the situation with SLMP where activities are spread across the entire country. Nonetheless, the ESIA was conducted with the understanding that the agro-ecological and social conditions are generally uniform across the country and, importantly, the activities in these areas are almost the same. In other words, the environmental and social conditions surrounding a project activity in a particular *agricultural region* are largely the same conditions surrounding that activity in other regions thus providing the basis for performing the assessment. The assessment had two main components – a baseline survey and a validation process as described below.

61. Four (4) monitoring visits to SLMP sites have been conducted to check for the occurrences of any anticipated negative environmental impacts or adverse social effects and the compliance of the project with the appropriate mitigation measures provided in the ESMP document to cope with the adverse effects. The monitoring is done by a team comprising Environmentalists from the NEA (including an environmental journalist) Department of Forestry (DOF), Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM), Department of Water Resources (DWR), Horticulture Technical Services (HTS) Project M&E Officers (one each from PIWAMP PMU and Soil and Water Management Services (SWMS). Monitoring reports have been produced and submitted to the PMU.

62. ESMP and EIA are new tools to most stakeholders and the validation workshop for the survey was a learning opportunity for them. The mitigation measures that were stipulated in the Environmental and Social Management (and Monitoring) Plan (ESMP) for the PIWAMP project were still valid and were used to guide mitigation of potential environmental and social risks for the GEF supplemental project – the SLMP.

63. Mitigation measures identified by the ESMP were implemented. As mentioned above, in Bamako for example, the project had to redo the bridge by removing the wooden deck and replacing it with a concrete

one. Additionally, the concrete ramp was further extended to link it to the bridge. The metal railings and the other exposed metal structures were coated in anti-corrosive paint as recommended by the ESMP.

64. The ESMP as a guide, have ensured that established protocols to mitigate negative environmental impacts are being adhered to by the NEA joint environmental monitoring visits to project sites. These visits assessed the condition of the sites and the potential impact of the project intervention on the following: the fauna and flora, topography and land use within watersheds (soil erosion, drainage patterns etc.), erosion of the uplands (increase or decrease in sand deposition in the lowlands), water bodies resulting from pollution from agro-chemicals (pesticides, fertilizers), sensitive areas (wildlife protected areas, fragile environments, sanctuaries), other developments associated with the project activities and, relationship between the Project and other existing or proposed development. Observations and recommendations are provided after each visit to the PMU.

C. CATALYTIC ROLE AND REPLICATION

65. The SLMP was set up to address the interlinked problems of rural poverty, food insecurity, and land degradation through the development and promotion of innovative sustainable land management technologies and community-based participatory watershed/landscape management planning approaches, with the aim of restoring, sustaining and enhancing the productive and protective functions of The Gambia's upland and lowland ecosystem resources. To this end, the SLMP has played a catalytic role in the following:

66. The SLMP funded and facilitated the formulation of the GAMSIF, funding for implementation of which is being sought. The implementation of GAMSIF will be pivotal in mainstreaming SLM interventions in the development process in the country in the future.

67. Public awareness has been created through the project, and this has brought SLM to the forefront of sustainable agricultural development in the country. Beneficiaries and their communities are more aware and there is greater chance that SLM interventions will be included in their field activities.

68. Through the project, CAPs have been formulated in 36 communities in all the six agricultural regions of the country comprising the priorities of the communities. Communities could further develop the priorities into projects and seek co-financing from local authorities and/or projects. Similarly, the project facilitated a study tour to Burkina Faso including senior personnel of MOA who are now more informed on



conservation agriculture and who now have greater leverage in influencing the mechanization policy formulation process. The process is currently being spearheaded by staff of the Agricultural Engineering Unit of NARI

69. The SLMP has also facilitated the development of new knowledge products such as:

Indigenous Knowledge Systems on SLMP

Specifically, this study (March 2013) assessed farmers' knowledge/ concept of land degradation, (awareness and concern, consequences of land degradation, etc.); identified knowledge on various causes of land degradation; provided an inventory of knowledge on traditional methods of Soil and Water

Conservation; assessed their concept of watershed and watershed characteristics; identified which local techniques are successful and made recommendations for replication.

The report of the study revealed that there is a dearth of data on Indigenous Knowledge Systems (IKS) in soil and water conservation in The Gambia that only in the medical arena are there IKS developed and practiced. It was further revealed by the authors that even the literature in the internet provides no reference to IKS in The Gambia, neither are there studies that have been conducted in this area. The authors concluded with a strong emphasis on the importance of IK as it is becoming more and more evident that local/traditional knowledge has some merit and should not be discarded in favour of the introduced systems without checking the validity of IKS.

Socio-economic, mapping and wildlife inventory.

70. This inventory was carried out in 10 community wildlife reserves. The overall objective of this exercise is to make sure that 1500 ha of communal land is under formal protection and that sustainable land management is practiced alongside with bio-right projects through purely community participatory management approach by end of July 2014. This activity was preceded by settlement committee meetings for the designation of the ten community wildlife protected areas.

71. Conclusions that emanated from these exercises were that:

- The legally recognized community wildlife reserve/sanctuary will be planted with both wild and domestic fruit trees likewise threatened non fruit species to provide food for wildlife population. This will contribute significantly to reducing human wildlife conflicts such as crop raiding;
- the settlement committee to ensure that any individual claim made and confirmed by appropriate authorities concerned, be settled through negotiations and compensation in a form of land by villages with the support of the committee supersedes individual interest for the benefit of the village and the globe as a whole.

Organizational Capacity Building Training Manual

72. This manual was produced by the Department of Community Development. The main objective of this manual is to serve as a reference guide for field extension agents working directly with community-based groups such as Village Development Committees (VDCs), village subgroups such as Village Farmer Associations (VFAs), Dyke Management Committees (DMCs), Watershed Management Committees (WMCs) operating in watershed areas, Women's groups, youth groups and other community organisations. It is expected to bring positive change – changes in behaviour, knowledge, understanding, skills, interests, values, awareness and/ or attitudes of field extension workers of various agencies to transfer sustainable watershed management and community development techniques and approaches to the communities.

73. The gains in knowledge and skills of trainers in the various issues / themes in this manual is expected to spill over to the communities through the trainings of the MDFTs who will in turn undertake step-down training with the Village Farmers' Associations. The knowledge and skills transfer will increase farmer's ability to address their concerns especially pertaining to sustainable watershed management and community organizational development. The manual has been reviewed and deemed quite useful to extension workers and has been used in the training of VDCs, VFAs and other community groups. The manuals are however not

available at community levels except through the CFAs or MDTF members. Other institutions such as the FFS of the *Nema* Project are also utilising the manual.

Community Action Plans (CAPs)

74. The Community Mobilization Component conducted two rounds of Community Participatory Assessment and Planning sessions which together covered all the 36 SLM targeted villages. During these sessions information provided was focused on strategic planning. The exercise as an initial activity provided opportunity for stakeholders to share understanding on sustainability concept. It examined degraded nature of the land and also assisted community members to identify and prioritise land related problems and draw Community Action Plans (CAPs) in resolving the problems. An outcome from these PRAs is the development of village maps which most communities have also received copies which seems to be empowering the communities as they have enhanced visualisation of the various inter-related interventions within the watershed – this encouraged the communities to monitor progress of the implementation of the action plans. Copies of CAPs are kept at the village level (VDCs) and at the PMU. Most villages visited produced their CAPs for scrutiny. It is also the reference material for donors intending to intervene within a community ensuring that duplication of interventions is avoided. All the CAPs produced were well done, especially after a monitoring visit highlighted the need for more PRA tools to be utilised.

SLM Handbook

75. An SLM handbook was produced in April 2012and distributed, and after review by users (trainers) it was deemed too technical and it was therefore recommended that a new, more user -friendly version needs to be produced, integrating more aspects related to CC and ENRM (water, forestry, wildlife), in order to make it more relevant to the GEF/SLMP work plan. This was done and a booklet was produced and used for training.

PM&E Handbook

76. Participatory Monitoring is the systematic recording and periodic analysis of information that has been chosen and recorded by beneficiaries with the help of outsiders (PMU, Donors, etc.). For the purpose of PM&E of the SLMP, thirteen (13) data collection tools were designed as follows:

		Description of Ferm	Time of Data Callestian
No.	Name of Form	Description of Form	Time of Data Collection
1	Village Household Population	Provides information on the number of people living in the particular SLM intervention community. Gender disaggregates the population data (male, female and youth)	Beginning of the project with subsequent collections being done beginning of every year
2	Materials T&D	T&D (Travel and Delivery) form is to monitor the distribution of material provided by the project. This form takes account of the type of item supplied by the project to the community: quantity, date of delivery and the deliverer and recipient.	Beginning of the project with subsequent collections being done beginning of every year.
3	Seed Loan Distribution and Repayment	Inventory of seed loan to be able to determine amount owed and paid, including defaulters.	Beginning of the project with subsequent collections being done beginning of every year.
4	Seed Loan Area Coverage and Yield	Captures area under which the acquired seeds were sown and what yield was harvested out of the cultivated area.	Beginning of the project with subsequent collections being done beginning of every year.

Table 3: Participatory Monitoring data collection tools

5	Village Household Crop Area	Captures information on total area put under cultivation by crop for the entire community	Beginning of the project with subsequent collections being done beginning of every year
6	Village Household Crop Yield	Captures information on total production of all major crops cultivated in a particular season for the entire community	Beginning of the project with subsequent collections being done beginning of every year.
7	SLM Micro Projects	Determines the number and types of micro projects initiated and the beneficiary participation.	
8	Bridge Construction Form –	Records the number of days worked as number of participants multiplied by the hours worked, and the number of cement and other inputs used during the construction process.	October to July when civil works are going on at project sites.
9	Causeway Construction Form	Records the number of days worked as number of participants multiplied by the hours worked during the construction process.	October to July when civil works are going on at project sites.
10	Dyke Construction	Records the number of days worked as number of participants multiplied by the hours worked, and the number of cement and other inputs used during the construction process.	October to July when civil works are going on at project sites.
11	Spillway Construction	Records the number of days worked; number of participants multiplied by the hours worked multiplied by the unit cost of labour, and the amount of cement and other inputs used during the construction process.	October to July when civil works are going on at project sites.
12	Well Construction	Records the number of days spent on the well, quantity of materials used and depth of the well including the water column.	This information should be collected concurrently with the well digging progress.
13	Tree Planting	Records the number and species of plants transplanted by each community and the survival rates from each of these woodlots for the first four years	

GAMSIF Study

77. The overall goal of GAMSIF is to mainstream and scale up SLM to secure ecosystem services and improve rural livelihoods. In this regard, the GAMSIF is aimed at reversing the trend of land degradation; improving land management and agricultural productivity and natural resource-based livelihoods by scaling–up and mainstreaming SLM and NRM in the development framework of The Gambia. The GAMSIF has been prepared as a precursor to a full country SLM investment plan to operationalise the framework, which will be prepared during the implementation of the GAMSIF.

78. The GAMSIF was prepared with technical support from the TerrAfrica Secretariat of NEPAD, as well as the African Development Bank, IFAD, and the GEF through the PIWAMP/SLM Project. In addition, the GAMSIF is based on the GEF/TerrAfrica guidelines⁴ on the preparation of Country SLM Investment Frameworks.

⁴ <u>http://tinyurl.com/qdffl3f</u>.

Study Tour to Burkina Faso

79. SLMP organized a 10 day trip for 15 multi-sectoral personnel to Burkina Faso in December 2012 headed by Permanent Secretary MOA. The main objective of this tour was to enhance the senior policy makers and technical experts' knowledge of different tillage techniques. Burkina was chosen by virtue of being the host country to the Africa Conservation Tillage Network (ACT) office for West and Central Africa.

80. During the course of the tour, participants visited SLM/SWC techniques in the semi –arid zone of Burkina and held meetings with staff of IFAD sponsored Programme de Development Rural Durable. A conducted tour of project sites by the officers exposed them to conservation techniques like the *zai pit*, *half-moon pit and stone bunds construction and plant residue management*. Other observations include the use of CA equipment like the direct jab planter and the ripper which are animal drawn. It emanated from this tour as

a recommendation that the SLMP project through NARI should replicate the ripper technology in The Gambia. And that since many farmers in the Region of Fatick, Senegal are using animal drawn ripper, it was further recommended that some Gambian farmers should be taken on a study tour to observe the technology from their counter parts in Senegal. Subsequently, interested private sector firms can promote this technology and build supply chains as demand increases.

Videos

81. Eight (8) videos were produced by the Communication Education Extension Services (CEES) for the project: i.) DoF Nursery Training (2014); ii) Fass Abdou Traffic Count on the new village rod (2014); iii) Herder Interview at Cattle Watering Point – Sare Seydou (2014); iv) Interview with Sang Bass (a FCA) on the newly constructed bridge at Kayai (2014); v) Jimara Bakadaji Women's' Group (2014); Moringa seed distribution and Sensitisation Meeting (2014); SWC Training Part I (2014) and SWC Training Part II (2014). These are captured in the local languages on different project activities. There are no subtitles to these videos which would enhance accessibility and understanding by a wider range of viewers.

Radio drama episodes

82. The Department of Parks and Wildlife Management (DPWM) under its awareness creation programme for the project organised the development of 24 radio drama episodes on rice cultivation vis-à-vis climate change; wildlife management; conflict between wildlife and farmers; causes of these conflicts and how to resolve them. The whole process was community owned and driven: messages were developed by the community members during a message development workshop; the community members played the different roles in the drama. These episodes were played over 7 Community Radio Stations, covering 4 regions of the country. They were very interactive and some Community Radio Stations are still airing them due to popular demand by farmers.

Conservation Agriculture tools and techniques for upland farming

83. The Agricultural Engineering Unit of NARI is spearheading the Conservation Agriculture (CA) demonstrations and has selected 36 upland sites. This intervention is at it very initial phases with rippers and the chisel ploughs acquired. The AES plans to demonstrate the use of the Ripper on upland cereals comparing



it with farmer's practices in which regard the distribution of 36 animal drawn rippers to the ARDs was completed. A similar effort was made in the promotion of minimum tillage using 6 tractor-drawn Ndume Ploughs (Chisel Plough) as demonstration per ARD. Six of this tractor mount chisel ploughs were procured from Turkey at the tail end of the project distributed one each to an ARD. Neither the animal drawn ripper nor the chisel plough demonstration has taken place ever since and most of the Directors have not been properly sensitized particularly on the purpose of the tractor mount chisel ploughs. Given the importance of sustainable tilling practices for the maintenance of soil productivity these demonstrations should be funded by Nema so that the trials will provide useful learning and information for the mechanization policy.

Google Mapping for upland conservation

84. Google mapping of some intervention sites were done through training of the SLMP Coordinator by the SLMP TA. Google mapping is a new idea for the project as it allows ease in calculating the area reclaimed by the different project structures and estimation of harvest per area. This technique for estimation of area is now fully used by the ongoing projects such as *Nema*.

Evaluation of the Knowledge Products

85. Generally, all the knowledge products developed were of sound technical quality. They each carry essential messages which are easy to understand and are accessible to users. All the manuals developed have also been very useful to trainers and in facilitating step-down training at village level. All the manuals are written in a simple language, easy to comprehend, except for the SLMP Handbook which was deemed too technical for the MDFTs and farmers to understand and use, resulting in the adoption of a recommended simplified booklet which has been used to conduct the trainings.

86. It is difficult to assess the intended target audience for the videos produced as it is not clearly articulated who they are meant for; what these videos would accomplish in terms of adding value to the SLMP implementation or sustainability and the dissemination mechanism to reach a wider audience. None of the videos reviewed had any subtitles, thus also limiting the audience to those beneficiary communities. It is recommended that subtitles are edited on the videos and aired through the GRTS for nationwide dissemination. In addition, the CEES could be contracted by one of the on-going projects to organise mobile video shows at the SLMP targeted communities and new ones with similar interventions identified by the ongoing projects.

87. The Socio-economic Baseline study and the ESMP are also very well written with graphs to indicate the data results from the baseline. Similarly, the study on IKS has proffered some recommendations which if implemented will most especially result in the creation of a database of IK. These have been useful in establishing benchmarks for the project to which the project staff refer to determine the quantum of changes from the baseline, and during and after project intervention. Workshops to validate these studies are considered to be learning events and have provided opportunities for others to learn and had provided a forum for feedback from other stakeholders. All the various capacity building activities of SLMP have increased the in-country knowledge about the SLM options and potential to contribute towards the attainment of the goals and objectives of the project.

88. The GEF support to GOTG has assisted and *catalysed* the realisation of major environmental and socioeconomic benefits through investments in Sustainable Land Management interventions such as restoring, sustaining and enhancing the protective and productive functions of the lowland and upland ecosystems. The lowland and upland sustainable activities have resulted in a significant increase in the returns from livelihood activities at the community and individual household levels. This has a positive impact on food security at various levels and has also contributed to the alleviation of rural poverty. Food stock now last for an average of 4-6 months as opposed to 1-3 months before project intervention.

89. The SLMP, while not having successfully established sustainable regional woodlot nurseries⁵, and community nurseries⁶ despite the vigorous tree planting campaigns carried out in 18 out of the 36 SLMP

intervention villages across the country; it has however engendered an understanding and appreciation of the value of tree planting within some of the targeted communities, especially in restoring their degraded woodlands and ecosystems, managing and protecting woodlots for their future benefits, enhancing soil fertility and improving upon the existing forest from further depletion thereby maintaining the ecosystem for future generations and as a source of income. The lack of wells to guarantee continued water supply impacted severely on the sustainability of these woodlots. It is therefore prudent to have a reliable water source established within woodlots for management of the nurseries until ready for transplanting.



90. In Sare Saydou (CRR-S), the team saw evidence of backyard tree nursery being maintained by individual farmers. In Daru (CRR-S), the Secretary of the SLMP committee and the VDC reported that while the community woodlot is not successful, individuals have set up tree nurseries in their backyards. These are species of *gmalina*, *tallo*, *moringa*, *jalo*, *dimba taba*, *mangoes and cashew*. Some have also planted fodder species for animal feed as a coping strategy during the dry season. In most gardens, farmers have established cashew orchards which serve as an income source. A local farmer, Modou Suwareh has over 1000 cashew trees in his farm.

91. The SLMP has also catalysed some communities for example, Daru (CRR-S), Fass Abdou (CRR-N) and

Kassagne in WCR. In Kassagne the community to transplant 10, 000 mangrove propagules⁷ along the riverine edge of *Bintang Bolong*, having been exposed to the value of the mangrove forest in improving fish stock, cleaning the bolong and providing a haven for oysters breeding.

92. Another very significant catalytic role associated with the SLMP is the expansion of the Rural Health Team's (RHT's) coverage into previously inaccessible areas which limited access to health services from the district and or regional offices. It has contributed to the improvement of the quality of life of the target beneficiaries. The community of Kumbija reported the constraints encountered before the construction of their 6 km. inter-village road linking them to Basse (the UR Regional Capital) and Fatoto (the eastern most part of the country). Vehicular transport was severely restricted during the rains. Even enticements with increased fares were not enough to convince any driver to venture to Kumbija. This had serious implications for



⁵ The DoF now supplies communities with seedlings on demanded

⁶ Only 3 communities had good nurseries: Fass Abdou, Sare Saydou and Badari

⁷ Seeds that develop into seedlings on the shrub before dropping

women in labour, emergency cases, delivery of consumer goods, etc. As a Kumbija farmer explained during the TE field trip:

"The construction of the road has been of great benefit to us.

Before, taxis and other commercial vehicles do not come into the village. Now, they come...Thanks for the road. Before a taxi trip from Basse to Kumbija would cost D350.Now, it only costs D150. Before the road [construction] we did not go to Basse at all...Even for the women to sell their garden produce was difficult if at all.

BUT! Now...evacuation of the garden produce is easy. Some off takers even come to the garden themselves to buy the produce. This is all because of the road.

93. In Kayai, the story is the same. The 8 km. inter-village road with 3 Irish Crossings linking Fula Kunda and Kayai have significantly improved the quality of life of the residents of this and other villages along the road. WFP School Feeding Supplies were often left undelivered at Fula Kunda with the poor state of the road virtually cutting them off from any possible delivery to the schools.

94. The community of Kayai also explained that the conservation bunds constructed through SLM have drastically reduced soil erosion and prevented flooding of the village and settlements for the first time over many years. It was further acknowledged by these beneficiaries that one of their popular village water wells was protected from contamination by runoff water this rainy season, all due to the preventative role played by the contour and diversion bunds constructed by the project. This, in spite of the magnitude of this year's

(2015) rains, they have not abandoned the use of that water well during the rainy season, as was usually the situation before project intervention.

95. Other communities surrounding the intervention communities where roads have been built also reported that the roads have additionally reduced drudgery, saved lives of babies and mothers and enhanced access to social facilities such as markets, health centers.

96. The SLMP has *dared farmers to dream* of expanded crop production in areas that were once thought to be inaccessible. The implementation of

causeways, dykes and footbridges have allowed farmers to realise their dreams. They now boast of increased productivity due to these SLMP structures which have improved soil fertility, reduced erosions, and retained water during production periods.

97. The SLMP has also played a catalytic role in the production of the GAMSIF – an investment framework with an indication of incremental investment requirements for SLM over the next 10 - 15 years into which development partners can contribute. This is an important milestone and one which will be of great benefit to SLM when it is launched.





98. The SLMP support to the development of *Conservation Agriculture* has engendered a keen and passionate attitude towards CA of some key MoA officers⁸ especially after a 10-day successful Study Tour to Burkina Faso. Despite the inability of the project to kick start the CA activities, dissemination of the technology has been done among the RADs for further demonstrations at farmer levels. 24 farmer demonstrators were selected in 2014 cropping season and issued each with a complete set of ripper to conduct CA trials on upland cereals using animal power.



99. While the study tour was a useful learning exercise, and could be used to develop an informed policy for future agricultural mechanization within the Gambia, this has not been pursued and the high attrition rate within MOA could result in key tour participants not being available to contribute to the policy formulation for mechanization. However given the increasing use of tractors for land preparation, the formulation of a mechanization policy will be crucial to ensuring sustainable utilization of the fragile land resources. In this regard, the MOA should constitute a task force to follow up from the tour to guide the formulation of the policy.

Replication

100. A number of innovations were embarked upon by the SLMP during implementation, they comprise the following: The project enhanced Knowledge management through study tours and exchange visits at regional and local levels. The Study Tour to Burkina Fasso by Senior Government and project staff engendered greater awareness on conservation agriculture and on the various techniques employed. Following the study tour to Burkina Faso, recommendations were that NARI and PIWAMP/SLMP should replicate the CA Field School and introduce some of the CA implements (especially the ripper). The use of the ripper in cultivation was part of a programme sponsored by USAID in Senegal. Many farmers in the Region of Fatick are using the ripper pulled by donkey or horse, and local blacksmiths have been trained to manufacture the ripper. It may be necessary to take some farmers across the border for a couple of days to observe the technology from their counter parts in Senegal. This can be organised by *Nema* and sponsored by the on-going *Nema/Chosso*, P2RS and FASDEP.

101. At Sare Seydou 30mx20mx1.5m depth cattle drinking pond (see Google map and photo) was excavated and serving 9 kraals with an estimated population of 770 cattle. According to eye witness accounts which is backed by herdsmen interviews, water collected in this pond during the rains could only serve its purpose for three months after the season. In this regard, future pond excavation plans should consider as

their bases, the livestock population multiplied by the livestock daily per capita consumption of water which is estimated to be 20 litres on the average for cattle.

Dr. Sait Drammeh, PS II, MOA, Chief of Party; (2) Asheme Cole, DPS, MOA, Pro Coordinator, CPCU; (4) Noah Kujabi, Financial Controller, CPCU; (5) Momodo Touray, Financial Controller, PIWAMP/SLMP; (7) Lamin Camara, Ministry of Financial



Touray, Financial Controller, PIWAMP/SLMP; (7) Lamin Camara, Ministry of Finance; (8) Musa Humma, DG, DOA; (9) Ebrind Saidy-ARD, LRR; (10) Habib Touray-ARD, CRR/S; (11) Ousman Jammeh-ARD, WCR; (12) Musa Bayo, Upland Coordinator, PIWAMP; (13) Kebba Manka Coordinator, SLMP; (14) Haruna Jobe, NEA; (15) Mathew Mendy, NARI.

102. The SLMP promoted the use of google map planimeter for mapping and computing area covered by interventions, although Nema/P2RS are already using the technology, similar projects in the country could employ it for accurate determination of their intervention areas.

103. The project promoted village tree nurseries which also entailed training of communities on nursery management. The seedlings were subsequently planted in the woodlots and on upland fields as farm boundaries, wind break, erosion control and for income and food. This activity could be linked with the annual tree planting campaign by the Department of Forestry. Nema/Chosso has tree planting as an intervention for restoration of degraded uplands.

104. The promotion of NRM investment interventions with beneficiaries having the choice to select and implement the most beneficial interventions to address local and global issues. Key NRM interventions such as woodlots, mangrove rehabilitation, tree planting, anti-hippo dykes, as well as enhanced physical access to fields and social amenities (health facilities, markets, schools) through roads and footbridges are vital for sustainable NRM and agricultural productivity. A number of NRM intervention are planned for implementation under Nema/Chosso.

105. The project enhanced Knowledge management through study tours and exchange visits at regional and local levels. The Study Tour to Burkina Fasso by Senior Government and project staff engendered greater awareness on conservation agriculture and on the various techniques employed.

106. Use of community radio for the dissemination of information to beneficiaries, given the wide and popularity of radio as a medium of communication. This channel of communication though not much utilized by SLMP is worth replicating.

107. Knowledge products – the promotion of knowledge products including manuals and Videos were used by the project to enhance skills and knowledge of beneficiaries. In this regard manuals such as the SLM handbook for use by MDFTs on conservation, the organizational capacity building training and that for PM&E are pertinent and replicable by similar projects.

108. Use of VDC as entry point for community development and planning. Through these structures SLMP PRAs were conducted culminating in CAPs which prioritized the development needs of the community. The Nema project is replicating elements of this in the watershed planning interventions.

109. The promotion of CA especially through minimum tillage using appropriate soil conservation practices such as using rippers (animal and tractor drawn), which ensure optimum use soil nutrients and land cover. The introduction of this technology was delayed during the implementation of the SLMP and needs to be continued with support under Nema/Chosso and other projects.

110. The SLMP engaged in Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation (PM&E) with secretaries of all groups trained on data collection and provided with scales, calculators, quire books and ropes to enable them monitor progress of interventions. While a few kept upto-date records, most did not have full or recent data. While it will be prudent to replicate this, it has to be linked with enhanced literacy of beneficiary groups.

111. The Socio-economic baseline and ESMP studies that have been completed and validated will assist in building of knowledge that can be disseminated in country and other projects with similar SLM objectives. The KM and Communication component of the Nema should disseminate these findings to other sister projects through seminars, project briefs, etc.

D. STAKEHOLDER PARTICIPATION/ PUBLIC AWARENESS

112. Relevant stakeholders are defined here as all those who have been or are likely to be affected by the project or activity, those who have participated in or contributed to the project, and those who in other ways have a stake in the outcomes of the project or activity. To this end, the SLMP has been successful in reaching a variety of stakeholders at national, regional and community levels. The design of the SLMP went through a very inclusive consultative process that featured the active participation of all stakeholders through information sharing and consultation and by seeking their participation in project design, implementation, and elaboration of the M&E system.

113. At the **National Level** the following ministries and related departments and national platform representatives are key stakeholders in the project and participated in the consultative process of the design stage: the Executive Director of NEA who is the National Focal Point for the Global Environment Facility (GEF), Permanent Secretaries of Ministries of Agriculture (MoA) and Finance (MoFEA), Directors of the Department of Community Development and line Departments under Ministry of Agriculture, President of Farmers' platform, and NAWFA. These representatives were also members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC). In so doing, the SLMP made valuable use of the local knowledge, experience and institutional memory of representatives from the mentioned institutions in guiding the implementation process.

114. At the *Regional level*, the entry point for the project are the Regional Agricultural Directorates (RADs) which are members of the Technical Advisory Committees (TACs) and are responsible for the supervision of regional level agricultural activities. They liaise with support staff, field supervisors, principal officers and Conservation Field Assistants (CFA). To ensure their participation all the 6 Regional Governors and their respective TACs were sensitised and consulted during the design and implementation of the SLMP. Various sensitisation meetings on the SLMP were conducted by the project staff with all the VDCs within intervention villages. The ANR&E sub-committees and MDFTs of the TACs were also sensitised on the SLMP and trained on community participatory assessment methods. RADs/SLM Regional Farmers Consultative Fora have also been organised countrywide in a bid to conduct community consultations on SLM issues. Sixty Farmers with equal gender representation from each regional SLMP intervention site across the country attended. The objective of the fora was to evaluate the achievements of SLMP registered, constraints or challenges encountered by both the farmers and project and the ways forward to remedy the problems for sustainability purpose.

115. Beneficiary participation at *community level* is facilitated by the Village Development Committees (VDCs) as the entry points for community development projects. Within each VDC are sub-committees created with equal gender representation to facilitate implementation of sectoral projects. Thus there are 36 SLMP sub-committees created by the project. These committees facilitate the participation of community members in project related work, such as the repairs of access roads, culverts and bunds, reforestation activities and replanting of mangroves. With support from the VDCs, they also mobilise resources to realise their development objectives within their communities. In Kumbija, for example, the community members contribute D300 every quarter as levies for work to be done. Income is also derived from the sale of sand (deposited from run-offs) and musical/cultural shows.

116. At *community level*, members from the selected intervention sites were also sensitised on SLMP and its *modus operandi*. The project further facilitated the establishment and legal registration of 36 VFAs, 36 SLMP Committees and trained them on the concept of watershed management and SLM culminating in their identification of priority interventions and development of Community Action Plans for their respective watersheds. A total of 576 community members were sensitised and trained, with a 50% gender representation. Feedback from community members were provided during meetings and training

programmes and these have been instrumental in shaping implementation strategies. Thus, participation at beneficiary level has been highly satisfactory.

117. **Service Providers** - For the execution of project activities and acquisition of M&E information, The PMU signed annual agreements with 8 implementing agencies called Service Providers. These are The National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI), The Soil and Water Management Services (SWMS), The Department of Community Development (DCD), The Department of Forestry (DOF), The Animal Health and Production Services (AHPS), The Planning Services (PS), The Communication, Extension, Education Services (CEES), and The National Environment Agency (NEA). Each Service Provider has designated a focal point as entry point to work with the project. Their respective participation and contribution to project implementation especially in data collection, monitoring and training has been adjudged to be satisfactory based on an annual assessment of all SPs to determine their continued engagement with the project. Some of the constraints registered by some SPs include for example the late arrival of inputs (wheelbarrows, iron rods, etc.) for the timely implementation of works on the woodlots and insufficient fuel supply to effectively monitor activities (NEA Monitoring Team).





PROVIDER	SERVICE RENDERED
PUBLIC SERVICE PROVIDER	
Department of Agriculture (DOA)	Site selection, Training of trainers (MDFTs), Conservation Agriculture (CA) trainings
Soil and Water Management Services (SWMS)	Technical supervision of upland conservation/diversion bunds; footbridges; causeways and dykes
Department of Forestry(DOF)	Woodlots promotion and forest enrichment through training and nursery establishments
Department of Parks and Wildlife Management(DPWM)	Mangrove restoration and resolution human/wildlife conflict through construction of anti-hippo barriers
National Agricultural Research Institute (NARI)	Conduct of demonstration trials on Conservation Agriculture (CA) using the tractor mounted chisel and animal drawn ripper
National Environment Agency (NEA)	Preparation of the Environmental and Social Management Plan (ESMP), environmental monitoring and membership of the PCC
PRIVATE SERVICE PROVIDER	
Green Impact Ltd	Construction of inter-village and farm access roads, footbridges, causeways and dykes
Nema General Merchandise	Fencing of woodlots

Public Awareness

118. To raise public awareness on SLMP at the start of the project, regional (RAD) level sensitisation meetings/campaigns on SLMP were conducted at all 36 SLM selected sites to raise the level of awareness on SLM and what it entails. It targeted Village Development Committees (VDCs) comprising men and women

group leaders, village alkalos and councillors. The campaign was conducted through group meetings in the villages supposed to receive investment support from the SLM. Resource persons and supervisor made presentations on which the group deliberated and discussed through comments and questions aimed at enhancing capabilities of resource owners for better management. The topics covered included: Background of SLMP/ PIWAMP; SLMP/PIWAMP goal, objectives, purpose and principles; Soil management for effective conservation; the concept and formation of VDC; Relationship between VDC and Village Farmers Association (VFA); Role of VFA/VDC in the implementation of SLM activities; Role of soil and Water Management Services of Ministry of Agriculture; Negative impact of land degradation and climatic changes and Integrated Agroforestry practice. The public campaigns engendered greater awareness of SLMP resulting in increased demand through requests for project services at RAD level.

119. The PIWAMP/SLM project also prepared and distributed yearly calendars on the activities of the PIWAMP/SLMP to stakeholders. The calendars featured few photos of SLMP structures. In addition, the SLMP structures were not clearly designated as such and thus it is not easy to identify SLMP specific interventions. Furthermore, there were no T-shirts, brochures or videos for publicity purposes and to raise awareness of SLMP.

120. Except for the anti-hippo barriers, the Project did not use the available regional Community Radio Stations to expand dissemination of messages to raise awareness of the SLMP. While the SLMP employed community level sensitisations and awareness raising activities, there were only few public awareness activities beyond the intervention communities. This point is well articulated during a PSC meeting (April, 2013) at which it was posited that:

"...a lot of work done by the projects go unnoticed due to inadequate publicity. The GRTS slot allocated to Agriculture is underutilised....For the way forward, the Deputy Director was advised to use their mandate to engage the M&E officers of the projects to draw up a programme to address the project s' visibility issue."

121. Similarly, after the TOT workshop for the Regional Technical Committee and MDFT members, a recommendation for the DoA was for "film shows and radio sensitization programmes to be conducted to compliment extension efforts in making sure information and technology transfer reach the farmers" There is however, no evidence of this having been done by the project.

122. As mentioned earlier, the Department of Parks and Wildlife Management under its awareness creation programme for the project organised the development of 24 radio drama episodes on rice cultivation vis-à-vis climate change; wildlife management; conflict between wildlife and farmers; causes of these conflicts and how to resolve them.

123. Also, as already alluded to, Eight (8) Videos were produced by the project. These are captured in the local languages on different project activities.

E. COUNTRY OWNERSHIP/ DRIVENNESS

124. In addition to the above, several Government actions indicate its willingness to take ownership of the project: the members of the PSU have been on trek to visit project intervention sites; the Director of Aid Coordination at the MoFEA participated in a joint trek with SLMP staff to visit project sites; high level Government Officials participate in the IFAD led Supervision Missions' debriefing meetings which are chaired by the MoFEA. The Government has also endorsed the findings and recommendations of the Supervision Missions and has signed all Aide Memoires for the Project.

125. The SLMP was a demand driven project with several micro-projects to choose from. This has galvanised targeted communities' collective sense of ownership as these interventions address critical

environmental, social and economic concerns. Not owning them means regressing to their former state of poverty and hardship. Kaba Saama a committee member of the Forest funded by SLMP stated that "the success of the community forest activity was based on strong community forest bye laws in place and unity that help the community to take ownership of this very project of the Village".

G. PREPARATION AND READINESS

126. In view of the recognition of land degradation as a key constraint to agricultural productivity by the Government, there was high level commitment and participation by senior officials in the design of the project. Project goals and components were clearly articulated and consistent with macroeconomic and sector policies. Furthermore, SLMP was anchored on PIWAMP with counterpart and specific staffing. There was agreement on the separation of accounting and reporting commitments to ensure accountability for the SLMP to AfDB and GEF.

127. The formulation and appraisal of the SLMP followed a stakeholder consultative process linked to PIWAMP, which ensured that the proposed investment activities were in line with national and regional level priorities, development strategies and administrative structures. The consultations held with key national and local level institutional stakeholders in the design process resulted in the focus on a two tiered SLM coordination at both National and ARD levels. In addition, the community based participatory approach for the preparation of the village area watershed/landscape management plans, which was developed following extensive ARD and community level consultations, ensured that investments reflected local level development priorities and concerns.

128. The design rightly identified the MDFTs and Technical specialist from the PMU and at the RAD level to drive the planning and implementation of the field level SLM interventions. Similarly, beneficiary communities were identified and took the lead in the participatory planning activities, thereby ensuring that they were at the forefront within their village area when it cames to: (i) identifying the lowland and upland ecosystem issues that need to be addressed; (ii) determining the type and nature of the SLM investments required; (iii) mobilising community level cash and in-kind contributions for the agreed SLM investments; and (iv) monitoring and evaluating the impact of implementing their watershed/landscape management plan.

129. Lessons from previous projects were incorporated in design. The SLMP was designed to build on the successful experience of the PIWAMP and the previous GoTG/AfDB/IFAD funded Lowlands Agriculture Development Project (LADEP) that used simple technologies and self help labour that ensured sustainability. While LADEP focused on water retention and tidal access works aimed at increasing rice production in the lowlands, PIWAMP broadened this to include SLM related activities in the uplands. The SLMP retains the demand driven and participatory planning approach with activities expanded to include support for a range of SLM activities related to crop, livestock and forest production within the uplands. These are in addition to the lowland rice development activities that had been the focus of LADEP. Other lessons learnt from previous interventions included the formation of community based user groups to manage water control infrastructure installed during project implementation and also the in kind contribution of the community towards the community demand driven micro-project investments.

130. The design may have been overoptimistic as some of the initial targets in the results framework were revised shortly before the MTR and the project was extended by one year. The extension was necessary as Component 1 was behind schedule due to the late recruitment of the TA , who only came on board in December, 2013.

H. IMPLEMENTATION APPROACH AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

131. SLMP was planned to be co-terminus with PIWAMP with a duration of 4 years. Its implementation has been embedded in MOA with the decentralized government approach in which activities are implemented at national, regional (RAD) and community levels. Field level implementation has been with 36 communities/villages selected for project intervention.

132. The PIWAMP PMU, the Regional Directorates and the SLMP watershed/landscape sub-committees of the VDC's, trained in all 36 communities were charged with project implementation. The project thus adopted a participatory approach. As required the SLMP adopted the Annual Work Plan and Budget (AWPB) process prepared by the PMU, submitted to the PSC for review and approval before subsequent submission to the Bank. The PMU produced as required separate AWPB, annual external audit reports and annual progress reports. The PIWAMP/Nema Steering Committees (with addition of DWR and TANGO) maintained the oversight functions for The SLMP. Seven SLMP meetings were convened which reviewed and approved the Annual Work Plan and Budgets for 2012, 2013 and the Consolidated 18-month Work Plan for 2014/15. The PMU also carried out procurements for works (access roads, dykes, spillways, footbridges, upland contour bunds etc), goods (vehicles, motor cycles, computers, office furniture etc), and services (capacity building, baseline and other studies) in line with GOTG and AfDB procedures. It prepared seven out of eight progress reports, conducted three of four external annual audits, prepared 4 of AWPB and conducted three annual review meetings.

I. MONITORING AND EVALUATION

M&E Design

133. At design, a robust M&E system was developed. It envisaged a participatory data collection, monitoring and evaluation framework from the village level to the regional and then to the national level. A Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Manual was developed and validated. Validation of the SLMP PM&E manual was held at the Agricultural Rural Farmers Training Centre, Jenoi. All the nine service providers of the project, M&E Officers of sister donor funded projects, the 6 Regional Agricultural Directors, Director General of Agriculture, Deputy Permanent Secretary Programs and Projects and a representative of the National Assembly Select Committee on Agriculture attended the occasion. During the workshop the draft PM&E manual was presented for review by the above mentioned stakeholders.

134. During the design, a number of SMART indicators were provided for the SLMP in the Logical Framework. These comprised 4 impact indicators, 11 outcome and 31 output level indicators. These were subsequently revised in 2014 following the Joint Supervision Mission by the AfDB and IFAD.

135. An M&E reporting framework was also developed at design stage which envisaged the following:

- i. The preparation of six monthly activity reports for submission, through IFAD/AfDB, to the GEF secretariat in accordance with GEF reporting requirements;
- ii. The Project Implementation Report (PIR);
- iii. The commissioning of a base line environmental study (in project year one) and a special impact study (in project year four) to determine the nature and extent of the local and global environmental benefits realised as a result of project implementation (particularly component 2); and,
- iv. The mid-term review (beginning of year 3).

M&E Plan Implementation

136. Initial activities under M&E plan implementation comprised the socioeconomic baseline and the ESMP which were completed in April and September 2012 respectively.

Baseline Socio Economic Survey

137. The main objective of the socio-economic baseline survey is to critically assess the current level of knowledge and awareness of communities benefiting from the SLMP interventions. It is aimed to generate data so as to establish baseline values for the important indicators against which achievements obtained as a result of SLM programs interventions shall be measured.

138. The survey report documented the various socio-economic activities, watershed benefits and status of livelihoods of people around selected watershed areas that will serve as an instrument for monitoring impacts of the interventions. Specifically, the results of the survey provided suggestions to harness sustainable utilization of watershed resources; assessment of awareness levels of the beneficiaries on the PIWAMP/SLMP intervention; socio-economic level of the beneficiaries; interventions to enhance community livelihoods from watershed products and, sustainable utilization and management of the watersheds.

139. Some of the conclusions drawn from the survey were: low formal education of respondents; average household ranges from 13 in NBR to 20 in CRRS; main livelihood income for the households are farming, trading, fishing, remittance and charcoal burning; erosion is a problem in all the regions with siltation being a major problem in the rice fields compounded by high acidity. Deforestation is also a major problem in the intervention areas.

140. Some suggestions provided by the study include establishment of community-based watershed associations in all the intervention sites; introduction of both upland and low land cultivars that are short duration and can do well in intervention site, and encourage farmers to adopt them; participatory impact monitoring and evaluation; etc.

141. The validation workshop for the baseline was attended by key stakeholders and the results accepted by all. This workshop exposed them to new information on the level of knowledge and awareness of communities benefiting from the SLMP interventions. This data can be used by other stakeholders and the process repeated where SLM interventions are planned.

142. Following the validation of the PM&E manual, the SLMP organised a series of Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Farmer Training Workshops from 1st to 8th October 2012. It targeted all the 6 RADs with 12 participants per region - i.e. 6 SLM Regional Committees and 6 SLM Intervention Village Committee Secretaries. After the farmer trainings, PM&E materials were distributed to each of them. These consisted of 12 PM&E forms; Visitors Record, T&D Record, Village Household Listing, Crop Harvest, Tree Planting, Seed Loan and construction monitoring forms for wells, causeways and bridges, dykes and spillways, etc.

143. The reports on both the Socio-economic baseline and ESMP Environmental baseline were completed and validated in April and September 2012 respectively. The PMU has provided six separate quarterly and 2 annual progress reports for the SLM Project, however only one of the reports was prepared in line with GEF reporting. According to the MTR, *"given the completion time of PIWAMP in December 2014 and that of GEF SLMP, the PIWAMP M&E Officer with familiarity of the SLMP is recommended to continue with the M&E tasks up to closure"*.

144. Most of the SLMP secretaries completed their Village Household Population Survey and have taken an inventory of the tree planting exercises which took place in their communities in August 2014. In Darsilameh (NBR) and Daru (CRR-S), the SLMP Secretaries had detailed recorded data on Household population, trees planted – with indication of survival rate, total area reclaimed and area under cultivation.

145. However, it was realised that quire books⁹ were the most convenient material to keep records rather than fragmented plain sheets of paper. In this regard the PMU later procured M&E materials for the 36 SLM Secretaries and Regional Technical Committee members. These were: quire books, plastic file folders, pens,



etc. for legible recording and safe keeping of PM&E data. They were also provided with calculators, measuring tapes and weighing scales The PM&E manual was also finalised, validated and edited into a user friendly format and distributed to RADs as reference material for administering PM&E forms.

146. During the field visit it was observed that the SLMP secretaries were at different levels of data collection and recording. As alluded to previously, some are keeping very detailed records, whilst others have scanty records, even where the requisite materials, tools etc. for monitoring have been provided. The selection of secretaries did not have set criteria such as ability to write in English or in the local languages, neither did the project attach a literacy activity to the work of the SLMP committee secretaries. These have further compounded the problem with data collection at the village level. As a backup strategy, the CFAs and Field staff assist the communities with data collection which are then sent to the PSU/M&E Officer.

Budgeting and Funding for M&E Activities

147. The project M&E was run by two staff comprising an M&E Officer and an Assistant. While funding for M&E was part of the overall project management, budget allocation to participatory M&E activities of the project was 400 US\$ allocated for materials and supplies to secretaries at community level.

Monitoring of Long Term Change



148. The Ministry of Agriculture has recently established a harmonized framework for data collection, analysis, storage and dissemination-the Gambia National Agricultural Database (GANAD). However the establishment of the GANAD came at the completion of the SLMP. The GANAD allows all agricultural related data to be housed in one databank which would be accessible to all users. In view of the need to include data collected on SLM by the project into the GANAD, the ex-M&E officer who is now posted to the Planning Services of the DoA should be tasked with supervising entry of SLM data into GANAD to ensure availability for other studies. The GANAD is housed at the Central Projects Coordinating Unit (CPCU) with another backup

⁹ A large notebook with hard bound covers

server at the PS. The main constraint of the system is the need for funding on a contributory basis by all agricultural projects. If this is done then there would be sustainability of the system.

149. The Project M&E system is rated as Satisfactory, i.e. there were minor shortcomings in the M&E system.

J. FINANCIAL PLANNING AND CONTROL

150. The financing comprises a GEF financing of US\$ 4.4 million with community-based watershed/land scape constituting the core of the project and allocated 73% of the total grant cost while component 1 was allocated 20% and component 3 at 7%. Table 5 provides expenditure against expenditure at PCR. It shows that project management principally utilized the base cost amounting to US\$ 4,215,295.54 or 99.6% of the base cost planned at appraisal. Expenditure by component revealed that 66%, 115% and 56% were the expenditure of components 1, 2 and 3 respectively. Further analysis indicate that 14%, 81% and 4.5% were the actual expenditure of the total grant by components 1 2, and 3 respectively. Accordingly, most of the expenditure went to the core component (component 2) of the project- community-based watershed/land scape management.

#	Component	Appraisal Target	Actual Expenditure at	% expenditure
		(base cost US\$)	PCR (US\$)	at PCR
1	Sustainable Land management	898,000.00	592,962.80	66.03
	Institutional strengthening			
2	Community-Based	2,989,000.00	3,429,938.07	114.7
	Watershed/Landscape			
	Management			
3	Project Management Unit	344,000.00	192,394.67	55.9
То	tal	4,231,000	4,215,295.54	99.6

Table 5: SLMP Expenditure by component of base cost at appraisal and Completion in US \$

Source: Appraisal Report and project financial reports

151. SLMP has conducted three of the four annual audits and have adhered to strict financial controls paying due diligence to the management of funds.

K. AfDB and IFAD SUPERVISION AND BACKSTOPPING

152. In line with project design, the role of the AfDB was to supervise and monitor the overall implementation of the SLMP while IFAD was charged with the responsibility for reporting on monitoring and evaluation according to GEF rules and regulations. In this regard, both the AfDB and IFAD fielded supervision missions for the SLMP which helped keep the project on track. A total of 10 Supervision missions (AfDB, 6 and IFAD 3 and 1 joint). These generally comprised teams with the right skill-mix relevant to the project and provided useful guidance which have enhanced project implementation and adherence to the Appraisal targets. However out of the 10, only one was a joint mission between the Bank and IFAD. Joint Supervision Mission comprise teams (including local expertise), which add value to the implementation progress as they provide *implementation support* to the project staff drawing from the vast reservoir of perspectives available within the team.

J. CO-FINANCING

153. SLMP Co-financing comprised 17, 575,922.40 US\$ from PIWAMP of which 7,120,400 US\$ (41%) was IFAD component, 7,130,762.40 US\$(41%) of AfDB, 1,798,860 US\$ (10%) from Government and 1,525, 9000 US\$ from beneficiaries. This gives a total finding of 21,975,922.4 US\$ if complemented with the 4,400,000 US\$ of the SLMP. At completion of PIWAMP in June, 2014, a year earlier than SLMP, the expenditure proportions remained the same as planned at appraisal i.e. 41% each for IFAD and AfDB and 10% and 7% respectively for Government and beneficiaries. Thus the level of co-financing expected was achieved. As planned, SLMP provided remuneration for additional staff comprising the National SLM Coordinator, SLM TA, two field supervisors and an accounts clerk.

VI. CONCLUSIONS AND RATINGS

154. Overall, the SLMP attained satisfactory performance. It was relevant, effective and efficient in reaching the targets. The project registered significant achievements reaching 68,441 direct beneficiaries 50.1% of whom were female. It put an incremental 6, 251 ha under cultivation (3,258.36 upland and 2,992 ha lowland) with structures for soil erosion control, access roads, water retention and protection from salinity. In these areas yield obtained was more than 10% assumed at appraisal for all the crops- with an almost two fold increase for rice from 853 kg/ha to 2,497 kg/ha. The yield increases is attributed to the project infrastructure which provided moisture retention, maintained soil fertility and salinity control. The yield increase enhanced the food security and income status of beneficiaries. In NRM, it improved 898 ha of degraded woodland and rangelands (149% of the appraisal target of 600ha); achieved 3,738 ha of improved vegetative cover in 13 protected sites(250% of the appraisal target of 1,500 ha); and a total length of 1,350 of anti-hippo barriers.

155. It enabled communities develop 36 CAPs and the implementation of 72 micro projects ranging from infrastructure for lowland and upland to woodlots and fruit tree nurseries to mangrove restoration and antihippo barriers. The SLMP trained regional technical committees, VDCs and village farmer associations and developed the SLM investment framework (GAMSIF). However, the late recruitment of the TA delayed implementation particularly of Component 1 and resulted in initial activities of Component 2 being more geared towards infrastructural development. The project had to be extended by a year and targets in NRM revised.

156. Given the achievements of outcomes and outputs of the project in protecting and restoring agricultural productivity and biodiversity; it is likely to attain its objectives. Table 6 provides a summary of the evaluation area, criteria and the ratings. The project following the analysis of the performance of the evaluation areas is rated as satisfactory.

Evaluation Areas	Criteria	Rating
Assessment of Project Results	Project Outcomes and Objectives	
5	Relevance: The SLMP objectives have been in line and consistent with both the macroeconomic and sectoral policy frameworks, notably the Gambia Environmental Action Plan (GEAP II, 2009-2018), the Poverty Reduction Strategy Paper (PRSP II-2007-2011) and the Agriculture and Natural Resources Policy (ANRP 2009-2015). It responded to international conventions and addressed land degradation, critical to addressing rural poverty and food insecurity.	Highly Satisfactory

Table 6: Summary Ratings

	Effectiveness: The SLMP established SLM platforms at national and regional levels and formulated the GAMSIF (2016-2020); reached 68,441 direct beneficiaries comprising 34,259 (50.1 %) females; put 6, 250.66 ha under cultivation comprising 3, 258.36 ha of upland (52%) and 2992.3 ha of lowland. Seventy two (72) micro-projects were implemented in the 36 sites comprising: access roads, woodlots and fruit tree nurseries. In NRM: anti- hippo barriers were built for protection of rice fields in 8 communities; improved vegetative cover (898 ha) in degraded woodlands and rangelands. It achieved 3,738 ha (249% of appraisal) of improved vegetative cover and restoration in habitat diversity in 13 protected areas.	Satisfactory
	Efficiency: The level of attainment of physical implementation commensurate the level of resource utilization in the realization of the outputs and outcomes in the components. The project experienced delays at start-up culminating in a one-year extension	Satisfactory
Assessment of Risks to Sustainability	Likelihood of sustainability of outcomes 4 dimensions of risks to sustainability:	
of Project Outcomes	Financial sustainability Tangible increases in income, improvements in food security and security from loss due to flooding at household level and the establishment of funding mechanisms at community level; and the formulation of an investment framework-GAMSIF at national level and for the medium term.	Likely (L)
	Socio-political sustainability Village Development Committees and farmer associations have had their organizational capacity and technical skills on sustainable land management enhanced. CAPs have been formulated based on the priorities and needs using participatory approaches with all stakeholders in the framework of watershed planning to build social cohesion in the communities. The Nema project (successor to PIWAMP) is adopting the watershed approach.	Likely (L)
	Institutional Framework and governance Structures at village (VDC), regional (RADs, TAC) and national levels (ANRWG) have been involved in both the design and implementation of SLMP interventions. The VDCs and RADS have had their technical and organizational skills enhanced. The VDCs and farmer organizations have bye-laws, constitutions and procedures for good governance.	Likely (L)
	Environmental sustainability Climate change and environmental sustainability have been embedded in the investments of the project. The ESMP developed for the project has provided guidance on procedures and key determinants in environmental monitoring and management.	Likely (L)
Catalytic Role	The formulation of the GAMSIF pivotal for SLM mainstreaming; public awareness with greater feasibility of incorporating CA in their field activities; community CAPs which could be further developed into projects; and, Study tour to Burkina Fasso engendered awareness of technicians and decision makers on CA and the relevance of the mechanization policy.	No rating required
Assessment of M&E System	<u>M&E Design</u> A participatory M&E system was developed hinged on the logical framework. It comprised 4 impact, 11 outcome and 31 output indicators.	Highly Satisfactory

	M&E Plan Implementation		
	PM&E manual developed, validated and distributed to RADs and secretaries of the 36 intervention communities, forms (village listing, crop harvest, tree planting, seed loans, community infrastructure etc), trained and provided materials (calculators, record books, weighing scales, ropes). Annual and quarterly progress and monitoring reports prepared.	Moderately Satisfactory	
	Budgeting and Financing for M&E activities Allocations for staffing, participatory M&E activities, MTR and for the TE.	Moderately Unsatisfactory	
Monitoring of	Contribution to establishment of long-term monitoring system		
long-term changes	Relevant SLMP project data to be incorporated into the GANAD developed with 22 outcome indicators harmonized for GNAIP and agricultural sector projects to enable synergy in monitoring outcome and outputs.		
	Accomplishment/shortcoming		
	Provided data for progress reporting and for some indicators in TE. However, the low literacy and numeracy skills of secretaries resulted in only few keeping timely, comprehensive and accurate data.	Satisfactory	
	Sustainability of system Linked with the national systems of the GANAD which will allow monitoring of progress on key indicators		
	Use of the system as intended		
	Provided progress reporting on indicators for measuring project outcomes and outputs		
Assessment of processes affecting attainment of project results	Preparation and Readiness High level commitment and participation by senior government staff in the design. Project goals and component were clearly articulated and consistent with macroeconomic and sector policies. SLMP anchored on PIWAMP with counterpart and specific staffing. Separation of accounting and reporting commitment agreed.	Satisfactory	
	Country Ownership/Drivenness		
	Consistency and congruence with relevant conventions ratified; the GEAP I and II; The ANR Policy; PRSP II, PAGE and Vision 2020. SLMP also constitutes a step in the implementation of the NAP to combat desertification.	Satisfactory	
	Stakeholder Involvement		
	Public service providers provided capacity building (TOT) and step down to beneficiaries and private contractors constructed upland and lowland structures and fencing. Both delivered quality services and works	Satisfactory.	
	Financing Planning		
	Government and Bank disbursement and procurement rules were adhered to. Disbursement of funds attained 99.6% with Component 2, the core of the project having most of the expenditure.	Satisfactory	
	GEF Agency supervision and backstopping	Highly	
	AfDB (executing) and IFAD (Technical) support fielded 10 missions to guide implementation	satisfactory	
	<u>Co-financing</u> PIWAMP (AfDB, IFAD, GoTG and beneficiaries provided co-financing of 17,575,922.40 US\$	Highly satisfactory	

VII. LESSONS TO BE LEARNED

- 157. The following constitute the lessons to be learned from SLMP:
 - **Timeliness of procurement:** Where there is seasonality in construction, concerted efforts should be made to undertake and complete all procurement processes to avoid any delay in implementation during the short time window for construction.
 - **Beneficiary involvement:** In the implementation of interventions such as restoration of natural resources comprising woodlands, protection of habitats and infrastructure maintenance, it is essential that beneficiaries are fully involved and in the driver's seat .
 - **Sourcing SLM TA locally/internationally:** It is prudent to first seek expertise locally/nationally rather than first seeking international TA. SLMP lost valuable time trying to recruit international expertise and had to resort to recruiting a local as TA.
 - **Experience in the area of assignment:** Need to ensure that the contractor are fully informed of the specific site and area to be covered
 - **Database on contractors:** availability of a database on contractors will facilitate referencing and tracking particularly of the poor performers and their blacklisting
 - **Capacity in conservation agriculture:** Training of critical mass of farmers and front line extension workers to acquire skills in conservation agriculture (through modules and equipped with user friendly reference materials) is pivotal to sustainable adoption of SLM practices.
 - **Gravel surfacing of causeways:** Constructed causeways should be surfaced with gravel for greater durability, ease traffic and reduce potential for acidification particularly within the seasonally saline zones
 - **Capacity building of VFAs and VDC's in NRM:** Training of VFAs and VDC's in natural resources management engender greater awareness and appreciation of the linkage natural resources and livelihoods. This in-turn leads to greater care of the resource base.
 - **Coordination amongst implementing partners:** Where multiple partners are involved in implementing a project, it is prudent that there is an effective coordination mechanism with clear roles ascribed to each to avoid conflict and duplication of work.

X. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 158. The following recommendations are proposed:
 - Gambia Sustainable Land Management investment Framework (GAMSIF)

During the formulation of the GAMSIP, the team experienced marked absence of updated reference materials on soils/land use characteristics/determinants, with the most comprehensive reference material on soil/land developed in the 1970's (LRS 22); there is urgent need to develop an updated Land Resources Study. This can inform effective watershed planning and mapping. MOA should work with ongoing projects such as *Nema/Chosso*, GCAV and FASDEP to support this exercise.

As the spring board for up-scaling SLM in the immediate to medium term, urgent efforts should be made towards launching the GAMSIP and subsequently to mobilizing resources for its

implementation. In this regard the MOA (for launching the GAMSIF) and the tapping resources from the Pilot Programme on Climate Resilience (PPCR) need to be pursued.

• Conservation Agriculture

In the bid to promote Conservation Agriculture and to facilitate implementation of the GAMSIF, there is urgent need to articulate a mechanization policy to guide conservation agriculture and sustainable SLM practices, formulation of a mechanization policy should be given urgent attention. The Ministry of Agriculture should mobilize funds from ongoing projects such as *Nema/Chosso*, GCAV and FASEDP in this regard.

Given the critical role of conservation agriculture in restoring and maintaining soil fertility, greater focus needs to be paid to continue training more farmers and extension workers on conservation agriculture. These capacity building interventions are consistent with *Nema/Chosso/P2RS* and should be supported.

• Natural Resources Management

Given that the SLMP has provided equipment (tractor –mounted chisel ploughs) and rippers (animal drawn) for CA activities, Nema/Chosso/P2RS should continue the process and support NARI to conduct the demonstration trials relevant for possible up-scaling of appropriate tillage practices nationwide.

The woodlots and enrichment plantings have only been established with the SLMP, these gains need to be sustained through continued support in annual fire belting of woodlots and forests to minimize the destruction of recurrent bush fires and by additional plantings of bamboo. Similarly, farmer managed natural regeneration of indigenous tree species should be encouraged. The Department of Forestry should spearhead these efforts with support from *Nema/Chosso* and other sources.

Beneficiaries of the SLMP anti-hippo barriers have experienced reduction in the human/wildlife conflict with minimized destruction of their rice crops. However, the length of the protection/barriers in most sites need to be increased for greater effectiveness. Given the relevance of these barriers, the MOA needs to work with the DPWM to support prone rice growing areas with support by ongoing project with intervention in rice production e.g. *Nema/Chosso/P2RS*, GCAV and FASDEP.

In the Complimentary PIWAMP project, energy saving devices comprising stoves using alternative energy were piloted. In this regards, communities which entirely depend on forest resources as their primary source of energy need to be targeted through interventions in alternative renewable sources of energy like bio-gas and new improved cooking stoves.

• Community Awareness and Literacy

The SLMP has In light of the need to "announce the successes" of the SLMP to a wider audience and for sustained interest in SLM practices, produced a number of videos. Most of these are narrations in local languages without subtitles. It is recommended that subtitles are edited on the videos and aired through the GRTS for nationwide dissemination. In addition, the CEES could be contracted by one of the on-going projects to organize video shows using mobile vans at the SLMP targeted communities and new ones with similar interventions identified by the on-going projects. The SLMP has built the capacity of farmer organizations and VDCs in organizational management and management. However most of the beneficiaries have low numeracy and literacy skills. In recognition of the empowering nature of functional literacy and numeracy, it is recommended that such projects attach functional literacy and numeracy activities to the work of the SLMP committee secretaries. This would facilitate data collection at the village level and further engender a collective sense of ownership as records would enhance village meetings.

ANNEXES

ANNEX 1. The Evaluation Terms of Reference (TOR)

The Scope/specific tasks of the Terminal Evaluation are:

- To assess the technical results and financial execution of the SLMP, including alignment with GEF policies and strategies, attainment and measurement of global environmental benefits and mobilisation of co-financing;
- To assess the results achieved under each component with reference to the project logical framework, Annual Work Plans and Budgets (AWPBs), Procurement Plans;
- To assess stakeholder engagement, particularly the beneficiaries, in the project in general and in specific interventions, and their level of satisfaction with implementation;
- To identify strengths and weaknesses, as well as challenges and opportunities encountered during implementation. This will include a review of SLMP delivery mechanism, including the performance of implementing partners;
- To review the financial management and flow of funds arrangements, procurement and contract management;
- To review compliance with Grant Agreement Covenants;
- To collate all knowledge products and assess their relevance, quality and outreach in advancing the SLMP objectives;
- To assess the sustainability of the SLMP achievements and measures put in place to ensure this happens;
- To review the performance of both AfDB and IFAD as the GEF Implementing Agencies and;
- To synthesize lessons learned and best practice, and provide guidance on key areas that need further attention.

The Agricultural Economist will be the lead consultant and will be responsible for:

- a) Overall coordination of inputs from the team members, ensuring that all aspects of the evaluation are addressed and for consolidating all information in an Aide Memoire, PowerPoint presentation and final TE report
- b) Review and assess the substantive quantitative data collected during project implementation to determine project contributions to development objectives and outcomes;
- c) Estimate the total number of beneficiaries of the project (both direct and indirect beneficiaries) as compared to what was planned at appraisal;
- d) Determine to what extent the project has contributed to improving the productivity of the farmers by comparing the yield estimates under "with" and "without" project scenarios;
- e) Re-evaluate the Financial and Economic Rates of Returns of the project emphasizing the cost benefiting analysis of the various project interventions;

- f) Assess and evaluate the effectiveness of the project management in the delivery of project activities and;
- g) Assess the financial and economic sustainability of the overall project;
- h) Undertake field visits to selected sites; and
- i) Present the findings of the Terminal Evaluations to the stakeholders.

The Institutional and Rural Development Expert will be responsible for:

- a) Assess the appropriateness and effectiveness of the project's targeting strategies and the extent to which an approach to sustainable land management has been implemented;
- b) Assess project implementation and management arrangements and annual planning;
- c) Assess the degree to which the project achieved its development and environmental objectives and delivered outputs as set out in the project design report;
- d) Assess the prospects for project sustainability and the implementation of the sustainable land management investment framework;
- e) Assess the IFAD, AfDB and Borrower performance, including compliance with relevant safeguards and cross-cutting policies;
- F) Evaluate the project monitoring and evaluation system and its effectiveness in guiding project implementation Identify and review the community engagement approaches, and policy dialogue and planning process adopted by the project and assess their appropriates and effectiveness in meeting project objectives and outcomes;
- g) Describe innovations and best practice emanating from project implementation and propose scaling up pathways;
- h) Evaluate the knowledge products generated by the project in terms of technical quality, messaging, ease of accessibility, use by stakeholders, and promotion of KM products through learning events. Provide a comprehensive list of knowledge products developed; and
- i) Undertake field visits to selected project sites.

ANNEX II: A List of Interviewees and Evaluation Timeline

	Name of person	Designation	Contact		
	-	WCB Kassagey			
wen-nassagny					
	Aja Sarjo Camara	VDC President			
	Lamin Touray	SLMP Secretary			
	Sibo Jammeh	VDC member	6290986		
	Binta Gibba	VDC member			
	Mariama Gassama	VDC member	6315003		
	Mama Touray	VDC member			
		LRR-Bambako			
	Jerreh Yarbo	Village Alikali	6951794		
	Mady Yarbo	Villager	6830142		
	Alh. Demba Manneh	Villager	6229937		
	Yankuba Jarra	Villager			
	Lamin	Villager			
	Bakery k. Darboe	Villager	6249049		
	Alieu Demba	Villager	6585969		
	Masannneh Sesay	Villager	6905810		
	Kajally Secka	Villager			
	Ansumanan Sanyang	Villager	6178342		
	Bakary Sonko	SLMP Secretary	6252655		
	Karri Darboe	Villager	6817218		
	Fabakary Demba	Villager	6615804		
	Lamin Sonko	Villager	6269189		
	Sekou Yabou	Villager	7113881		
	Kaddy Dibba	Villager	6671456		
	Fatou Jobe	Villager			
	Mariama Dibba	Villager			
	Fatou Darboe	Villager			
	Nyimansata Jammeh	Villager			
	L	.RR-Jarra Madina			
	Mamudu Gikenne	Village Alikali			
	Alhaji Camara	SLMP Secretary	6536637		
	Kekoi Juwara	Villager			
	Muhamed Isatu	Villager	6406471		
	Gikenne	-			
	Balla Musa Gikenne	Villager			
	Sekou Gikenne	Villager	6422126		
	Talibou Jarju	Villager	6405904		

List of persons met during the SLMP PCR trek

Hamjatatta Gikenne	Villager	6221794
	NBR-Salikenne	
Basekou Kanteh	SLMP Secretary	2496103
Abdou Njie	VDC Chair	9060363
Tapha Trawalleh	VDC Adviser	
Sekou Saidy	Villager	
Buba Jarju	CFA	3529293
Barra (Alieu) Joof	Grader Operator	
Sekou Fatty	Excavator	
	operator	
Alpha Sawaneh	Operator	
Lang-ba Drammeh	Operator	
Pascal Jatta	Operator	
Tumani Fatty	Operator	
Naato Darboe	CFA	3529307
	NBR-Dasilami	
	1	1
Bakery Queen Fofana	SLMP Secretary	7776137
Lang Jakurru Fofana	Villager	
	CRRN-Kayai	
Yedally Janko	SLMP Secretary	6951757
Alh. Muhamed	Village Alikali	6242357
Touray		
Fa-sutu Danso	Villager	
Niamina Kunjira	Villager	
Lamin Janko	Villager	
Lamin Jabi	Villager	6229457
Ebrima Jabi	Villager	6387891
Sariba Jobateh	VDC member	6920482
	URR-Kumbija	
Nchamba Conateh	SLMP Secretary	3722376
Alh. Bully Nemaga	Villager	9841305
Ebou Kebbeh	Villager	3942270
Alh. Musa Trawalley	Villager	
Alh. Sekou Conteh	Villager	9951681
Muhamed Conteh	Villager	9703080
Muhamed Gerew	Villager	9730963
Dambelley Trawalleh	Villager	3059880
Baba Jawara	Acting Alikali	9919648
	CRRS-Daru	
Modou Wurry Jallow	SLMP Secretary	3251112
Mariama Keita	VDC Organizer	7895793
Modou Cham	Villager	, 0, 0, 0, 0
	1110801	I

N	/Iodou Suwareh	Villager	3605697
Т	amsir Cham	Villager	2122519
S	heriff Houma	Villager	7897549
A	mat Jawo	Villager	7286058
C)mar Baldeh	Villager	3691939
A	laji Suwareh	Villager	7415045
E	issa Wali	Villager	3237100
J	aiteh Houma	Villager	7339561
Т	amsir Houma	Villager	7507201
	C	RRS-Sareh Seydou	
Y	'aya Jallow	SLMP Secretary	7179909
C)r. Katim Touray	Former, TA, SLMP	
L	amin Camara	Deputy	
		Permanent Secretary,	
		Fiscal Affairs	
A	bdoulie Sawo	SeniorWildlife	
		Officer, DPWM	
B	abanding Sanyang	Forestry Officer,	
		Department of	
		Forestry	
F	adera	Proprietor Nema	
		General,	
Т	amba Jasseh	Senior Officer,	
		Department of	
		Community	
		Development	

ANNEX III: Bibliography

- 1. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations; Evaluation Document No. 3 (2008)
- 2. The Gambia Environmental Action Plan Phase II (2009 2018)
- 3. SLMP Training Reports 2011 2014
- 4. Aide Memoires
- 5. SLMP Handbook
- 6. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation Manual
- 7. The GEF Component Of The Participatory Integrated Watershed Management Project (PIWAMP) Project Brief
- 8. SLMP AfDB Appraisal Report
- 9. SLMP Project Closure Report; June 2015
- 10. SLMP AfDB Project Completion Report
- 11. SLMP Socio-economic Baseline Survey (March 2012)
- 12. Annual Audit Reports
- 13. SLMP Special Report: January September 2014
- 14. Organizational Capacity Building Training Manual Department of Community Development
- 15. GAMSIF (2015)
- 16. The SLMP MTR (July 2014)

ANNEX IV: SLMP Financial Information by Component

Component	Year					Total
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	
Sustainable Land management Institutional strengthening	3,989.87	146,414.45	83,863.29	242,391.63	21,443.56	498,102.80
Community- based Watershed/landsc ape management		514,228.98	926,795.40	1,147,200.15	936,573.64	3,524,798.17
PMU	18,358.88	75,873.03	31,057.36	38,549.97	28,555.43	192,394.67
Total	22,348.75	736,516.46	1,041,716.05	1,428,141.65	986,572.63	4,215,295.54

Annex Table 1: Annual Expenditure by Component

Annex Table 1B: SLMP Actual Expenditure at PCR by Component against Planned at Appraisal

#	Component	Appraisal Target (base cost US\$)	Actual Expenditure at PCR (US\$)	% expenditure at PCR
1	Sustainable Land management Institutional strengthening	898,000.00	592,962.80	66.03
2	Community-Based Watershed/Landscape Management	2,989,000.00	3,429,938.07	114.7
3	Project Management Unit	344,000.00	192,394.67	55.9
Total		4,231,000	4,215,295.54	99.6

ANNEX V: Comprehensive list of knowledge products

- 1. Indigenous Knowledge Systems on SLMP
- 2. Baseline Socio economic Survey
- 3. The Social and Environmental Management Plan (ESMP)
- 4. Socio-economic, Mapping and Wildlife Inventory
- 5. Organisational Capacity Building Training Manual
- 6. Community Action Plans (CAPs)
- 7. SLM Handbook
- 8. PM&E Handbook
- 9. GAMSIF
- 10. Study Tours to Burkina Faso
- 11. Videos
- 12. Radio drama episodes
- 13. Conservation Agriculture tools and techniques for upland farming

Mamadi Baba Ceesay – Agro-Economist and Team Leader

Mr Mamadi Baba Ceesay has a B.Sc. in General Agriculture with the following post graduate qualifications: M.Sc. in Survey Integration for Resource Development with specialization in Project Planning and Implementation; Post Graduate Diploma in Survey Integration for Resource Development; Certificate in Project Analysis for Agriculture and Rural Development and, Certificate in Macro-Economic Adjustment/Agricultural Food Policy Analysis.

Mr. Ceesay has over 25 years professional experience in project planning, preparation and analysis, monitoring and evaluation, strategic planning, investment planning and programming related to agriculture and natural resources. He has executed several consultancies for The African Development Bank(AfDB), The International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD), The United Nations Development Programme, NGOs and the Gambia Government on project/program formulation and evaluation.

Mr. Donald C. Sock the Institutional Development Expert is a Management and Institutional Development/Rural Socio-economist and Training Consultant with over 35 years of relevant professional experience. His qualifications can be summarised as initiative in team and independent assignments, demonstrated oral and written communication skills, discerning analysis of development problems and programme issues, ability to develop and present project proposals, comprehensive understanding of cross-cultural dynamics, broad social science training with specialisation in management, institutional development, rural sociology and adult education and training.

He holds a BA in Psychology and Biology; an MA in Rural Sociology/Adult and Continuing Education; a Diploma in Personnel Management and a Certificate in Management Analysis and Consultancy Skills. He has performed various assignments for IFAD and has also worked on GEF related assignments on behalf of the National Environment Agency. He has experience within the sub region and Kenya.