

1. Project Data

Summary project data			
GEF project ID		5147	
GEF Agency project ID		1100001760	
GEF Replenishment Phase		GEF-5	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)		International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD)	
Project name		Enhancing Resilience of Agricultural Sector in Georgia (ERASIG)	
Country/Countries		The Republic of Georgia	
Region		Europe and Central Asia (ECA) ¹	
Focal area		Climate Change Adaptation - GEF Special Climate Change Fund (SCCF)	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives		SCCF CCA-1, CCA-2 and CCA-3 ²	
Executing agencies involved		Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA) (MoA at design stage)	
NGOs/CBOs involvement		Bio Association Elkana, Caucasus Environmental NGO Network, Regional Environmental Center for the Caucasus ³	
Private sector involvement		Georgia Amelioration Company ⁴	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)		January 13, 2015	
Effectiveness date / project start		February 16, 2015	
Expected date of project completion (at start)		June 30, 2019 ⁵	
Actual date of project completion		January 31, 2021	
Project Financing			
		At Endorsement (US \$M)	At Completion (US \$M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding ⁶	0.090	0.085
	Co-financing	0.120	
GEF Project Grant		5.3	5.09
Co-financing	IA own	12.5	11.73
	Government	1.80	1.83
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	4.11	4.11
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		

¹ As per GEF IEO TE Sept 2021 dataset available on their website, Republic of Georgia is in ECA region. Georgia is also a member of GEF ECA constituency. The TE mentions it in Near East and North Africa region (TE page 6).

² PIF page 1.

³ PIR 2017 page 2.

⁴ TE page 47.

⁵ MTR page 1.

⁶ This excludes GEF Agency Fee of USD 8,550.

	Other ⁷	9.76	8.6
Total GEF funding		5.39	5.17
Total Co-financing		28.29	26.27
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		33.68	31.44
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 2021	
Author of TE		Joris Oele	
TER completion date		October 1, 2021	
TER prepared by		Nayanika Singh	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)			

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S ⁸	S	MS	
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	ML	
M&E Design		MS	S	
M&E Implementation		MU	US	
Quality of Implementation		MS	MS	
Quality of Execution		S	MS	
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	MS	

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project aimed to enhance the adaptive capacity of farmers to climate risks through resilient agricultural systems (PD page 28).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The development objective of the project was to improve water availability, farmland productivity and smallholder's income through investments in climate-resilient farming systems and technologies (PD page 28).

⁷ Includes beneficiaries.

⁸ This is the overall Development Objective (DO) rating provided by PIR 2021 (page 6). The overall Implementation Progress rating provided is MS. The TER has taken DO rating as the overall rating because it is based on the likelihood that by the end of the project implementation, the stated objectives will be achieved (PIR 2021 page 6).

3.3 Were there any **changes** in the Global Environmental Objectives, Development Objectives, or other activities during implementation?

The project completion timeline was first extended by 16 months to accommodate the slow start of the project and then for another 3 months due to covid-19 related delays (TE page 34).

The scope of the GEF/SCCF project was also revised affecting the project outputs: (i) the landscape restoration plans to be implemented were reduced from up to 150 to up to 8; and, (ii) at least 1,000 instead of initial 3,000 farmers participate in 10 instead of initial 30 on-farm demonstrations where new irrigation and CA production systems and technologies are tested and validated (TE page 25). The rationale and impact of these changes on the overall project outcome as well as on the budgetary allocations across the project components is not mentioned in the TE.

The TE notes some other changes during the project implementation which are: “(i) Ministry of Agriculture was renamed as Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture; (ii) target areas were changed from Kakheti and Samtskhe Javakheti regions to Adjara, Kakheti, Shida Kartli and Samegrelo pilot areas. For infrastructure and irrigation-related activities, the geographic scope was retained to Government’s priority regions of Khakheti, Samegrelo, Shida Kartli and Skra Kareli as at the start of the project; (iii) the main target group was changed from poor farmers to commercially active farmers; (iv) alignment with GEF priority outcome 2.2 was added; and, (v) the log frame of AMMAR project (baseline project) was revised after the 2017 MTR to better reflect the output distribution along its outcomes, adding indicators for policies, access to financial services and the DANIDA grant but also reducing some targets. The end target for women outreach was raised from 30% to 52%” (TE page 19). The rationale and impact of these changes on GEF/SCCF project interventions and outcomes are not explained in the TE.

The co-financing amount as mentioned in the TE (page 19) significantly varies from the figures mentioned in the final PIR. Also, there is significant variation in the co-financing amount mentioned in the PIRs. In the PIRs from July 2016 to June 2020, the actual co-financing secured amount is USD 17,130,000 and actual co-financing spent amount is USD 3,200,730.96 whereas PIR (July 2020 – 30 June 2021) mentions the actual co-financing secured amount as USD 33,903,325 and actual co-financing disbursed amount as USD 28,603,325 (PIR 2020 page 1, PIR 2021 page 2). These significant variations in the co-financing amount are not explained either in the PIRs or in the TE.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

Please refer to the GEF Terminal Evaluation Review Guidelines for detail on the criteria for ratings.

Relevance can receive either a Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory rating. For Effectiveness and Cost efficiency, a six-point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess. Sustainability ratings are assessed on a four-point scale: Likely=no or negligible risk; Moderately Likely=low risk; Moderately Unlikely=substantial risks; Unlikely=high risk. In assessing a Sustainability rating, please note if, and to what degree, sustainability of project outcomes is threatened by financial, sociopolitical, institutional/governance, or environmental factors.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 Relevance	Rating: Satisfactory
---------------	----------------------

The TE assesses the relevance of the project to be **Satisfactory** (page 8) with which this TER concurs. The TER notes that the project objectives were consistent with the GEF-5 SCCF programming strategy and specifically contributed to outcome 1.2 on livelihoods and sources of income of vulnerable population diversified; outcome 2.1 on increased awareness of climate change impacts, vulnerability and adaptation; outcome 2.2 on improved scientific and technical knowledge base for the identification, prioritization and implementation of adaptation strategies and measures; outcome 2.3 on access to improved climate information and early warning systems enhanced at regional, national, sub-national and local levels; outcomes 3.1 and 3.2 related to integrating climate change adaptation into relevant policies, plans and associated processes (TE page 41). The additionality and adaptation benefits of GEF/SCCF funding to the baseline programs/ interventions is clearly mentioned in the project document. Briefly, it says “without SCCF additional funding, the IFAD-supported baseline interventions could turn out to be a business-as-usual investment, which fails to tackle the root cause of the constraints facing agriculture and rural development in Georgia” (PD page 42). The TE mentions that the linkages between GEF/SCCF project log frame and GEF climate change adaptation tracking tool could have been clearer/ better at the design stage (TE page 52).

The TER notes that the project was in line with IFAD’s agriculture-related investments in Georgia, including the Agriculture Supported project (2010-2016) and Agriculture Modernization, Market Access and Resilience (AMMAR) (2015-2018) project. The GEF/SCCF project was expected to “help mainstream a climate-resilient approach into the IFAD baseline interventions i.e., AMMAR project” (PD page 19). The GEF/SCCF project was also fully aligned to the Government of Georgia’s Strategy for Agriculture Development (2012-2022) and supporting plan to revitalize irrigated agriculture through the rehabilitation, reconstruction and modernization of irrigation and drainage systems, and the support for efficient irrigation systems and good agricultural practices to ensure sustainable production, promote environmental sustainability, improve soil quality and reduce land degradation (PD page 18). The TER also notes that in the project document, the GEF/SCCF interventions under all the three components were designed to complement the activities funded by other donor agencies in the region to avoid duplication. The activities supported through the GEF/ SCCF project were identified among the governmental climate change adaptation priorities for the agriculture sector as included in Georgia’s Second National Communication and Technology Needs Assessment to UNFCCC (PD page 26).

The TE mentions that the GEF/SCCF project “responded to the needs of the farmers in general but not specifically to women and youth needs. A gender approach or strategy was not developed at the design stage” (TE page 42). The TER notes that the project design mentions that GEF/SCCF project will follow IFAD’s ‘Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment Policy’ in project implementation, monitoring and reporting as well as women and unemployed youth will be the primary beneficiaries of the project because of their higher vulnerability (PD page 21-22).

In view of the above, the TER finds that the project outcomes at the design / approval stage were consistent with the GEF SCCF, IFAD’s and country’s programming priorities and has thus, provides a satisfactory rating.

4.2 Effectiveness	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
-------------------	--

The TE assesses the project effectiveness as **Satisfactory**. This TER rates project effectiveness as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

The overall outcome level targets of GEF/SCCF interventions were to (i) increase of > 20% of real net household farm income for at least 80% of the 10,000 supported households; (ii) more than 20% increase in total value (relative to reference market price) of surplus agriculture production of targeted VCs sold by participating producers, traders and agribusiness (disaggregated by gender and age); and, (iii) climate-resilient agriculture production practices are adopted by at least 50% of trained smallholder farmers (disaggregated by gender and age) (PD page 62).

While reporting against the overall project targets, the TE notes that about 17,016 households were supported however, only 51% of the supported households experienced an increase of >20% of real net farm income. According to the impact survey, the increase of income from agriculture production was 60% compared to 2017. About 56% of trained women smallholder farmers adopted climate-resilient agricultural practices (TE page 77). The TE does not provide adequate information to understand the methodology, approach and data-sets used by the impact survey and its findings.

The TE also notes that before the GEF project, the main on-farm irrigation technology in the project area was surface irrigation. With GEF support installation of on-farm water use efficiency technologies increased which also reduced use of fossil fuel and increased soil carbon. In particular, the project promoted use of sprinklers and drip irrigation systems, adoption of CA and rehabilitated irrigation canals and other water infrastructure. The TE notes that “farmers are currently informally organized to manage water resource however, the GEF project investments will also contribute to improve collective water management and potentially support the creation of Water Users’ Organization” (TE page 40).

The TE notes that it was a challenge to understand the impact of GEF-funded interventions as there was not a clear distinction between the indicators and targets of baseline AMMAR and GEF/SCCF project. It also notes that the four-year time duration was too short to assess the impacts in such a project. During the project implementation, in line with government’s effort to shift from subsistence to business-oriented agriculture, the support was provided to economically active smallholder farmers instead of the most vulnerable farmers. Further, no initiative was undertaken to engage with financial institutions and facilitate access to loans which continues to be an important bottleneck in the agriculture sector. The agribusiness grant did not manage to attract expected number of investors (TE page 41).

Despite of the above-mentioned discrepancies, the GEF/SCCF project implemented some activities well. A summary of the project’s achievements by the three project components is provided below.

- **Component 1: On-farm efficient irrigation, and soil and water conservation for climate-resilient agriculture production.**

This component aimed to generate farmer’s knowhow and support investments in climate change adaptation technologies (PD page 28). The overall expected result of this GEF/SCCF component was (i) at least 4,750 farmers have improved on-farm soil and water conditions through climate-resilient efficient irrigation technology (EIT) and/or conservation agriculture (CA); (ii) at least 3,000 farmers report diversification of farming systems with higher economic and environmental benefits from the

deployment of EIT and/or CA (disaggregated by gender); and, (iii) up to 1,000 small grants made to farmers and at least 30 grants made to agribusiness and processors in target value chains (PD page 62). The TE notes that “at project completion, the soil and water conditions improved at about 6,486 ha (target 4,750 ha) of land through the application of EIT/ CA. About 227 (target 220) small grants were made available to primary producers and 13 (target 20) small grants to agri-businesses” (TE page 77). While listing the project achievements, the TE mentions that “a total of 217 such grants were made available under the GEF budget” (TE page 40).

- **Component 2: Landscape restoration to prevent climate-related risks.**

This component aimed at landscape restoration to prevent climate-related risks (PD page 34-35). The overall expected result of this GEF/SCCF component was (i) at least 4,750 ha receiving reliable irrigation water supply from climate-proof rehabilitated and properly maintained irrigation schemes; and, (ii) up to 8 (initially 150) landscape restoration plans implemented (PD page 63, TE page 25).

The TE notes that “at project completion, about 3,079 ha of land was brought under climate-resilient practices (includes 320 ha riverbank protection and 2759 ha windbreak protected area) and 42 landscape restoration plans were implemented (includes 2 river bank protection works and 40 windbreak management plans)” (TE page 78). The TE also notes that “although locally useful for farmers to restore their land, the river-bank interventions cannot be labelled as proper landscape restoration interventions in a wider scale, as they have been implemented with insufficiently integrated planning” (TE page 9).

- **Component 3: Enabling environment for climate-risk reduction in agriculture.**

This component aimed to support the improvement of the policy framework for adaptation and risk reduction in the agriculture and water management sector in Georgia (PD page 38). The overall expected result of this GEF/SCCF component was (i) a policy dialogue triggered to mainstream climate change risk reduction into water and soil conservation in agriculture; (ii) a training programme is designed and implemented to build the capacity of service providers on efficient irrigation, sustainable soil and water management, and landscape restoration; and, (iii) at least 1000 (initially at least 3,000) farmers participate in 10 (initially 30) on-farm demonstrations where new irrigation and CA production systems and technologies are tested and validated (PD page 63-64, TE page 25).

The TE notes that “by the project completion, three policy/ regulatory framework have been formally proposed but adopted, including the Climate Change National Adaptation Plan for the Agricultural Sector, draft law on Windbreaks and Soil Protection” (TE page 78). Under this component, about 109 service providers and regional MoA officers (of which 27% were women) received ToT on climate resilient EIT/CA practices, 2,470 smallholder farmers (of which 28% were women) were trained in climate-resilient farming systems and technologies and on 17 demonstration plots, EIT and CA technologies and farming systems were tested and validated (TE page 78).

Overall, this TER concurs with the concerns raised by the TE especially in monitoring and reporting on the impacts of the GEF/SCCF funded project activities. This is a concern because the approved project document clearly identified the additionality brought by GEF/SCCF interventions to the baseline AMMAR project. It is also important to note that the TE presents the performance and impact of GEF/SCCF interventions as stand-alone. How GEF/SCCF interventions worked, influenced and impacted the co-financed activities and vice versa - does not find a mention in the TE. The TE also does not explain how in

spite of a significant reduction in some of the targets as well as shift in target group beneficiaries, there was a little/ no impact on the project’s overall achievement. Despite of these major limitations, the GEF/SCCF project performed and yielded results however, the overall impact was either not monitored or reported from GEF/ SCCF perspective. Thus, in view of all the above, this TER rates project effectiveness as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

4.3 Efficiency	Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory
----------------	--

The TE assesses project efficiency as **Moderately Satisfactory** which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Unsatisfactory**.

The project was endorsed by the GEF CEO for implementation on January 13, 2015, by IFAD on February 2, 2015, the grant became effective on February 17, 2015, the first disbursement was on September 15, 2015, inception workshop was in December 2016 and the inception workshop report was finalized by end of September 2017. As per the GEF CEO endorsed project document, the inception workshop and the report should be completed within first two months of project start up (PD page 61). This delay significantly impacted the efficiency of the GEF/ SCCF interventions. The TE also mentions that the data and the report of the inception workshop was not available (TE page 53).

The overall project timeline was extended by 19 months from June 30, 2019 to January 31, 2021. The TE mentions that the “delay of initial start could perhaps have been avoided through better design of the baseline AMMAR project results framework, more efficient engagement of farmers and strong supervision from the start” (TE page 45).

The TE says that “the GEF project performed well against set targets. Contributing factors were strong supervision from MTR period, good country ownership but also lowering of initial targets set during project design” (TE page 44). As mentioned under section 3 above, the scope of the GEF/SCCF project was revised with a significant reduction in some of the targets. The reason for this change in scope is not mentioned in the TE. The impact of these changes on the overall project outcome as well as on the budgetary allocations across the project components has not been explained. The TE also does not present the component-wise utilization of GEF grant and co-funding, at project completion to understand the cost-effectiveness of GEF/SCCF interventions. The TE reports that 96% of the GEF grant i.e., USD 5.091 million of USD 5.3 million were utilized (TE page 35).

Furthermore, the variations with regard to the co-funding amounts (as mentioned under section 3 above) and the reporting of the results of GEF/SCCF interventions as stand-alone - provides insufficient data/ information to assess the project efficiency with a degree of certainty. In view of all of the above, this TER rates project efficiency as **Moderately Unsatisfactory**.

4.4 Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely
--------------------	----------------------------------

The TE assesses project sustainability and rate it as **Likely**. The GEF/SCCF project has introduced climate-resilient technologies and practices in the agricultural sector of Georgia; however, these are still either at demonstration stage or require substantial support either from the government or external funding agencies. Thus, this TER rates project sustainability as **Moderately Likely**.

Financial Resources

The TE notes that “the O&M budgets related to the water-related works are included in the annual plans of the municipalities. There is one limitation i.e., the absence of Water User Organizations (WUOs) that, combined with the very low water fees charged nationwide, do not guarantee sustainable maintenance of irrigation infrastructure without heavy subsidizing from the government. The World Bank supports the WUOs and IFAD is working on GCF concept note to support windbreaks” (TE page 47-48). However, a sustainable solution for access to financing is required for the farmers.

Sociopolitical

At project completion, the TE notes that “there is a continued support from the government and willingness to scale up the windbreak pilot at the national scale. The links to training materials are accessible on ELKANA’s website. The risk is that the O&M budgets and trainings should be made available for longer period (institutionalized)” (TE page 48-49). The TE notes that lead farmers selected for demonstration pilots are willing to share knowledge with other farmers on demand and beyond project duration. Also, the grants made available to women have a long-term impact (TE page 48).

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE notes that an enabling environment has been created with three policy/ regulatory framework have been formally proposed but adopted, including the Climate Change National Adaptation Plan for the Agricultural Sector, draft law on Windbreaks and Soil Protection. However, “further support is required to implement and enforce these laws effectively” (TE page 48).

Environmental

The TE notes that the project activities were aimed at, among other things, sustainable management of water and soil resources and environmental protection. By design, significant adverse environmental risks are not expected due to continuing operation of the subprojects/ activities (TE page 48).

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

5.1 Co-financing. To what extent was the reported co-financing essential to the achievement of GEF objectives? If there was a difference in the level of expected co-financing and actual co-financing, then what were the reasons for it? Did the extent of materialization of co-financing affect project’s outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

The role of co-financing in this GEF/SCCF project was essential to the achievement of the project objectives as was clearly mentioned in the approved project document. However, the TE reports on the performance and achievement of the GEF/SCCF-funded activities as stand alone. The causal linkage between the GEF/SCCF and the baseline project activities has not been mentioned. The variations in the reported co-financing figures have already been mentioned in the preceding sections.

5.2 Project extensions and/or delays. If there were delays in project implementation and completion, then what were the reasons for it? Did the delay affect the project's outcomes and/or sustainability? If so, in what ways and through what causal linkages?

As noted in the Efficiency section above, the project's start and implementation at least till MTR in 2017 was delayed, which negatively affected the project outcomes and sustainability. The TE notes that these delays were due to bureaucracy and limited leadership from IFAD" (TE page 38).

After MTR, the project activities were revised however, the rationale for this change, its impact on the project's overall outcome and financial outlays across the budget lines is not mentioned in the TE. The project activities picked up after MTR 2017 resulting in the achievements as mentioned in the Effectiveness section.

5.3 Country ownership. Assess the extent to which country ownership has affected project outcomes and sustainability? Describe the ways in which it affected outcomes and sustainability, highlighting the causal links:

The TE at many places has mentioned "good and/or strong country ownership after MTR 2017". The TE mentions that "the GEF project was designed to follow the approach of country ownership and a focus on results, supporting investments that reflect governmental priorities for poverty reduction and climate change adaptation in agriculture. Relevant country representatives (esp. from MEPA) were part of the design and implementation of the project, also as executing entity. Project outcomes have been incorporated in the CCNAP and draft laws on windbreaks and soil conservation. O& M budgets have been included in annual plans" (TE page 50).

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

Ratings are assessed on a six point scale: Highly Satisfactory=no shortcomings in this M&E component; Satisfactory=minor shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Satisfactory=moderate shortcomings in this M&E component; Moderately Unsatisfactory=significant shortcomings in this M&E component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Satisfactory
-------------------------	-----------------------------

The TE assesses the project's M&E design at entry as **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE notes that the "M&E of the GEF project-specific indicators and targets was challenging as it was blended with the baseline (AMMAR) project" (TE page 56). The TE notes that "a results framework indicators did not fully match those in the GEF adaptation tracking tool and gender related indicators and targets were limited" (TE page 53).

M&E was a budgeted activity in the approved project document and the process of monitoring, reporting and evaluation was well laid out in detail (PD page 60). The project's results framework had a well-defined set of indicators, including gender-related indicators, which needed to be verified and finalized during the project inception workshop. Baseline survey for IFAD/SCCF component was also a budgeted activity to be completed within first six months of project start up (PD page 61). There was a provision to create a

project steering committee at the national. The project had adequate provisions for semi-annual reviews and a midterm review of the project’s progress (PD page 61). Given these considerations, this TER rates M&E design at entry as **Satisfactory**.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Unsatisfactory
------------------------	-------------------------------

The TE assesses the project’s M&E implementation as **Moderately Unsatisfactory** which this TER downgrades to **Unsatisfactory**.

The TER notes that the approved project document clearly mentions the additionality and adaptation benefits, in particular table 6 (page 44-45) quantified the expected adaptation benefits from GEF/SCCF intervention along with projects results framework which needed to be discussed, validated and finalized during the project inception workshop. However, the TE notes that “the inception workshop report was not produced. The changes made to the baseline (AMMAR) project’s results framework were not clearly reflected in the GEF/SCCF project results framework. The data from inception phase was missing. The data to complete the GEF tracking tool was not complete. The data related to gender approach was limited” (TE page 53).

The TE says that “there was a major acceleration and improvement in project implementation after MTR 2017, because of strong supervision and management. The M&E system was focused on baseline AMMAR project. The project could have benefitted from clear additional targets for the GEF/SCCF project and monitoring these separately (or from climate change adaptation perspective)” (TE page 46). Based on the above-mentioned considerations, this TER rates M&E implementation as Unsatisfactory.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

Quality of Implementation includes the quality of project design, as well as the quality of supervision and assistance provided by implementing agency(s) to execution agencies throughout project implementation. Quality of Execution covers the effectiveness of the executing agency(s) in performing its roles and responsibilities. In both instances, the focus is upon factors that are largely within the control of the respective implementing and executing agency(s). A six-point rating scale is used (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory), or Unable to Assess.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
---------------------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** to the quality of project implementation. IFAD was the GEF implementing agency for this project. The TE notes that “there were delays in the project start-up due to redesigning of some elements of baseline AMMAR project, delays in recruitment of project staff and related project oversight. After 2017, the project showed high effectiveness in delivering activities according to annual plans but were not fully in line with the initial proposal. Supervision missions were increased, non-functioning service providers were replaced and procurement issues were identified and solved” (TE page 36).

The issues raised by the TE with regard to the quality of project implementation are important. IFAD supervision missions started on February 28, 2016 – almost one year after the project effectiveness in February 17, 2015. The TE at various places says that GEF/SCCF activities were “fully blended with the AMMAR project” (TE page 32). This is a positive observation. However, the concern is that either while monitoring or while reporting, the achievements of the GEF/SCCF activities is presented as stand alone. The relevance and cost effectiveness of GEF/SCCF interventions is not apparent. As GEF agency, IFAD was responsible for the management of the GEF/SCCF project cycle in line with GEF/SCCF policies and procedures. Based on the considerations, this TER concurs with the TE and rates the quality of implementation as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory
----------------------------------	--

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** to the quality of project execution. The Ministry of Environmental Protection and Agriculture (MEPA) was the project’s executing agency. The TE does not provide a comprehensive assessment of the role played by MEPA as project’s executing agency except for some sketchy references across the report. The TE says that “MEPA had an active role (high-level) in decision-making (during design and project implementation) as execution entity” (page 38). “The major procurements were civil works, consultancies for design and supervision of works, studies and training. The bidding processes were managed by the project management unit, while the evaluation committee were formed from MEPA’s staff with participating members from AMMAR/ GEF-SCCF project as observers and non-voting members” (TE page 37). “MEPA executed project activities with service providers. This was supervised through supervision missions” (TE page 53).

The responsibility of project design and execution ultimately rests with the country who as per the TE was fully involved and active – which still resulted in delays and limited monitoring/ reporting on GEF/SCCF project activities from climate change adaptation perspective. The steps taken by MEPA and the concerned authorities to develop an exit strategy and willingness to replicate/ scale up successful project initiatives are commendable. In view of the above, this TER rates quality of project execution as **Moderately Satisfactory**.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

Note - In instances where information on any impact related topic is not provided in the terminal evaluations, the reviewer should indicate in the relevant sections below that this is indeed the case and identify the information gaps. When providing information on topics related to impact, please cite the page number of the terminal evaluation from where the information is sourced.

8.1 Environmental Change. Describe the changes in environmental stress and environmental status that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE does not provide information on the achievement of the project's impact indicator for environmental change.

8.2 Socioeconomic change. Describe any changes in human well-being (income, education, health, community relationships, etc.) that occurred by the end of the project. Include both quantitative and qualitative changes documented, sources of information for these changes, and how project activities contributed to or hindered these changes. Also include how contextual factors have contributed to or hindered these changes.

The TE notes that "according to the impact survey, the increase of income from agriculture production was 60% compared to 2017. About 56% of trained women smallholder farmers adopted climate-resilient agricultural practices" (TE page 77).

8.3 Capacity and governance changes. Describe notable changes in capacities and governance that can lead to large-scale action (both mass and legislative) bringing about positive environmental change. "Capacities" include awareness, knowledge, skills, infrastructure, and environmental monitoring systems, among others. "Governance" refers to decision-making processes, structures and systems, including access to and use of information, and thus would include laws, administrative bodies, trust-building and conflict resolution processes, information-sharing systems, etc. Indicate how project activities contributed to/ hindered these changes, as well as how contextual factors have influenced these changes.

a) Capacities

The TE notes that "about 109 service providers and regional MoA officers (of which 27% were women) received ToT on climate resilient EIT/CA practices, 2,470 smallholder farmers (of which 28% were women) were trained in climate-resilient farming systems and technologies and on 17 demonstration plots, EIT and CA technologies and farming systems were tested and validated" (TE page 78).

b) Governance

The TE notes that "by the project completion, three policy/ regulatory framework have been formally proposed but adopted, including the Climate Change National Adaptation Plan for the Agricultural Sector, draft law on Windbreaks and Soil Protection" (TE page 78).

8.4 Unintended impacts. Describe any impacts not targeted by the project, whether positive or negative, affecting either ecological or social aspects. Indicate the factors that contributed to these unintended impacts occurring.

The TE does not indicate any unintended impacts.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been

established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE does not identify any instances of adoption of GEF initiatives at scale.

9. Lessons and recommendations

9.1 Briefly describe the key lessons, good practices, or approaches mentioned in the terminal evaluation report, including how they that could have application for other GEF projects.

The TE provides the following key lessons learned (page 56):

A. Project design

- The M&E of the GEF project-specific indicators and targets was challenging as the GEF-project results framework was blended with the baseline project; thus, indicators and targets were not clearly distinguished.
- The GEF project indicators were not well-matched with those in the GEF adaptation tracking tool
- The GEF-project results framework was not adjusted after adjustments were made to the baseline project results framework, which resulted in some non-efficient M & E reporting.
- Although a risk of possible slow start of the project was identified at the project design phase, this did not prevent a slow start-up of the project - project extension could have been avoided.
- There has been limited consideration of women (and youth) specific needs and concerns, especially climate change adaptation-related, at the project design phase of the project - the development and implementation of a gender action plan at the start could have led to increased benefits to women - project supervision / management could have benefitted from gender expert from the design phase.
- The strategy / mechanism to engage farmer beneficiaries at start of the project turned out to be non-appropriate / weak - as farmers are mostly not organized in Georgia.
- There was limited interest from agribusinesses for grants.
- Access to financing modalities options was limited (only grants/subsidy approach) – there should be a more sustainable solution.
- Focus was changed from poorest farmers beneficiaries to commercially active farmers to ensure better effectiveness and sustainability of the project.

B. Project implementation

- From land brought under climate-resilient practices, windbreaks are an effective response to climate change-related erosion and a promising solution for replication/upscaling.
- Further support may be required to implement and enforce the draft laws on windbreaks and soil conservation effectively.
- Although locally useful for farmers to restore their land, the river-bank interventions cannot be labelled as proper Landscape Restoration interventions in a wider scale, as they have been implemented with insufficiently integrated evaluation and planning - future project designs should ensure that wider catchment scale approach for river planning and management are in place (e.g., detailed river basin impact studies) to implement this type of intervention.

- It is not clear how effective O & M budgets (as part of exit strategy), and trainings are on the longer-term.
- Demonstration sites supported capacity strengthening of municipal staff and farmers.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations (pages 57):

A. Project design

- Ensure the GEF project results framework (indicators and targets) is additional / distinguishable from the baseline project
- Ensure alignment of the project indicators with those in the GEF adaptation tracking tool
- Ensure that any adjustments made to the baseline project (results framework) are also made / integrated into the GEF project (results framework).
- Ensure mitigation measures to possible risk of slow start of the project are effective and followed-up – delays and extension could have been avoided through well prepared start incl. better design of the baseline-project, supervision and involvement of beneficiaries (mechanisms to do so)
- Ensure women (and youth) specific needs and concerns, especially climate change adaptation-related, are fully identified at project design stage and a gender approach and baseline (i.e., action plan) is developed (with support from gender expert)
- Ensure the process of engaging stakeholders is based / building on possibilities / realities on the ground (e.g., to respond to farmers mostly not being organized in Georgia).
- Assess the interest and possible concerns / barriers of potential beneficiaries for accessing financing modalities (e.g., grants to agribusinesses) before the start of the project to ensure appropriate and impactful project activities are proposed at proposed at the design phase. This would also apply for women and youth.
- Consider more diversified and sustainable access to financing options as the approach under this project was limited to grants/subsidy
- Assess and identify, before the start of the project, how the highest possible effectiveness and sustainability of the project could be achieved through engagement of different types of beneficiaries, including e.g. the most vulnerable / poorest farmers versus commercially active farmers – or justify selection of beneficiaries with possible less effective and sustainable outcomes.

B. Project implementation

- The investments in the windbreak pilot, combined with its solid contribution to preparing a legal framework for windbreaks, have opened a wide scope for windbreak development country wide. This momentum should be seized as early as possible with the approval of the Law on Windbreaks.
- Identify what actions are needed to implement and enforce the draft laws on windbreaks and soil conservation effectively.
- For river-bank interventions / protection to be effective, ensure that future project designs consider a wider catchment scale approach for river planning and management (e.g., detailed river basin impact studies) to implement this type of intervention.
- Consider how O&M budgets and trainings can be effective on the long-term, as municipal budgets and capacities to sustain interventions may not suffice.

- Demonstration sites are recommended for replication as these can effectively support capacity strengthening of municipal staff and farmers.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

A six-point rating scale is used for each sub-criteria and overall rating of the terminal evaluation report (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory)

Criteria	GEF IEO comments	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	Overall, the TE is sketchy and lacks comprehensive analysis of the outcomes, achievements and impacts of the envisaged project objectives. This may be due to the restrictions imposed by the global pandemic and limitations mentioned in the TE.	MS
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The TE is internally consistent when read along with PIRs, MTR and other project-related reports. However, as a stand-alone TE report, it does not provide complete assessment to substantiate ratings. This may be due to the restrictions imposed by the global pandemic and limitations mentioned in the TE.	MS
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report only briefly addresses project sustainability and exit strategy. This may be due to the limited information made available to TE.	MS
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The TE provides comprehensive lessons learned and recommendations.	S
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE report only provides a total of the actual project costs but does not provide activity-wise breakup of the GEF grant and co-financing used.	US
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does not take into M&E design as was approved and mixes it with its observations on M&E implementation. The assessment of M&E at implementation is at best sketchy.	US
Overall TE Rating		MS

11. Note any additional sources of information used in the preparation of the terminal evaluation report (excluding PIRs, TEs, and PADs).