TERMINAL EVALUATION

Project ID:	5811
Project Name:	Closing the Gaps in Great Green Wall: Linking Sectors and Stakeholders for Increased Synergy and Scaling-up
Countr(ies):	Regional
Implementing Agency:	UNEP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. OVERVIEW 3
A. Description 3
B. Key Dates 3
C. Disbursements 3
II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES 4
A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings 4
B. Stakeholder Engagement 4
C. Gender Equality 4
D. Knowledge Management 4
III. CORE INDICATORS 5
IV: CO FINANCING 6
V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS 8
VI. ANNEX 8

I. Overview

A. Description

Project name
Closing the Gaps in Great Green Wall: Linking Sectors and Stakeholders for Increased Synergy and Scaling-up

Country
Regional

GEF ID	Implementing Agency
5811	UNEP

Executing Entity
IUCN

Trust Fund	Project Type
GET	MSP

Objective
Greater implementation of policies for sustainable land management in the Sahel (Great Green Wall (GGW) countries) through enhanced investment, intersectoral coordination, and engagement of marginalised groups.

B. Key Dates

CEO Endorsement/Approval	Agency Approval
6/13/2016	6/13/2016
Implementation Start	First Disbursement
6/13/2016	8/1/2016
Expected MTR	MTR Submission
12/19/2019	9/29/2026
Actual MTR	Expected Completion
4/8/2020	12/31/2020
Actual Completion	Actual TE
12/31/2022	9/1/2026
TE Submission	Final Disbursement
9/29/2026	

C. Disbursements

Project Financing	Cumulative Disbursement
1,890,408.00	1,688,416.00

II. PROGRESS STATUS AND ISSUES

A. Main Terminal Evaluation Findings

The overall performance of the project is rated Moderately Unsatisfactory. The project was strategically relevant and addressed real gaps in the Great Green Wall agenda, particularly weak coordination, fragmented monitoring, limited civil society engagement and insufficient investment readiness for Sustainable Land Management. The project design was coherent and appropriate for an enabling intervention, but it underestimated the complexity of implementation across 11 countries. The project delivered a substantial proportion of its planned outputs, including indicator work, knowledge products, training, CSO network strengthening, pastoralism and inclusion dialogue, investment-related studies and local planning support. Outcome achievement was uneven, with all three outcomes assessed as partially achieved. The strongest area was civil society and network engagement; the indicator pathway established useful foundations but was not fully institutionalised; and the investment partnership pathway was weaker, with limited evidence of concrete financing outcomes. Efficiency was affected by delays, COVID-19, partner dependency and high coordination costs. Financial management supported implementation, but final financial closure, co-financing verification and some audit/procurement evidence were incomplete. Monitoring and reporting were useful for tracking activities and outputs, but weaker for verifying sustained use, institutionalisation, influence and differentiated benefits. Sustainability is the most fragile area, especially financial sustainability. The likelihood of impact is plausible but not assured and depends on continued institutional use, financing, network activity and country ownership. Report references: paras. 71–163.

B. Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholder engagement was central to the project design and remained one of its most visible contributions. Following the MTR, the project continued to support national and regional dialogue, CSO networks, learning events, national alliance meetings, pastoralism-related dialogue, and the engagement of women's organisations and other marginalised groups. The project also contributed to strengthening the visibility of non-state actors in GGW processes, including through CSO platforms and regional exchanges. However, engagement was uneven across countries and stakeholder categories. COVID-19, security constraints, institutional turnover, changing focal points, stakeholder non-responsiveness and limited institutional memory affected continuity and verification. During the Terminal Evaluation, some listed stakeholders could not confirm participation or had no institutional memory of the project. Overall, the project made a meaningful contribution to stakeholder participation and networking, but evidence was stronger for participation and visibility than for sustained influence, formalised cooperation or long-term ownership. Report references: paras. 18-27, 86-88, 131-134 and 147-157.

C. Gender Equality

The project had a relevant gender and inclusion intent. It explicitly sought to engage women, pastoralists, civil society organisations and other marginalised or vulnerable groups in GGW and SLM dialogue. Completed measures included the inclusion of women's organisations and pastoralist-related actors in dialogue spaces, support to CSO networks, learning fora addressing barriers faced by marginalised groups, and attention to inclusion in stakeholder engagement. PIR evidence also indicates that pastoralist networks and women's groups were engaged in GGW discussions. However, the project did not provide sufficient evidence of a fully operationalised gender results pathway, systematic gender-disaggregated monitoring, or measurable changes in women's influence, decision-making power or differentiated benefits. The evaluation therefore concludes that gender-responsive measures were relevant and partially implemented, but actual gender results are more clearly evidenced at the level of participation and visibility than at the level of sustained influence or empowerment. Report references: paras. 10, 21-23, 58-61, 86-89, 133-136 and 155-156.

D. Knowledge Management

Knowledge management and learning were important features of the project. The project supported indicator-related work, training, learning and awareness-raising publications, regional events, CSO platforms,

pastoralism dialogue, SLM-related knowledge products, local planning tools and investment-oriented studies. Knowledge products and outputs were presented in GGW-related fora, and adaptive management was used to respond to implementation delays, including through reprioritisation, a no-cost extension, budget amendment and increased use of virtual modalities during COVID-19. The project therefore generated a significant enabling knowledge package. However, the evidence base is stronger on production and delivery than on dissemination reach, sustained use, uptake and institutionalisation. Some final deliverables, dissemination records and use evidence were incomplete or could not be fully verified. The main challenge was moving from knowledge production and event-based learning to routine use by national institutions, CSO networks and investment actors. Report references: paras. 82–85, 140–146 and 147–157.

III. Core Indicators

Indicator 1 Terrestrial protected areas created or under improved management

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 1.1 Terrestrial Protected Areas Newly created

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Ha (Achieved at TE)

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Total Ha (Expected at PIF)	Total Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Indicator 1.2 Terrestrial Protected Areas Under improved Management effectiveness

Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)

Name of the Protected Area	WDPA ID	IUCN Category	Ha (Expected at PIF)	Ha (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Total Ha (Achieved at MTR)	Total Ha (Achieved at TE)	METT score (Baseline at CEO Endorsement)	METT score (Achieved at MTR)	METT score (Achieved at TE)
		Wilderness Area						0.00	

Indicator 11 People benefiting from GEF-financed investments

	Number (Expected at PIF)	Number (Expected at CEO Endorsement)	Number (Achieved at MTR)	Number (Achieved at TE)
Female				
Male				
Total	**0**	**0**	0	**0**

IV: Co Financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier	Type of Co-financing	Investment Mobilized	Anticipated at CEO($)	Materialized at MTR($)	Materialized at TE($)
NGO	IUCN	In-kind		450,000.00		
NGO	IUCN	Grant		6,500,000.00		
Civil Society Organization	ReSAD	In-kind		95,000.00		
Civil Society Organization	ReSAD	Grant		105,000.00		
Multilateral	Global Mechanism	In-kind		50,000.00		
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Burkina Faso	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	450,000.00	296,500.00	
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Burkina Faso	Grant		625,000.00		

Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Niger	In-kind	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00	500,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Niger	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	600,000.00	55,000.00	
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Mali	In-kind		10,800.00		
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Mali	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	100,000.00	77,514.00	
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Senegal	In-kind		500,000.00		
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Senegal	Grant		250,000.00		
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Sudan	In-kind		50,000.00		
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Sudan	Grant		40,000.00		
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Chad	In-kind		502,000.00		
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Chad	Grant		640,000.00		
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Mauritania	In-kind		68,143.00		
Recipient Country Government	GGW Agency of Mauritania	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	500,000.00	280,322.00	
Total Co-financing				**12,035,943.00**	**280,322.00**	**0.00**

Comments

V: ENVIRONMENTAL AND SOCIAL SAFEGUARDS

Overall Project/Program Risk Classification

PIF	CEO Endorsement/Approval	MTR	TE
		High or Substantial High or Substantial	Low

Measures to address identified risks and impacts

The project was a low-risk technical assistance and enabling intervention. It did not finance physical works, direct restoration activities, infrastructure or activities likely to generate significant environmental or social safeguard risks. No major environmental or social safeguard incidents were identified by the evaluation. Safeguard management was mainly addressed through the project's participatory approach, stakeholder engagement, risk monitoring and reporting. The latest PIR evidence reported a low risk rating. The evaluation finds that safeguard management was broadly adequate for the type of intervention. The main limitation was that documentation on consultation quality, grievance mechanisms, inclusion risks and differentiated effects for marginalised groups was not sufficiently detailed. The main lesson is that even low-risk enabling projects should document stakeholder consultation quality, inclusion risks and feedback mechanisms more systematically, particularly when working with women, pastoralists and marginalised groups. Report references: paras. 40–41, 133–136, 144–145 and 155.

VI. ANNEX

Uploaded Document

Document Category	Prefix	Title
M and E Document	Terminal Evaluation (TE)	Terminal Evaluation Report