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# i. Summary of the Project

**Project “**Developing Agro-Pastoral Shade Gardens as an adaptation Strategy for poor rural communities of Djibouti “

**No identification**Atlas Award ID: 00066414 ----- Project ID: 00082602 ---- PIMS ID: 4683

**Planning of the evaluation report** : From September 28 to November 28, 2018

**Region and countries included in the project** : Republic of Djibouti; RBAS

**Operational / strategic program** : Energy and Environment Development Strategic and Disaster Risk Reduction

**Implementation Partner** : DATE (Department of the Environment and Sustainable Development) and the United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
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This finale evaluation of Developing Agro-Pastoral Shade Gardens project is in compliance with the Monitoring and Evaluation planning, and the will of SNU to include it in the mechanisms, processes and tools envisaged to assert and ensure greater coherence and synergy with government action and to strengthen national monitoring and project evaluation capabilities.

We would like to thank UNDP for its investment in the success of the assessment mission.

Also, the evaluation team would like to thanks the Government of Djibouti through the Ministry for the Environment for its availability and support throughout the mission. Also, our thanks and recognition go to the site of the Department of the Environment, the various members of the Steering Committee and the staff of the Project Management Unit (PMU) for their time and support to mission.

Then we thank the local and regional authorities in the locations concerned for their availability and their supporters.

Finally, thanks go to the project beneficiaries who welcomed us warmly during field visits.

# ii. Glossary

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| AAP  AF | African Adaptation Program  Funds adaptation (Adaptation Fund) |
| AGR | Income Generating Activities |
| CCD | Convention to Combat Desertification |
| UNFCCC | Convention United Nations Framework on Climate Change |
| CBD | Convention on Biological Diversity |
| CES / DRS | Soil Water Conservation, Protection and Restoration of soils |
| ESIA | Studies Environmental and Social Impacts |
| EMP | Mid-Term Evaluation |
| ERC | Evaluation Resource Center UNDP |
| GEF | Fund for Global Environment |
| FIP | Identity card project |
| GEF | Global Environmental Facilities (Global Environment Fund) |
| GEF IEO | Office of the independent evaluation of the GEF |
| GRN | Natural Resource Management |
| HS | highly Satisfactory |
| MHUEDD | Ministry of Housing, Urban Development, Environment and Sustainable Development |
| OFP | Operational Focal Point |
| NGO | Non-Governmental Organization |
| CSO | Civil Society Organization |
| PA | Partner programs |
| PIMS | Information management system relating to UNDP-GEF projects |
| PIR | Implement Project Report |
| UNDP | United Nations Development Program |
| UNDP IEO | UNDP Independent Evaluation Office |
| POPP | Policies and procedures related to programs and UNDP operations |
| HIPC | Highly Indebted Poor Countries |
| Produc | UNDP Project Document |
| RTA | Regional Technical Advisor of UNDP |
| S | Satisfactory |
| SDR | Rural Development Strategy |
| SRP | Reduction Strategy Poverty |
| TE | Terminal Evaluation |
| ToRs | Terms of Reference |
| U | Not Satisfactory |
| PMU | Project Management Unit |
| UNV | UN Volunteer |

# iii. Executive Summary Project

## Table 1: Table of information about the project

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project title | Development of agro-pastoral areas as a strategy for adaptation to climate change for poor rural communities to Djibouti | | | | |
| Atlas Award ID: | 00066414 | |  | | Amount  (In millions) |
| Project ID: | 00082602 | | Financing Adaptation Fund | | 4658556 |
| PIMS ID: | 4683 | | other funding | | - |
| Calendar of the Terminal Evaluation | September 28 to November 28, 2018 | | Total Project Cost | | 4658556 |
| Date of Report | November 5, 2018 | |  | |  |
| country: | Djibouti | | Region : | | RBAS |
| Focal Area: | Energy and Environment for Strategic Development and Disaster Risk Reduction | | | | |
| Implementing Agency: | Ministry of Housing, Urbanism and Environment (MHUE) | | | | |
| achievement agency: | United Nations Development Program (UNDP) | | | | |
| Other Partners: | MAEPH, CERD, SEAS, ADDS | Signature Date PRODOC | | August 13, 2012 | |
| Closing Date | | February 2018 | |

## a) Project Description (brief)

The project “**Developing Agro-Pastoral Shade Gardens as an adaptation Strategy for poor rural communities of Djibouti**” strengthens the resilience of rural communities in Djibouti regions to climate change. The arid and repetitive droughts that faces the country has led to a massive exodus of rural communities. For these reasons, the project aims not only to improve rural communities coping skills areas of the Petit Bara and Grand Bara to climate shocks but also to develop income-generating activities through the allocation of agricultural areas. These will significantly improve agricultural productivity in the country.

Moreover, this project aims to create a synergy between several ministries at achieving the desired objectives in working together. By doing so, the Ministry of Environment, the Ministry of Higher Education has contributed to this project through the study of hydrogeophyscis and the identification of potential sites in favorable water for agriculture. For its part, the State Secretariat for Social Affairs has came within the framework of the provision of microcredit through the social banking sytem (Credit Union for Saving and credit national credit and CPEC.

In its overall objective underlying the project is trying to address the challenges listed in the National Food Security Policy, namely:

* Access and water security,
* Transformational processus from Pastoraslism system to agro-Pastoralism
* The establishment of autonomous agriculture cooperatives.

The importance of these challenges is a top priority for the government by building adaptive capacity of rural poor people affected by climate shocks. However, analysis of the impact of achievements of this project requires a long time to assess the real impact at the beneficiary level and at the level of the environment.

Overall the following three interrelated components are:

Component 1: Sustainable access to secured water resources in the face of climate change *.*

This component will allow access and water security whose main objective is not only be for humain consumption but also the development of agricultural production. To this end, this component is essentially the mobilization and sustainable water resources (surface water and the groundwater). This concerns support for the provision of the current drinking water and water for agricultural activities in rural communities. To achieve this goal, the project will rely on studies that will identify water resources sites, the establishment of the necessary infrastructure to extract water, sustainable management and implementation guidelines (guides ) based on the sharing of good practices.

Component 2: Shade gardens to support diversified and climate-resilient agro-pastoral production system

This component is the development of agro-pastoral areas, the beneficiaries will benefit by practicing market gardening activities (fruits and vegetables) and forage for the livestoock. The identification of these areas meet criteria such as soil quality, possibility of access to water, protection from flooding in case of flooding, existing agricultural sites, the local population experiences of agriculture, distance from the town and interaction with traditional breeding systm. Also strong capacity bulding will be set up and training for agriculture breeding and milk conservation and transformation to cheese will be conducting.

Component 3: Access to local finance for climate resilient agro-pastoral enterprise development.

Micro finance available to rural communities for the development of micro-enterprises will rbe explore and making available to enhance the production of agro-pastoral. The community will be mobilize to better organize itsel to face these challenges using new technologies and indigineous mecanism. This last component mainly is about facilitating access to micro credit for rural communities, particularly agricultural cooperatives.

## b) Funding Method

It is important to note that this project is fully funded by the Adaptation Fund for a total amount of 4,658,556 USD over a period of 06 years (extended by an additional year until July 2018 due to the late start of the project).

## c) Progress of the project

The project is the adaptation of rural communities to climate change problem through water security and the development of agricultural areas. For this, the draft document provides mainly 03 Expected results.

***Project effectiveness ...***

For Outcome 1, it was expected to achieve the infrastructure below:

* Build and equip 06 development drilling;
* Rehabilitate 01 injection wellbore;
* Construct 06 dams with surface water basins;
* Build 08 dams infiltration.

For the second result, it was planned:

* The establishment of 228 hectares of agricultural areas in favor of 228 beneficiaries at a rate of 01ha per family and 30,000 indirect beneficiaries.

The third result includes the establishment of microcredit for beneficiaries.

***Project Efficiency***

The efficiency criterion measures the relationship between activities, resources and expected results. This should be quantitative, qualitative, and should also include time management and budget. Compared to the project, the main question posed by the efficiency criterion is "the project he implemented optimally?" He raises the question of the most economically advantageous solution. So this is to see if similar results could be obtained by other means, at a lower cost and in the same timeframe.

In keeping with these criteria in mind, the use of resources by the project appeared optimal for the evaluation team because different corrective adaptive actions and adjustments was made the Steering Committee (SC). All planned activities, which helped to achieve the objectives at the lowest cost and with the minimum of means were endorsed by the SC for each year. For instance, the corrective actions were taken when the open escavation of Kourtimalei has provided inexpected water quatities requiring from the PMU t an ajustement of the number of families, granted land respectively and the construction of number of boreholes. It was wise choice to rehabilitate wells in Oumboucto with the saving budget from the afromentionned. This is reflected the relevance PMU for being provided with means for achieving the objectives at the lowest cost.

Finally, the various performance reports prepared by the PMU reflect the achievement of annual planned activities (as PTA) in accordance to the resources provided for the period. Finally, the implementation of project funding is subject to an annual financial audit according to the draft document.

***Relevance of the project ...***

As part of this final evaluation and after the examination revealed that:

* the project is aligned with the priorities of the National Food Security Policy and UNDP programs,
* project objectives meet the challenges in terms of adaptation to climate shocks by rural communities;

## d) Project impact

The study of the impact of the project will measure the impact of the medium and long term action, which is the appreciation of all the effects of the project on the environment, both positive and negative effects, foreseen or unforeseen , economic, social, political or ecological. This is all significant and lasting changes in the lives and environment of people and groups with a direct or indirect causal link with the project.

In terms of overall results, it should be noted that the project has significantly improved the resilience of rural communities to climate shocks through the realization of spans infrastructure for sustainable access to water and development areas agropastoral. The realization of many works such as drilling borehole, reservoir, wells corresponds to government policy in the fight against thirst.

In terms of water supply infrastructure, the project has to reach rural communities in remote locations relative to capitals. This goal helped secure rural communities in their localities. Also, it is important to note that water security structures built by the project will increase the wealth to supply water (for consumption , livestock and agriculture) the most remote areas of the capitals.

In environmental terms, the implementation of activities was done according to the recommendations of the report "Environmental and Social Impact Assessment" developped as part of this project. Individual achievements are part of the rural landscape of the country and do not compromise the sustainable development of regions.

## e) Project Sustainability

At the time of the Final Evaluation, which took place in October when the project ended in July (period consistent with the project document), the evaluation team found that cooperatives set up (Kourtimaleh, Ouboucto, etc.) begin to struggle to finance itself by taking the costs of operating agricultural perimeters. The exit strategy from MoE is not yet well implemented. This sustainability mechanism will be continued if state structures (ADDS, CPEC, Ministry of Agriculture) support the agricultural cooperatives in the years to come as these cooperatives will take to develop and intake substantial financial resources will be needed to increase agricultural production . In addition, the development of the sustainability strategy under the PMU validated by the Steering Committee and signed by the CPEC and ADDS, reflects an integrated approach to agricultural cooperatives at sectoral level.

We can summarize them as follows:

**For the result - 1:**The work of five holes were drilled on the six planned. However, two holes appear positive and functional. Of the remaining three, drilling has a low rate (didjander one) and two are negative (Qoran Qalooc and Wadajaleh). As for dam work, only one dam seepage was built ( Oumbouctou one) on eight scheduled and one dam retained surface water has been rehabilitated (Kourtimaleh) on six planned.

Note that the number of infrastructure to set up, as originally planned was revised downwards in view of not only the high cost of the civil work but also the volume of water that has already been mobilized the water reservoir with a storage capacity of 500 000 m3 site of Kourtimaleh.

**For Result - 2:** the project allowed the granting perimeters to needy beneficiaries of land to practice agriculture. He was provided a grant of 1 ha per family. Now families can not develop the planned area. That is why this area has been revised downwards to 0.25 ha (the Steering Committee). This leads to the decrease in total 228 ha to 57 ha (0.25 ha X 228 families = 57 ha). For recipients, 96 families benefited 30 ha of agricultural areas.

**For Result - 3:** All studies were performed accompanied by training for the establishment of cooperatives and agricultural techniques on all project interventions sites and ultimately the site of Omar Djagga. The latest beneficiaries have already started the development of the agricultural perimeter Omar Djagga and attended by agronomists of the Ministry of the Environment).

On the financial plan It should be noted that the budget is implemented 100% and there are no resources to plan training late or repair water leaks tanks Kor Kalooc. In fact,the original purpose of the establishment of cooperatives or groups was essential support activities after the project ends. However, some sites have already launched the concept of care as the case of agricultural cooperatives and Hamboucto Kourtimalei sites that begin to self-finance the agricultural perimeters operating costs.

## f) The ratings of the final evaluation and the table of the summary of achievements

**- Tables 2** : Overall rating of the final assessment

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measured** | **notation** | **Description of achievements** |
| **Project Strategy** |  |  |
| **Progress towards results** | **Goal**: Improving resilience in rural communities  **Note**: **S** (Satisfactory) | The ultimate goal of the project is achieved with the availability and securing water and development of agro-pastoral areas of the planned sites |
| **R1** : Sustainable access to secure water resources  **Note**: S (Satisfactory) | Construction of :   * **05** completed drilling only two functional, two negative and a low flow * **01** retention dam for water infiltration on 06 * 01 dam to capture water surface of 08 |
| **R2**: Perimeters agropastoral developed oasis kinds  **Note** : **MS**  (Moderately Satisfactory) | **- 30 ha**Agricultural areas for 96 families out of 228 families planned (Journal downward at a steering committee meeting of the project for the installation and equipment costs 228 families).  - construction of 02 storage shops and 01 small dairy |
| **R3**Micro financing available  **Note** : S (Satisfactory) | - Studies on microfinance conducted planned in component 3 were performed on all the sites and especially training ADDS CPEC and the use of microfinance as a tool against climate change |
| **Implementation and Adaptive Management** | **Note** : **S** (satisfactory) | Corrective measures were undertaken on time and especially after the mid-term through the implementation of an accelerated work plan for the implementation of the remaining activities These corrective measures have to ensure implementation effective and efficient implementation of some project components |
| **Durability** | **Note**: L (Probable) | The Department is in the process of working on a sustainability strategy results. So the risk is moderate; some achievements should be maintained, given the progress made. |

## g) Summary Conclusion

The project “**Developing Agro-Pastoral Shade Gardens as an adaptation Strategy for poor rural communities of Djibouti**” is a response to the challenges of access and security to water. This project provides a sustainable solution to the rural poor to avoid the massive rural exodus. Therefore, improving the capacity of mobilization and management of surface and groundwater is important for the resilience of local populations and the development of an agro-pastoral system indisepensable to create generating activities returned.

Therefore, the project helps to mitigate climate impacts due to the arid climate that knows the Republic of Djibouti resulting in recurrent droughts. The tireless efforts of the government, international organizations and donors are significant in view of the challenges for poor rural communities exposed and affected by climate change.

Activities already carried leveraged a large volume of water at certain sites such as Kourtimalei and Omar Jagaac. Similarly, Kourtimaleh agricultural cooperative is operational and begins to make some expenses inherent in the functioning and operation of agricultural perimeters. Furthermore, the drilling Yabe which feeds the perimeter Kourtimaleh operates using solar panels and fuel, which ensures a continuous supply of water. However, the cooperative Omar Jagaac is the last to be installed on the perimeter because of the late allocation to families of farming areas.

Given the importance of achievements in terms of infrastructure project, it is important to note that the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation have been implemented and particularly on strengthening capacity of the unit project management (PMU) for monitoring and evaluation and participatory planning. Indeed, the PMU has implemented an accelerated work plan for the implementation of the remaining activities, which is why at the end of the project all activities under the Annual Work Plan were performed successfully. Moreover, weekly missions were organized by the PMU to monitor the project's progress on the ground

Finally, UNDP supervision missions were regular and associated cross-sectoral synergies. The meetings of the Steering Committee and Technical Committee were in line with the document project schedule. However, it was noted the absence of recipient (or beneficiary representatives) in the meetings of the Steering Committee and Technical Committee to ensure the consideration of complaints of beneficiaries of agricultural perimeters.

# I) Introduction

This final evaluation of the project “**Developing Agro-Pastoral Shade Gardens as an adaptation Strategy for poor rural communities of Djibouti**”, for 2012-2018 period is on the outcome and impact level of the project intervention areas in the regions of Arta and Ali Sabieh (Petit Bara and Grand Bara). The need to learn from the project implementation will lead to take stock of the implementation and progress made, to identify lessons and propose recommendations.

Thus, this final evaluation of the project is in compliance with the terms and schedule Monitoring-EvaluationAnd the willingness of donors to include it in the mechanisms, processes and tools envisaged to affirm and ensure greater coherence and synergy in project management. It was carried out according to the guidelines, rules and procedures established by UNDP and reflected in the evaluation guidelines for all projects supported by UNDP and funded by the Adaptation Fund (AF - Adaptation Funds). She carried on all project activities starting from the start date to the date of October 30, 2018.

## Purpose and Objective evaluation

Following the Terms of Reference, this final evaluation mission of the project for the period 2012-2018 aims to provide an independent assessment of interventions performance in achieving the project objectives. Through this final assessment, an analysis of the relevance of project interventions will be carried out and an assessment of the achievements of the project will be drawn up while identifying strengths and weaknesses, opportunities and threats and, finally, to draw the relevant lessons learned .

Particularly, It is in this mission:

* assess project performance through the results achieved compared with the expected results while considering the project implementation of internal and external environment;
* examine major problems including administrative, structural, organizational and financial encountered in project implementation;
* assess the impacts of interventions on target populations and the sustainability of results achieved and to what extent the principles of strategic importance such as capacity building, environment, sustainable development and results-based management have been reflected in the project interventions;
* to learn from the implementation of the project;
* to identify best practices to capitalize and make recommendations to help the different stakeholders, including donors, civil society and the government to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, impact and viability of the project for the 2012-2018 period and in the light of the results obtained have strategic and practical recommendations for the formulation of similar projects in the future.

## Scope and Methodology of the mission

### Scope of Mission

This final evaluation covered the entire project implementation period from the effective start in August 2012 to the date of October 30, 2018 and for all the components and all activities carried out with the support of project regardless of the funding body.

### Methodology: Approaches and data collection methods

The criteria for this final evaluation are the classic evaluation criteria of the OECD / DAC[[1]](#footnote-1) of relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact and sustainability plus the principles of strategic project scope such as the environment, capacity building and results-based management

The methodology takes into account the policies, practices and standards applied to UNDP and in accordance with project evaluation procedures funded adaptation fund for climate change. This is a participatory approach that includes all stakeholders involved in the implementation of this project. We worked not only with UNDP, but also with the government party and the beneficiaries and other partners involved in the execution of this project. This work was carried out through a secondary data collection (documents review), the collection of following primary data direct observation, individual interviews and group using the questionnaire with all partners and field visits to check project achievements to date.

The Mission has give the privilege the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods for data collection and implemented a participatory approach through individual interviews and focus groups. To this end, the methodological path essentially includes document review, individual interviews and focus groups, observation and field visits, the triangulation of information gathered, the development of findings, conclusions, lessons and recommendations. Thus, this methodology is summarized as follows:

### Document review :

The evaluation team sought and obtained from the project management unit (PMU), the provision of all necessary documentation including among others:

* + GEF Project Information Form (PIF);
  + Project Document;
  + Log Frame Analysis (LFA);
  + Project Implementation Plan;
  + Implementing / Executing partner arrangements;
  + The country's national strategy document;
  + The paper on the country's long-term vision (Vision Djibouti 2035);
  + Lessons Learned Report;
  + Mid-term review (MTR) Report;
  + Annual Project Implementation (APR / PIR) Reports;
  + Project budget and financial data;
  + Project Tracking Tool, at baseline, at mid-term, and at terminal points,
  + UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF);
  + UNDP Country Program Document (CPD);
  + UNDP Country Program Action Plan (CPAP);
  + GEF focal area strategic program objective.

### Interviews with stakeholders

The 'Consultants team has done the small group working sessions with the direct beneficiaries of project interventions and collected the opinions of different stakeholders in the project. Working meetings were held by the team of Consultants with the various groups:

* 1. Ministry of Housing, Urban Planning and Environment through the Directorate of Environment and Sustainable Development (DESD);
  2. Secretariat of State for Social Affairs (SEAS);
  3. Ministry of Higher Education and Research (Center of Studies and Research in Djibouti, CERD);
  4. Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries responsible for fisheries resources (Focal Point Branch Great Works);
  5. Prefects and Regional Councils of the project areas;
  6. Project beneficiaries of Representatives;
  7. UNDP (Implementation Agency);
  8. Project Management Unit.

### The Focus Group

Data collection was done through group discussions in order to collect qualitative information by discussing with different groups with the same expectations for this project. This takes into account the specific aspects of different groups related by culture, social organization or the standard of living, to determine its attitude towards this program. Also, in main place was given to vulnerable member community and the women.

In addition, based on information gathered during the briefing meeting and the literature review, we have conducted sampling for the meetings and sites to visit. So, for people, we made choices at both the beneficiaries at the level of all stakeholders involved in the implementation of this project. To this end, we met the representatives of organizations and individuals including among others: UNDP,Directorate of Environment and Sustainable Development, The Project Management Unit, Ministry of Agriculture, the State Secretariat for Social Affairs, CERD, the Project Steering Committee, local wome cooperarive, etc.

### Fieldwork:

The mission of the field was organized to observe the physical achievements of the project at each of the project sites. The field mission has allowed us to collect the views of beneficiaries on their expectations and the various achievements of the project. Also, this visit allowed us to appreciate the achievements, the realisations and the overall implementation of the project to date. This visit was made with the project team on all the sites.

### triangulation:

This method was used to allow verification in several forms different information sometimes using similar questions to examine the same issues. The main objective of this method was to better understand the different aspects of each information by eliminating or reducing bias and to increase the reliability and validity in order to obtain a better understanding of the phenomenon and have insurance against results obtained .

1. **Limitations of the final assessment**

It is important to emphasize that the evaluation team found that all project activities planned was performed. However, the final evaluation occurs very early (six months) compared to the end of the project (according to the project folder). The learning phenomenon and the impact assessment on the behavior of beneficiary families will present limits in this final assessment. Also, the evaluation was conducted between October and December 2018 period is not conducive to the cultivation of vegetables and fruits.

### Structure of the final evaluation report

This final evaluation report of the project to adapt to climate change mainly includes five parts. The first part provides an overview of the assessment through an executive summary with a brief description of the project progress, the overall rating given by the team to the final evaluation, conclusion and summary of the table recommendations.

The second part is the introduction, gives us a reminder of the terms of reference, methodology and approach used for this final evaluation. The third part of the report provides a detailed description of the project, its context, the problems that the project seeks to solve, the strategy, objectives and expected outcomes and institutional arrangements implementation and different parts stakeholders.

The fourth part gives in detail the results that this final evaluation resulted in 04 according to the following criteria: strategy, progress, implementation and adaptive management and sustainability.

The fifth and final part of this report concerns the conclusion of the final evaluation mission and the necessary recommendations for the management of similar projects in the future.

# II. Project description and context

In recent years, the government's priority is to improve the capacity of rural communities affected by water shortages caused by recurrent droughts. For that, this project aims to support the country's efforts to strengthen the resilience of populations in the regions of the Petit Bara and Grand Bara to shocks related to climate change due to repeated drought for several years. With UNDP technical support, the project is fully funded by the Adaptation Fund and implemented by the Ministry of Housing, Urban Planning and Environment through a Project Management Unit (PMU).

Several other technical institutions are involved in the implementation of sectoral activities of the project, including the Ministry of Agriculture whose responsibilities included agricultural management, water resources and infrastructure relating there to through the Directorates of 'Rural hydraulic, Agriculture and Major Projects, and other state services.

## 2.1. Project Development Background:

The Republic of Djibouti is a country located in the Horn of Africa on the border between the three continents including Asia, Europe and Africa with a very young population, 35% are under 15 years (Djibouti, vision 2035). He is one of the least developed countries with an economy heavily dominated by the service sector. Its territory has a reliefcontrasted with an arid desert climate, low rainfall in the order of 150 to 300 mm of rain on average per year, and prolonged drought affecting the population.

Variability and climate change are causing these repeated drought affecting much of the Horn of Africa. This has significantly increased food insecurity and weakened the resilience of the rural population of Djibouti. Therefore, the project is in line with the Strategy for Accelerated Growth and Employment Promotion (SCAPE, 2015-2019). This project will improve the living conditions of people in these rural areas through improved water resource access. This project is also consistent with the objectives of the Water Initiative, which aims to improve the access rate of rural populations to drinking water and also it is in line with the procedures provided for in the Program Resilience to Drought and Sustainable Development (PRSDD), running by the Ministry of Agriculture with IGAD.

The project is consistent with Goal 1 of the Adaptation Fund portfolio is to "reduce the vulnerability of the negative impacts of climate change at local and national levels." Providing access and better management of water resources, the project will directly reduce the impact of climate variability. Also, increasing market gardening and fodder production and fostering the development of solutions to diverse communities agropastoralists through access to microfinance products, the project will result in the Adaptation Fund "exposure nationally risks and climate-related hazards are reduced. "

Moreover, the project is fully in line with the National Action Plan for Adaptation (NAPA) that officially recommends capacity building activities for agro-pastoralists, dissemination of efficient forage species, strengthening cooperative organizations, the introduction of pumping technology for drinking water and the protection of agricultural land against erosion and flooding.

The project is also fully compatible with the CAADP (Comprehensive Agriculture Development Program in Africa) - which adheres Djibouti - which calls for urgent action in areas related to investment in water and land management, investment in rural infrastructure, including roads and food storage facilities, direct incentives for agricultural production and productivity, and safety nets of implementation for the most vulnerable populations and support science and technology development.

The percentage of the population living in extreme poverty increased from 43% to 23% in late 2008. Poverty affects all regions and induced a massive rural exodus to Djibouti City. Relative poverty in rural areas has taken disaster-like with a rate close to 95% (more than 3 of 4 rural living in extreme poverty according to the survey of DISED in 2010.

Persistent food insecurity is exacerbated by the inflation of food prices (1.7% in 2009 and 4% in 2010). That is why this project is online right National Food Security Program and the National Microfinance Policy (2012-2016) On the government policy plan, the fight against desertification and agricultural development are the key elements of the Government's strategy and the framework law on the environment which is in phase with this project.

However, the continuous efforts of the government and development partners have reduced the extreme poverty rate in the country between 2009 and 2017. According to the latest survey of DISED (Statistics Directorate), the extreme poverty rate individuals for the whole country is estimated at 21.1% in 2017 (EDAM4 -IS) against 23% in 2008. According to studies in previous years, there seems to be a lasting gap between the well-being of the capital , Djibouti city and other regions. Indeed, in Djibouti City, the extreme poverty rate is estimated at 13.6%, while in other regions, it is almost three times higher than the national rate: 45.0%. Using a global poverty line, the proportion of the population considered poor increases significantly. Across the country 35.8% are not able to cover their food and non-food. Among households in other regions, the rate is even higher with 59.8%.

## 2.2. Issues that the project addresses

Given the arid climate and recurrent drought by lack of water, the Republic of Djibouti with its status of least developed country is located in the arid Sahel-Sudanese band. In fact, the country is experiencing a very high desertification and a fragile ecosystem. As a result, people are exposed to high vulnerability to climate change in the long term.

Consequently, access and water security is a priority for the government to meet the extreme urgency and improve the resilience of rural communities to the effects of change. This is why the project aims to:

* Remedy evaporation of rainwater by the establishment of a new robust solution for capture and storage of water;
* Transforming farmers in agro-pastoralists allowing them to practice farming;
* Facilitate the development of microfinance products to enhance the resilience of rural communities.

## 2.3. Project Description and Strategy

The project aims to improve the resilience of poor rural communities in Djibouti regions face the repetitive droughts caused by climate change. Therefore, the project aims to help these rural communities living in areas of the Petit Bara and Grand Bara develop their capacity to adapt and to take the path of developing a resilient to climatic shocks.

Thus, the project also aims to implement sound management actions to better manage water resources, increase market gardening and fodder production for livestock and finally develop diversified solutions through the establishment of a local micro finance and accessible to all. It is for this reason that the project targets the development of agro-pastoral areas as an adaptation strategy for these vulnerable populations to reduce the adverse effects of climate change on them. The project has three interrelated components, namely:

* **component 1**: Sustainable access to secure water resources through the development of new infrastructure;
* **component 2**: Perimeters agro-pastoral oasis type developed for each of the target project area families;
* **component 3** Micro funding available to rural communities for the development of agro micro enterprises;

The expected results of this project will not only enhance access to water resources capabilities for target populations of the project, improve resilience to climate change to fight effectively against the harmful effects of climate variability and especially to promote and to develop new micro credit products for rural women and girls out of school. For this purpose and in accordance with different components, the expected project results are:

* **Results 1:** The capacity to mobilize and secure sustainable water resources in the context of climate change for agro-pastoral communities are developed.
* **Results 2:** Resilience to climate change developed agro-pastoral systems, offering greater forage production capacity, diversification of agricultural production and creating replication capabilities.
* **Results 2:** Micro-credit products to facilitate and promote the diversification of resilient agro-pastoral production systems to climate change developed.

To achieve these results, several activities were carried out and involve several target areas identified in the project document and which are spread over two areas of the South West of the country and in different areas, which include:

* Mobilization and managing surface and ground water to ensure better water supply for the various agricultural areas, local people and their livestock;
* Construction and rehabilitation of detention facilities and hydraulic structures (earth dams, underground dams, boreholes);
* Development of agricultural areas to improve agricultural and livestock production in rural communities around the project areas in terms of water availability, vocation soil, and attitudes of the beneficiary population;
* Development of income-generating activities through the availability of different microfinance products, the creation of employment;
* Strengthening the capacity of these beneficiaries through the implementation of organizational structures for managing and monitoring these water infrastructure (Steering Committee, waterholes Management Committee and agricultural areas).

The project is based on a participatory approach that will enable beneficiary communities to organize, coordinate with project partners, local institutional stakeholders to better undertake the implementation of the work of these water infrastructure and ensure the best conditions the best implementation of the project adaptation activities.

A total of 35 activities are planned and are divided into the following results below:

* Outcome 1: Access to water ..................... ... ... 13 activities.
* Result 2: agricultural perimeters ............... ... 11 activities.
* Result 3: Micro-finance activities .................. ...... ... 11 activities

These different activities aims the achievement of 4 outcome for R1, R2 and 3 outcome 3 products for R3 for a total of 10 expected products for the three components.

## 2.4. project intervention area

The project intervention area is located in the regions of Arta and Ali - Sabieh (south) and covers pretty nearly 30 km long and 12 km wide (Figure). Rainfall occurs mainly during the Karma (July-August) season giving an annual average of 150 mm of rain.

The temperature generally remains high throughout the year, associated with heavy wind conditions, resulting in a potential evapotranspiration rate of about 2000 mm / year.



**map 1 :** Delimitation of the project area (Source: Project Document AF / UNDP / MHUE)

## 2.5. Project Management Agreement

The Ministry of Housing, Urbanism and Environment (MHUE) is the key institution on issues related to the environment and climate change in Djibouti. To this end, it coordinates all actions related to climate issues and is working with several government institutions and civil society.

Thus, as part of this project, the Government of Djibouti through this Ministry has requested that the implementation of this project is provided by the UNDP as implementing agency of quality accredited by the Adaptation Fund.

In addition to the UNDP and the Ministry, the project includes a Steering Committee chaired by the MHUE which is responsible for monitoring the activities, a Technical Committee and a Project Management Unit (PMU).

Members of the steering committee are the Secretary of State for Social Affairs (SEAS), CERD, the Ministry of Agriculture, the Prefects and Regional Councils of the project areas and the representatives of the beneficiaries.

The roles and responsibilities of each of its members is defined as follows:

* **Agency implementation:** United Nations Development Program (UNDP)
* **Implementing Agency:** Ministry of Town Planning and Habitat of Environment through the Directorate of Environment and Sustainable Development (DESD).
* **Steering Committee of the Project:** The Steering Committee provides guidance for the implementation of the project. It includes UNDP, the Secretariat of State for Social Affairs (SEAS), the Ministry of Higher Education and Research (CERD), the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries responsible resource fish (focal Point Great Works Branch), the prefecture of Arta and Ali Sabieh regional Councils Arta and Ali Sabieh.
* **Technical Committee:** The technical committee provides technical guidance for defining field actions. It consists of the focal points (The Great Branch Works, Rural Water Directorate, Directorate of Agriculture and Forestry, Department of Livestock, CERD, SEAS UNDP) and the Project Management Unit.
* **The Project Management Unit:** Ensures implementation of operational and functional activities of the project. The project management unit consists of a project of the National Director responsible for the project implementation. Daily activities are conducted by a project manager attended a loaded M & E (vacant), a responsible agriculture, administrative and financial assistant, agent in charge of community mobilization and a driver

## 2.6. Project duration

The project is planned for a total initial five (05) years from 13 August 2012 until 13 August 2017 (extended until July 2018 due to the late start of the project).

## 2.7. List of key stakeholders

The main stakeholders of the project are:

* Ministry of Housing, Urbanism and Environment (MHUE)
* **Ministry of Agriculture, Water, Fisheries, Livestock and Fisheries (MAEPERH)**
* Secretariat of State for Social Affairs (SEAS)
* The Center for Studies and Research in Djibouti (CERD)
* Local authorities including Prefects and Regional Councils
* The beneficiary communities

# III. Results of the final assessment

The results of the final evaluation are consistent with the terms of reference of this mission and the UNDP procedures regarding final evaluation of projects under funding Adaptation Fund (AF), and the standard model of the mandate for the final exam. Primarily, the results of the final evaluation are presented in four parts, namely:

## Project strategy: Relevance to the National Priorities Project

This part mainly concerns the results of the evaluation in relation to the design and scope of the project results.

After a comprehensive assessment carried out based on data from other project document, work plan, monitoring and evaluation plan, PPR (project performance report) and observations during the field visit, we reached the following findings :

* **Project design:**

Built around national priorities mitigation strategy related to climate change, the project is formulated on the design plan with assumptions taking into account local realities. The lessons learned from other similar projects were considered and have resulted in better design, which is in line with national priorities. One important aspect of the project design is the participatory approach that takes into account the participation of beneficiaries in decision-making affecting them. The other satisfying aspect is the consideration of gender (women's participation) in the project activities. Women, although they can not do a number of jobs reserved for men and some limitation related to the cultural and religious aspects, occupy a prominent place throughout the process that can contribute to their development and facilitate empowerment. The various preparatory studies for project design (identifying the needs of people in the most vulnerable sites) were a significant contribution in the project design.

* **Results Framework:**

As part of this final evaluation, assessing the quality of results formulation is not to their questioning. But it offers rather to highlight the shortcomings that could be corrected by preserving the essence of the results concerned. The approach is part of a learning perspective that is expected to capitalize on lessons learned for the execution of similar projects.

Indeed, the examination of the project results matrix shows overall consistency in the results chain. Activities are well articulated products. The products provided effectively contribute to achieving the desired objectives.

Indeed, in this final assessment project aims as previously indicated to help poor rural communities to find solutions to adapt to climate change linked to recurrent droughts that knows the country for several years.

To achieve 03 key results are expected at the end of this project whose realization depends on expected 10 products through the implementation of 35 activities to ensure that people have water, an agricultural area and micro finance for the continuation of their adaptation to climate phenomena.

However, the development of the project results framework presents some insufficient in terms of indicators for activity 17 of the 35 planned in total. This may not facilitate the understanding to some degree due to provide indicators for certain activities and not the other especially when it comes to key activities such as the development of infrastructure related to water mobilization .

Similarly, the intervention logic in the project raises some difficulties of understanding that would be easier if the presentation of the results framework followed the following logic: Overall objective - Specific objectives - Expected results (for each specific objectives) - attractions in perform related to each expected result and finally, indicators of achievement for each activity. This would facilitate the work of the unit monitoring and evaluation.

## Progress against the expected objectives: Project Efficiency

This part mainly concerns the final review of various achievements in order to assess the level of progress and results achieved at the end of the project. A brief explanation can give a '' justification '' or the reasons for awarding this or that note. As previously indicated, a total of 35 operations are provided and are distributed as follows: 13 activities for R1 Result and 11 activities for R2 and 11 R3 activities for the result.

In fact, the assessment of progress will be to assess the effectiveness of the project and results achieved effects. In other words, it will measure progress have achieved the intended objectives. So, in simple terms, it is to check firstly whether the targets of expected products for the 2012-2018 period have been achieved and secondly to highlight the possible contribution they have made to achieving strategic results.

**Table 3 Matrix of progress towards results**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Project Strategy** | **Indicator** | **Base level** | **level PPR** | **Target achieved at project** | **target expected** | **Rating Achievement** | **Rating rationale** |
| **result 1**  **sustainable access to safe water** | 1.1: Number of approved study reports | 0 | 04 | 04 | 04 | **S**  (Satisfactory) | All activities were carried out taking into account the corrective measures, that is to say, some targets were revised downward steering committee ' |
| 1.2: Number of hectares irrigated speak drilling |  | - | 15 | 228 ha |
| 1.3: Number of hectares irrigated by dams built |  | 07 | 09 | 228 ha |
| 1.4: Number plan and shared good practice guides |  | - | 21 ha | 228 ha |
| **result 2**  **developed agricultural areas** | 2.1: Number of hectares of developed agricultural areas | 0 | 60 | 30 | 228 | **MS**  (Moderately Satisfactory) | The implementation of all planned activities were effective. But taking into account some initial targets related changes (revised downwards during the Steering Committee). |
| 2.2: Number of beneficiaries of the training provided |  | 60 | 96 | 228 |
| 2.3: Number of shop built storage |  | 03 | 02 | 06 |
| **result 3**  **Secure access to micro finance products** | 3.1: Number of micro-finance products available | 0 | 0 | 7 | 07 | **S**  (Satisfactory) | All planned activities (education and training) were performed |
| 3.2: Number of agro-pastoralists trained |  | 0 | 96 | 228 |
| 3.3: Number of established cooperatives | 0 | 0 | 4 | 04 |

Achievements to each Expected Result is as follows:

**result 1: Sustainable access to safe water**

To achieve this, i was expected to achieve a number of activities including 13 retail projects to assess the level of implementation is shown below:

**tables 4 : Details of activities in view of the result R1**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No. Activities** | **Planned activities** | **achievements** |
| 1 | **component 1 : Securing sustainable access to guaranteed water resources in the context of climate change** |  |
| 1.1.1 | Modeling Study soil, hydrological and hydrogeological including an analysis of the current availability and demand for water resources and projected scenarios for water availability in the watershed of the Petit Bara and Grand Bara | All planned studies have been achievements.  This helped determine likely points for boreholes and water catchment areas.  Also soil science soil was used to determine the type of crop for every site for the development of farming areas. |
| 1.1.2 | Detailed Environmental Impact Study on the design of dams and irrigation networks, including water quality analysis in accordance with the regulations Djibouti | This study was conducted in December 2014 and proposed recommendations for the operational phase of the project. |
| 1.1.3 | Identifying suitable sites for retention basins, dams and underground drilling based on group consensus between beneficiaries and ministries. | This activity was conducted in a participatory manner with beneficiaries and local authorities. |
| 1.2.1 | Training of technical staff of the Ministry of Water exploitation of surface water, artificial recharge and sustainable water resources management | Ministry staff participated in the work for learning on site but there is no formal training on the subject. |
| 1.2.2 | Design of artificial recharge and production of operating and maintenance manuals for drilling pumping system with solar energy | The design of the charging drilling plans was carried out. The operating manual is not yet available. |
| 1.2.3 | Construction of 06 operating wells (4 and 2 Grand Bara Bara Small) and the rehabilitation of an injection drilling. | - 05 holes were drilled. However only two are equipped and operational, two were negative and the flow of the fifth low drilling |
| 1.3.1 | Design of Scheme dams, location and surface water retention ponds with the manual | The design of the scheme was made dams and made technical dossiers accompanied the user manual |
| 1.3.2 | Construction of 06 dams (dikes) of retained land and their basins | 01 dam land Realization (dam). The project achieved great restraint with a capacity of 600,000 cubic meters. However the number of successful initially planned is not reached. becauseit should be noted that the amount of infrastructure in place, as originally planned was revised downwards in view of not only the high cost of the work but also the volume of water that has already been mobilized in retaining water Kourtimalei.  19 Water Tanks |
| 1.3.3 | Constructions 8 dams (dikes) of selected surface water (infiltration for well water) | Dam only 01 was built on a total of 08 planned in the project document becausethe very high cost of the work, but also the volume of water that has already been mobilized |
| 1.3.4 | Monitoring the work of dams (dams) to ensure a durable construction in any social or environmental negative impact | Activity carried out to 02 sites on 06 planned, it waslowered with regard not only to the very high cost of the work but also the volume of water that has already been mobilized |
| 1.4.1 | Creation and training of community infrastructure Management Committee water to develop local recovery mechanism, the management plan and good practice guides | - created Management Committee  - A guide manual of good practices has been developed as part of project |
| 1.4.2 | helped design and pricing structure socially sensitive to run in a national legal framework for water resources management and raise the efficiency of water use and resources for the maintenance of water infrastructure | - Unrealized Activity |
| 1.4.3 | Development of a standard system for lessons learned on water harvesting on community mobilization, water management strategy and cost recovery mechanism to continually incorporate the good practice guide on water | - Activity carried out |

It appears from this table that the 13 activities planned for the achievement of the results R1, 05 activities are fully completed studies on part essentially 05 activities were carried out with downward revised targets and 03 activities concerning the management of infrastructure were completed.

Note that the number of infrastructure to set up, as originally planned was revised downwards in view of not only the high cost of the work but also the large volume of water that has already been mobilized.In fact, efforts and financial resources committed, the number of operations performed drilling compared to exploitable agricultural areas are sufficient (3/6). Regarding the work of construction of infrastructure for the capture and storage of water, significant efforts have been made. Similarly, the number of dams planned and implemented (surface water or infiltration) of 2/14 are given the exorbitant cost of dam construction.

Thus, the assessment of progress towards achieving this result is summarized as follows:

**tables 5**: Rating of progress toward R1 Result

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment of progress towards achieving results R1** | | |
| **R1: Sustainable access to safe water** |  | **Explanation** |
| S  **(Satisfactory)** | Securing access to water throughout the project intervention area has been secured to (Kourtimalei Omar Djagga and Hamboucto) to share the site with which Qaloc Qoran-drilling today feeds the region Ali Sabieh but local authorities also claimed during the assessment mission he plans the realization of another drilling on this site. Note also that beneficiaries continue despite this constraint water agricultural activities by installing on some plots the water system drop by from gout. |

**result 2 : Agricultural perimeters developed**

To achieve this result, which depends in part on the availability of water at a given site, a total of 11 activities have been planned in the project document. Out of all of these activities, it should be noted that given their interdependence with the first component and the availability of water, it was a little late in realizing.

However, almost all of these activities were carried out and major efforts have been made on a number of sites such as Kourtimalei, Ombouctou and Kor Kalooc. Similarly, the work of installations of solar panels on the drilling site Yabe and finalization of the second reservoir site Jagaac Omar are made operational and before the final evaluation

The overall situation of the achievements are as follows:

**tables 6: Details of activities in view of the result R2**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **2** | **component 2 : Development of agro-pastoral areas to support and diversify the climate resilience of agro-pastoral systems** | **achievements** |
| 2.1.1 | Selection of beneficiaries agro-based criteria through community meetings with project representatives | Kourimalei ... .. 20  Qoran Qaloc ...... 24  Hamboucto ... ... 12  Omar Jagac ... .. 40  -------------------------------------------  Total ............. 96 families (identified and installed during installation except Omar Jagac) |
| 2.11.2 | Construction pens thrown with sturdy fencing material surcharge trees | Fences constructed for sites with implementation of natural windbreaks such as Leuceana |
| 2.1.3 | Design and construction of water reservoirs (tanks) for sites of 38 hectares each with cost irrigation equipment | The tanks are installed in 06 sites where the beneficiaries have already been identified and installed. |
| 2.1.4 | Preparation 06 ha 38 sites each  NB: Forecast revised down (0.25 ha per family X 228 = 57 ha) | 05 ha ...... Kourtimalei  12 ha ... .. Qoran Qaloc  10 ha ... .. Omar jaqac  03 ha ... .. Hamboucto  -------  **30 ha** |
| 2.1.5 | Seeding of plots with forages | Activity carried on 06 Sites |
| 2.1.6 | Purchase of fruit trees and vegetable seeds | Activity carried on 06 Sites |
| 2.1.7 | Installing new nurseries by women's groups | Specific to each household nurseries were conducted. |
| 2.1.8 | Reforestation by species adapted to climate change to reduce evapotranspiration, stabilize the soil and prevent the loss of vegetation due to grazing | Activity carried out on 06 sites set value |
| 2.2.1 | Training of the Ministry of Agriculture staff in agricultural practices drought resistant | - Activity unrealized for lack of time |
| 2.2.2 | Training of all households agropastoralists by extension specialists to help develop methods and technical agricultural production that are resilient to climate change | Numerous situ formations were made to beneficiaries by agricultural specialists in the fields of forage, technical routes of market gardening and fodder crops. |
| 2.3.1 | Construction of fodder warehouses, agricultural products and milk storage facilities (21 mx 9 m) with balance weight measurement | Two warehouses were constructed and a mini dairy. |

**tables 7 : Rating of progress toward R2 Result**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment of progress towards achieving results R2** | | |
| **R2: developed agricultural Perimeters** |  | Explanation |
| **MS**  **(Moderately Satisfactory)** | All planned activities were carried out taking into account the departure of targets related changes. However, reducing the number of hectares of 228 hectares to 30 hectares and the number of families of 228 to 96 (decided by Steering Committee) did not reach the greatest number of expected beneficiaries. |

**result 3 : Access to secure microfinance products**

The result of the 3 component is very important to help sustain the achievements of the project. Because of its dependence on the first two components. Indeed, the activities of Component 3 started with a delay that was filled with the positive results generated by the other components. Already, the final evaluation has found that training to the cooperatives were conducted as well as some successful partnerships in place, including with CPEC and SEAS which aims to ensure the continuity and sustainability microfinance-related project for self-financing of agricultural cooperatives.

Details of activities is as follows that according to the draft document:

**tables 8: Details of activities for the result R3**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **3** | **component 3 : Development of sustainable agro-business by secure access to finance for climate resilience** |  |
| 3.1.1 | Development MF occurs in three stages, including a safety net program for cooperatives, Nanofinance for small loans and flexible loans of diversified microfinance, income-generating activities with the help of the international expert group and national | - Studies conducted on the Dev strategy. product Microfinance  - Study conducted on the taxation of Microfinance Sector  - Study carried out on the development of knowledge management plan |
| 3.1.2 | targeted training for ADDS CPEC and to give them the expertise in teaching principles of MF products geared towards adaptation to the project beneficiaries | - activity performed |
| 3.1.3 | Preparation of a technical guide detailing the principles of microfinance and activities of sustainable agriculture | - Activity carried out |
| 3.1.4 | Development of mobile banking to provide microfinance services to beneficiaries without the need to travel | - Canceled in the steering committee for the project sites do not have or hardly capture the mobile network. Moreover, agropastoralists have difficulty have operational phones regularly for lack of electricity |
| 3.1.5 | Monitoring and periodic evaluation of micro-finance-oriented long-term adaptation | - Unrealized Activity |
| 3.2.1 | Organization of agro-pastoralists and pastoralists into cooperatives and training in cooperatives in terms of loan repayment program, savings account, sustainable farming practices and diversification of agricultural products | - 4 agro-pastoralists Cooperatives created |
| 3.2.2 | Development of diverse women's groups micro finance with a focus on empowering women | - Activity carried out, it should be noted the case of the establishment of small dairy center on the site of Kourtimalei managed by women in the processing and sale of milk. This center contributes to the empowerment of women. |
| 3.3.1 | Organization of agro-pastoralists into cooperatives which provide them advice on measures to improve microfinance products | - Training conducted for 96 direct beneficiaries. |
| 3.3.2 | 2 workshops per year are organized by the ADDS to facilitate the documentation and collection of ideas to promote microfinance sustainable products | - Unrealized activity due to the delay recorded in the implementation of components 1 and 2 activities |
| 3.3.3 | Formalizing training communities focused on adaptation to be integrated into the national food security program and the National Micro fiance policy | - Unrealized Activity |
| 3.3.4 | Organization, centralization and promotion of lessons learned on good practices agropastoral areas in its written route, video reports, workshops and study tours | Several activities reportage video, television and other written press is realized. |

In view of the above, the evaluation team attributed the notation below:

**tables 9: Rating of progress towards the R3 Result**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment of progress towards achieving results R3** | | |
| **A3: Access to secure micro finance products** |  | Explanation |
| S  **(Satisfactory)** | Activities related to this result has been achieved despite the observed delay in the start of this component |

**3.3. remaining barriers to the completion of the results:**

The project has three exceptional characters, namely:

* The achievement spans infrastructure such as dam, drilling, etc;
* Lev development of agricultural areas in several locations (6);
* The transformation of the rural poor backgrounds farmers in agro-pastoralists.

However, the duration (5 years) of building this infrastructure is almost insufficient to carry out all activities and achieve the objectives set in the project. Therefore, the analysis of the impact of this project requires a period of time sufficient to assess the change made by the project on the living standards of the populations and the environment.

Nevertheless, we should first recall the project's importance for the people living in rural areas who after losing all their livestock, these rural populations find themselves exposed to permanent climate risks because of the adverse effects of repeated droughts due to climate change. These people that we can consider as climate refugees in their own country are facing a survival problem and need assistance in order to be more resilient to the effects of climate.

In fact, there are no major obstacles to the achievement of expected results but it is important to note a few things to take into consideration, including among others:

* Some observed delays in disbursements which delay the implementation of activities within the period;
* The long delays in signing partnerships and engagement of some stakeholders such as SEAS, ADDS and CPEC;

## Implementation of the project and adaptive management

As part of the final assessment, the analysis also focused on the management mechanism, business planning, financing, monitoring and evaluation system, participation of stakeholders, the internal and external communication project and the overall implementation of the project. This is to propose solutions to identify and increase the effectiveness and efficiency of the implementation of similar projects.

## Management Agreement

The Ministry of Housing, Town Planning and the Environment as an institution is in charge of all matters related to the environment and climate change in the country and coordination of all related activities climate issues. For this purpose, it must work in collaboration with several governmental and nongovernmental institutions.

The final evaluation mission found that the implementation of control bodies, monitoring and evaluation have been set up according to the document project with very clear terms of reference with a focus on the expected results. UNDP supports are adequate and in accordance to the demands of the PMU. The various committees regularly hold their meetings to provide their support to the PMU.

In terms of effectiveness, although the implementation arrangements have been effective, they must still emphasize the failure of UNDP from monitoring missions to support the PMU in monitoring and evaluation to the suffering of the expected results.

## Workplan

The establishment of the necessary bodies (Steering Committee, Technical Committee and especially in terms of field activities) and institutional arrangements have led to a significant delay in the actual start of the project. The start was planned that was effective only administratively but in September 2012, technical studies (hydrology, soil, geophysical, etc.), which marked the start of field activities were held only from so in September 2013 with 12 months of delays (Ref. 2013 annual Report).

Annually, the PMU is developing a PTA approved by the Steering Committee which provides a schedule of activities and a quarterly and semi-annual work plan with specific responsibilities.

## Financing and Financial Management Project: Project Efficiency

The assessment of efficiency was based on the main issue following documented in the evaluation matrix: How far the results have been achieved with the resources available on time? Specifically, it is to assess the level of disbursement of resources from the results achieved during the period and also to judge the respect of deadlines in the delivery of products.

Funding for the project is fully insured by the Adaptation Fund without any financing. In terms of financial management, it should be noted first that the project is 100% in terms of budget execution (Table below)

**Table 10: Implementation rate of the budget by component and year**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Designation** | **Budget in US $ (a)** | **(\*) Total Expenditure USD (b)** | **Rate of implementation of the budget** |
| component 1 | 1910000 | 1910000 | 100% |
| component 2 | 1498000 | 1498000 | 100% |
| component 3 | 477800 | 477800 | 100% |
| Project management | 407800 | 407800 | 100% |
| MIE Fees (UNDP) | 364 956 | 364 956 | 100% |
| **TOTAL** | **4658556** | **4658556** |  |

**Source:** Combined Financial Report (CDR) of UNDP

(\*) The detail of the total expenditure shown in another table in the appendix.

The control system on the financial plan is in place and operating under different audits held every year and the development of implementation plans of audit recommendations.

However, some targets (number of dam) project have been revised downwards given the infrastructure costs underestimated in economic calculations in the formulation of the document project.

**Overall, products (activities) are deemed delivered across a proven solidity**, As they have been developed and made on the basis of international standing procedures. Both the installed equipment, training and expertise accompanying provision for developing rural communities adaptive capacities of Djibouti, meet robust quality requirements. contract review committees have allowed even to the PMU to identify and exclude non-performing suppliers.

## monitoring and evaluation system level

In terms of monitoring and evaluation and implementation, the implementation of UNDP procedures are the rule for the project management unit (PMU). To this end, it is important to note here that if the system worked at project start.

However, the project suffered from a lack of appropriate monitoring and evaluation mechanism due to the absence of a responsible monitoring and evaluation. Also, weak human resources of the PMU has led to a slight lack of visibility and responsiveness for certain activities.

However, to ensure the achievement of progress towards the results according to indicators, monitoring and evaluation remains essential.

At this level, it is important to note that the recommendation of the mid-term evaluation on a reorganization of the unit in charge of monitoring and evaluation of the project and revision of monitoring and evaluation plan was acted upon given the large number of jobs to follow on the remaining period. Thus, accelerated work plans have been developed and more, weekly field visits were made by the coordinator or technical experts to monitor the project's progress on the ground

## Stakeholder engagement

The stakeholders included in the project document are: the Ministry of Housing, Urban Planning and Environment, the Ministry of Agriculture, Livestock, Fisheries, Water Resources and Fisheries, the Secretariat of State for Social Affairs, CERD, the CPEC, ADDS, local authorities and beneficiaries. Partnership agreements are made directly between the PMU and the various technical departments of the ministries concerned such as the Directorate of Rural Water, the Great Works Directorate, the Directorate of Agriculture, etc. for carrying out the activities that they have the necessary expertise.

The active engagement of all stakeholders in the project reflects their awareness of the challenges and needs of rural communities in terms of water supply and creation of income generating activities.

## Elaboration of Reports

The reporting capacity is sufficient for the volume of work and the number of person in charge in the PMU. Sharing and disclosure by the steering committee was important to ensure a participatory and adaptive management of the project.

## communications

The project received excellent visibility due to the communication strategy. Indeed,several regional and national articles have focused on the results of BARA project; namely newspapers such as Jeune Afrique, Sahel or nation.

It is important to emphasize that the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation led the PMU has developed a communication plan for better visibility and ownership of project activities by all. However, at the institutional level, the participation of key actors such as the State Secretariat for Social Affairs, ADDS and CPEC took place late this has impacted on project ownership.

To this end, the evaluation team, taking into account all the aspects mentioned above gave a score below this section:

**Table 11: Notation implementation and adaptive management**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Assessment of progress towards achieving results R3** | | |
| **A3: Access to secure micro finance products** |  | Explanation |
| S  **(Satisfactory)** | Corrective measures have been made through the implementation of an accelerated work plan has been followed strictly in the implementation of the remaining project activities |

## Sustainability and Project Impact

The sustainability of project achievements is based on key determinants, upstream and downstream. Upstream, there is the quality of the delivered products and downstream quality ownership of beneficiaries and their ability to take over and hold the result. Without quality products, we can not consider real sustainability. Also, if good products have been delivered but are not required as they should be and that the beneficiaries are not really ready to wear as they were in bygone programming cycle, we can not no more talk about sustainability.

Compared to the risks identified in the project document, the final evaluation mission generally noted the existence of a sustainability mechanism to maintain the project activities in time. Apart from the fact that the infrastructure such as dams and boreholes will be maintained by the Ministry of Livestock and Water Resources, sustainability of other actions are not challenged by the lack of funds to continue the actions of project (leading to the abandonment of certain agricultural areas). For some agricultural cooperatives set up (site Kourtimaleh and Oumbouctou) already provide themselves some operating expenses.

Thus, the second lever of the project outside the access to water, it is to address the issue of access to micro credit. The adoption of a strategy to ensure ownership and sustainability of the project at the end of the funding of the Adaptation Fund A was prepared by the PMU through the signing of partnership between several ministries and, in particular, the State Secretariat for Solidarity (CPEC, ADDS, etc.).

In terms of beneficiaries, the project enabled the allocation of 30 hectares of plots of land to 96 families. The agro-pastoralism diversification where the project will allow origins herder families to adopt adequate activity (farmer or rancher) to take account of seasonal factors on agriculture and thus constantly meet their needs. By successfully diversify the business families, the project has not only enhance the resilience of these families to climate shocks but also to prevent the rural exodus. Furthermore, the indirect effects of the project on the beneficiaries is the need to create a favorable environment for families and their children in terms of health and educational facilities for the rural exodus is caused not only by the lack of water but also by the lack of school facilities, health, etc.

Moreover, the sociological aspect of the project was analyzed through the question of gender. The distribution of beneficiaries for agricultural areas was made according to the individual vulnerability criteria, households but also the genre. The number of women (individual or family responsibility) with the plots corresponds to 21 out of 31 for the site of Omar Jaggaac. The number is almost identical to the other sites. Another highlight for gender mainstreaming in the project is the award of the management of dairy center for women only. Finally, women hold an important place in the cooperatives Management Committee. Similarly work on agricultural parcels is done in a collective way in summer (high output). In times of low production (September to March), work on farm land is carried out by women to grow forage for livestock while the men go about their occupations breeders. However, the project contributed positively to mitigate the socio-cultural pesenteurs affecting women in Djiboutian society and, especially, in the rural. The woman is fully involved in decision making in the management of agricultural cooperatives.

Finally, on the environmental side, the Environmental Impact Studies and Social identified no major risks in project reports (ESIA) and made recommendations in the direction of increasing overall benefits for the environment . To this end, the evaluation team attributed the note below to sustainability.

**Table 12: Rating of the Sustainability Assessment**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Sustainability Assessment** | | |
| **Sustainability** |  | Explanation |
| **The** (Likely) | The risk is attenuated in the presence of a sustainability mechanism. Agricultural cooperatives grow to be independent. But the lack of exist staretgy implemented by the Ministry of agriculture way tempred the expected sustanaibiliy. |

# IV. Conclusions and Recommendations

## Conclusion

The project “Developing Agro-Pastoral Shade Gardens as an adaptation Strategy for poor rural communities “of Djibouti” is a response to repeated drought problem which has led to the scarcity of water and people's aid dependency food. Therefore, improving the capacity of mobilization and surface water management and the basement has become critical to the resilience of local populations through the development of an agro-pastoral system associated with their well be.

Thus, in view of the consequences of the prolonged drought for several years due to climate change, the project continues to be of utmost importance for the country, otherwise, people might live in constant chaos. Faced with this situation, all efforts have been made to the success of this project despite the difficulties.

Activities already carried leveraged a large volume of water at certain sites such as Kourtimalei and Ombouctou. The establishment of management committees helped prevent conflicts and sustain the achievements of the project. Also, low physical ability of herding origin populations led the PMU to review the area of ​​each agricultural area under 1ha declining to 0.25 ha per beneficiary family

Despite efforts by the PMU in terms of monitoring, evaluation and participatory planning, weak staff mitigated the execution within the certain project activities and monitoring of UNDP supervision missions and make recommendations bring the project team to beneficiaries.

In the end, after this final evaluation mission, we made the recommendations below.

## recommendations

After this final evaluation mission, we make the following recommendations for the management of similar projects in the future:

### Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project:

**result 1 : Sustainable access to secure water resources**

1. Achieving the same activities in similar projects to actually to provide a lasting solution to secure water;
2. In the capacity building framework, it will integrate the monitoring and evaluation of dams and boreholes at the Ministry of Livestock and Water Resources;
3. Support cooperatives established by state structures such as the Secretariat of State for Social Affairs (through ADDS and CPEC), the Ministry of Agriculture, etc.

**result 2: Perimeters developed agro-pastoral**

1. Establish structures reconciliation between the Ministry of Livestock and Water Resources and beneficiaries to ensure water security;
2. Ensure adequate training of the beneficiaries for the expansion of agricultural areas;

**result 3 Micro financing for micro-enterprises set up**

1. Implement all partnerships signed so that agricultural cooperatives have easy access to microcredit for the sustainability of agriculture
2. Integrate agricultural cooperatives in a comprehensive national policy for strengthening the primary sector;

**Sustanaibility**

1. Explore other sources of funding (public and private);
2. Implement the recommendations of the ESIA to the extent possible by the Ministry of Livestock and Water Resources;
3. Plan the PNA in the country's overall policy.

### Proposals for action to follow to enhance the initial benefits of the project

* Ensure a strong commitment to the state through government departments and local authorities;
* strongly involve local communities in strengthening the Steering Committee;
* Regions need to strengthen cooperatives and micro finance products in their favor;
* Establish partnerships and ensure all the necessary training.

# NOTES

1. **Terms of Reference for the final evaluation;**
2. **route of the mission;**
3. **List of respondents;**
4. **Summary of field visits;**
5. **List of documents reviewed;**
6. **Matrix of evaluation questions;**
7. **Summary of results;**

**8) Evaluation Form consultant agreement.**

Appendix I : Terms of Reference for the final evaluation (RDT see attached file)

# Appendix II : Mission itinerary

In accordance with the predetermined program in the initial report of final evaluation, the route of the mission is:

September 28, 2018:

* Beginning of the final evaluation mission
* Interview with UNDP responsible for the National Program and Project Coordinator

September 29-October 2, 2018 :

* Collection of secondary data;
* document review and preparation of the mission.

-6 05 October 2018 : Interviews, stakeholder interviews

* Visit to the management of the environment: DESD and interview respectively with the Deputy Director General of DESD after introducing the program specialist - UNDP, other stakeholders.
* Interview with the Directorate of Studies and Research Center of Djibouti (CERD)

07 - October 2018 : Field visits in the regions of the Petit Bara and Grand Bara to assess the achievements and other invesinvest- the project on site according to the following table:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Sunday, October 7** | **Monday, October 8** | **Tuesday, October 9** |
| **Sites** | **Omaar Jagaac** | **Qoran Qalooc** | **Wadjaleh** |
| **Kourtimaley + Yabbeh** | **Oumbouctou** | **Didjander** |

# Appendix III: List of Interviewees

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **No. Order** | **First Name and Last Name** | **Function** | **Organization** | **Contact** |
| 1 | Idriss Ahmed Hared | Program Officer | UNDP | [Idriss.hared@undp.org](mailto:Idriss.hared@undp.org)  Tel: +253 77 83 64 31 |
| 2 | Houssein Ali Mahamoud | Project National Coordinator | DATED | [Mahamoud.houssein@live.fr](mailto:Mahamoud.houssein@live.fr)  Tel: +253 77 81 52 10 |
| 7 | Idriss Ismael Mour | Deputy director | DATED | Tel: +253 77 84 95 04 |
| 13 | Dr. Abdurahman Daher | director | Sces Institute of Life / CERD | [(+253) 77 82 14 84; abd\_daher@yahoo.fr](mailto:(+253)%2077%2082%2014%2084%20;%20abd_daher@yahoo.fr%20) |
| 14 | Prefect Ali sabieh |  |  |  |
| 15 | Prefect of Arta |  |  |  |
| 16 | Abdillahi Sougueh Assoweh | Agro-pastoralist | Kourtimalei |  |
| 17 | Ali Atteyeh | Agro-pastoralist | Kourtimalei |  |
| 18 | Idriss Hassan Gouled | Agro-pastoralist | Kourtimalei |  |
| 19 | Mahamoud Ismael | Agro-pastoralist | Kourtimalei |  |
| 20 | Mahamoud Ahamad Okiyeh | Agro-pastoralist | Kourtimalei |  |
| 21 | Omar Hassan Aouled | Agro-pastoralist | Kourtimalei |  |
| 22 | Djama Darar | Agro-pastoralist | Hamboucto |  |
| 23 | Said Maidel | Agro-pastoralist | Qoran Qaloc |  |
| 24 | Hassan Goubeh | Agro-pastoralist | Qoran Qaloc |  |

# Appendix IV: Summary of field visits

Members of the mission visited six project sites in connection with the evaluation of Bara project. It was to pay particular attention to issues

* + - Relationship between environment and development,
    - In terms of implementing the strategy of strengthening the resilience of communities to climate change effects that will fight against poverty by increasing the income of producers of the project area,
    - Improving food security for families,
    - increased biodiversity (plant and animal) ecosystems.

To implement (operationalizing) this strategy, the mission noted the implementation of important infrastructure and actions:

* + - * Infrastructure construction (barages, restraint, wells, tanks, etc.)
      * Capacity building of project beneficiaries,
      * The emergence of agro-enterprises (cooperatives and marketing channels) resilient to climate change effects.

However, the mission was able to meet on the field a few limits under the impact of the project and the strategy that the challenges are:

* + - Challenge in water: The number of negative wells or low throughput (3) on five constructed;
    - Challenge conversion of breeders farmers;
    - cooperative challenge and agro-pastoral businesses.

In general, the mission found some work in progress or to come as the project ends such as:

* Second Omar Jaggac tank during construction,
* Equipping the second perimeter Omar Jaggaac gardening tool
* Solar panels are not installed on the site of Yabbeh,

# Appendix V: List of Documents Reviewed

1. The project document UNDP / AF
2. The Report of the Environmental and Social Impact Assessment of UNDP prior to the project;
3. The various reports on project performance (PPR);
4. The annual work plan of the project between 2012 - 2018;
5. Reports of annual activities of the project from 2012 to 2018;
6. The budget and the project budget revisions;
7. The country's national strategy document;
8. The document on the country's long-term vision on the country (Djibouti Vision 2035);
9. Report on lessons learned;
10. The project monitoring and evaluation reports;
11. The project monitoring reports by UNDP;
12. The reports of the Project Steering Committee;
13. Reports of workshops as part of the project;
14. Report of audit recommendations monitoring plan between 2012 - 2017;
15. Financial Reports 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017 and 2018 (UNDP CDR).

# Annex VI Matrix of evaluation questions

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation criteria** | **key Questions** | **Specific sub-issues** | **Method / data collection tools** | **Indicators / standards of success** | **Methods of data analysis** |
| ***Relevance*** | Is the project relevant in its design? | Is the project consistent with national priorities of the Republic of Djibouti including with regard to the evolving context? | * documentary study * Interview with stakeholders (institutional, technical structures) | * Availability of information in the documents concerned | Analyze and highlight the country's development or not consistency between project objectives and the strategic reference frameworks |
| Are the objectives and activities appropriate to the needs of beneficiaries in particular gender? | * documentary study * Meeting with Institutional * Interview with project teams * Interview with individual beneficiaries and Focus Group | * Quality of available data in documents * Credibility / accuracy of information gathered from stakeholders | Integrate information interviews and compare them with those of the literature review |
| Is the proper implementation strategy to the objectives and does well integrated programming principles such as gender, environment, human rights, capacity building and managing for results? | * documentary study * Interview with the UNDP program officers * Interview with implementing partners | * Quality of available data in documents * Credibility / accuracy of information gathered from stakeholders | Integrate information interviews and compare them with those of the literature review |
| The control device, for project implementation and coordination of layout is relevant? | The internal mechanisms for coordination and implementation of the project and national mechanisms are they relevant in the design and adequate with the issues and challenges of the project? | * documentary study * Interview with the steering committee, the steering committees | * Data Quality for stronger institutional arrangements | Review of the operation and the institutional system dysfunction in the light of results recorded |
| The results framework and project monitoring and evaluation framework they provide good readability of expected results and they allow performance measurement indicators to assess the expected performance? | * documentary study | Readability of the consistency and quality of the results framework and monitoring framework -assessment / readability of the results chain | Review of articulating the results chain and quality indicators |
| ***Efficiency*** | Are the expected results? | - What is the level of progress towards the achievement of expected results?  - The products and the expected effects are they obtained?  - To what extent that revenues do they contribute to the achievement of expected effects? | * documentary study * Interviews with technical managers ministries and agencies * Focus groups with beneficiaries * Visits achievements | * Level of performance measurement * Relevance of the level of achievement of outputs and outcomes | Analysis of what is achieved compared to what is provided using performance measurement indicators / compare Targets to Baselines. |
| What are the major transformational changes induced from the beneficiaries? | * documentary study * Individual Interviews and Focus Group | * Level of performance measurement | Comparative analysis of the situation at the end of the project with the initial baseline |
| What internal and external factors that positively or negatively affected the performance of each component of the project? | * documentary study * Interviews with national stakeholders * Meetings with focus groups and joint piloting, monitoring and evaluation group | * Level of identification factors and their impact | Consideration of the context and situation of implementation of the shares of each component of the project in relation to the results recorded |
| ***efficiency*** | What is the performance of the project compared to the conditions of achievement of outputs and outcomes? | Are the products obtained on the basis of better cost-effectiveness? | - Documentary study   * Interview with agency program officers | * Quality of financial monitoring implementation of country programs | absorbed Resources reported the% of achievement of expected results |
| Have the Monitoring and Evalulation system and reporting were used as tools to support the achievement of results? | * - Documentary study * - Individual and Collective Interviews | * Quality monitoring of country program outcomes and UNDAF midterm | Review of Monitoring and Evalulation system in place and functioning, the tools used to monitor the project |
| What positive or negative factors affected the operational context of implementation of the project? / Difficulties and administrative, organizational, structural, financial? | - Documentary study   * Interview with members of the Joint Steering Committee, the joint thematic groups, stakeholders at national level | * Level of identification factors and their impact | Review of Project operationalization issues |
| What is the relevance of the partnership during the implementation of the project | The Intersectoral partnership with UNDP | - Documentary study   * - Individual and group interviews | Stakeholder satisfaction | Review of the partnership during the implementation of the project |
| What are the strengths and weaknesses of the partnership developed by the technical services of partner ministries, the private sector and civil society organizations in the implementation of the project? |
| ***Impact*** | What are the visible impacts of the project mainly on the populations | What are the major changes in the lives of those concerned? | * - Consultation of databases * - Documentary study * - Interviews Individual and Collective | Quality of available data | Comparative analysis of the data before and after the project to draw conclusions |
| The capacity of ministries, they are strengthened technical services in connection with the implementation of the project? | * - Documentary study   - Interviews Individual and Collective |
| ***Durability/***  ***sustainability*** | How durable the results? | They may Actions financed to be maintained and continued after the end of the support provided by donors at the end of the project? | * documentary study * Interviews * In situ observation | Information contained | **Review mechanisms and sustainability measures provided and the situation at the end of the project** |
| What measures and strategies are implemented by beneficiaries, communities and the government of Djibouti to sustain the results? |
| ***Capitalization*** | What lessons learned from the implementation of the project? | What are the significant lessons learned from project implementation in Djibouti? | * documentary study * Interviews * In situ observation | Information contained on the successes and failures | To highlight the failures and successes and model advocating what should be avoided and which should be encouraged. |

# Appendix VII Summary of results

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Measured** | **notation** | **Description of achievements** |
| **Project Strategy** |  |  |
| **Progress towards results** | **Goal**: Improving resilience in rural communities  **Note**: **S** (Satisfactory) |  |
| **R1** : Sustainable access to secure water resources  **Note** : **S** (Satisfactory) | Construction of :   * **05** completed drilling only two functional, two negative and a low flow * **01** retention dam for water infiltration on 06 * 01 dam to capture water surface of 08 |
| **R2**: Perimeters agropastoral developed oasis kinds  **Note** : **MS** (Moderately Satisfactory) | **- 30 ha** Agricultural areas for 96 families out of 228 planned.  - construction of 02 storage shops and 01 small dairy |
| **R3**Micro financing available  **Note** : S (Satisfactory) | - Studies on micro-finance  - Training of beneficiaries kourtimalei perimeters Cooperatives |
| **Implementation and Adaptive Management** | **Note** : **S** (Satisfactory) | Corrective measures have been taken in time to ensure effective and efficient implementation of some project components |
| **Durability** | **Note** : **The** (Likely) | The Department is in the process of working on a sustainability strategy results. So the risk is moderate; some achievements should be maintained, given the progress towards results already achieved. |

# Appendix VIII: Scales criterion Notations for the final evaluation

### Scale of ratings by criterion (Table A, B & C)

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Assessment of progress towards achieving results:** (An evaluation for each embodiment and for each target) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The objective / achievement should meet or exceed all targets project end without presenting major failure. Progress towards the objective / achievement may be an example of "good practice". |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The objective / achievement should reach most target project completion, and presents only minor deficiencies. |
| 4 | Fairly satisfactory (MS) | The objective / achievement should reach most of the final project targets but has significant shortcomings. |
| 3 | Rather unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective / achievement should reach most of the final project targets but has major shortcomings. |
| 2 |  | The objective / achievement should not reach most of the end of project targets. |
| 1 | Very Unsatisfactory (HU) | The objective / achievement has reached the mid-term targets, and should not reach any of the end of project targets. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Evaluation of the implementation of the project and reactive management:** (One comprehensive evaluation) | | |
| 6 | Highly Satisfactory (HS) | The implementation of the seven components - provisions for the management, planning, financing and co-financing, monitoring and evaluation systems at the project level, stakeholder engagement, communication and data communication - allows the implementation effective and efficient project management and reactive. The project can be an example of "good practice". |
| 5 | Satisfactory (S) | The implementation of most of the seven components enables the effective and efficient implementation of the project and reactive management, with the exception of a few components subject to corrective action. |
| 4 | Fairly satisfactory (MS) | The implementation of some of the seven components enables the effective and efficient implementation of the project and reactive management, but some components require corrective action. |
| 3 | Rather unsatisfactory (MU) | The implementation of some of the seven components enables the effective and efficient implementation of the project and reactive management, but most components require corrective action. |
| 2 | Unsatisfactory (U) | The implementation of most of the seven components does not allow the efficient and effective implementation of the project and reactive management. |
| 1 | Very Unsatisfactory (HU) | The implementation of any of the seven components permits the effective and efficient implementation of the project and reactive management. |

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1. **Sustainability Assessment:** (One comprehensive evaluation) | | |
| 4 | Probable (L) | negligible risk to sustainability; Key actions about to be reached at the end of the project and should be maintained in the foreseeable future |
| 3 | Somewhat Likely (ML) | moderate risk; some embodiments at least should be maintained, given the progress towards results achievement observed during the mid-term review |
| 2 | Somewhat unlikely (MU) | risks than the main achievements are not continued after the close of the project, with the exception of certain products and activities |
| 1 | Unlikely (U) | strong possibility that the project's achievements and the main products are not kept |

# Appendix IX : Tables of budget implementation rate by component

1. **Implementation rate of the budget by component and year**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Designation** | **Budget in US $ (a)** | **Total Expenditure USD (b)** | **Rate of implementation of the budget** |
| component 1 | 1910000 | 1910000 | 100% |
| component 2 | 1498000 | 1498000 | 100% |
| component 3 | 477800 | 477800 | 100% |
| Project management | 407800 | 407800 | 100% |
| MIE Fees (UNDP) | 364 956 | 364 956 | 100% |
| **TOTAL** | **4658556** | **4658556** |  |

**Source:** Combined Financial Report (CDR) of UNDP

1. **Expenditure Summary of the 2012 draft until December 31, 2016**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Designation** |  | |  | | **Annual expenditure by component in USD** | | | | | |
| **2012** | **2013** | | **2014** | | **2015** | **2016** | **2017** | **2018** | **Total** |
|
|
| component 1 | 21 932.86 | 408 351.76 | | 229 832.60 | | 70 115.80 | 425 028.82 | 586,130.85 | 118,952.85 | **1910000** |
| component 2 | - | 196 730.99 | | 326 373.06 | | 119 068.14 | 597 036.91 | 254,755.43 | 293,869.18 | 1498000 |
| component 3 | 14 079.09 | 44 523.97 | | 14 449.78 | | 17 234.79 | 43 127.68 | 69114.5 | 29706.27 | 477800 |
| Project management | 78 242.41 | 87 950.52 | | 118 598.31 | | 71 591.84 | 30 255.96 | 3124.3 | 4585 | 407800 |
| MIE Fees (UNDP) |  | 189 662.00 | | 66 808,00 | | 51 906.00 | 37 432.00 | 29456 | 8528.33 | 364 956 |
| **TOTAL** | **114 254.36** | **927 219,24** | | **756 061.75** | | **329 916.57** | **1132 881.37** | **942,581.08** | **455,641.63** | 4658 556.00 |

**Source:** Combined Financial Reports (CDR) of UNDP

1. Development Assistance Committee (DAC) of the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)