



To Do

Projects

Reports

Administration

Help

Logout

Terminal Evaluation Review - Entry Form

Quick Select: [Select](#)

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

Collapse all sections

Project

GEF ID	<input type="text" value="2405"/>
Project Title	Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis and Strategic Action Program Development for the Lake Victoria Basin
Project Type	Medium Size Project
Funding Source	GEF Trust Fund
Focal Area	International Waters
Agency	World Bank
World Bank ID	<input type="text" value="85782"/>
Country	Regional
Add Country	(Select country to add)
Country List	<input type="text"/>
Project Status	Project Closure
Duration	<input type="text" value="1.25"/> years
CEO Endorsement	<input type="text" value="04/01/2004"/>
Agency Approval	<input type="text" value="10/14/2004"/>
Project Effectiveness	<input type="text"/>
GEF Agency Execution Partners	<input type="text" value="(Select Execution Partners)"/> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Civil Society <input type="checkbox"/> Private Sector <input type="checkbox"/> Indigenous Community <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other
If other, please specify	<input type="text" value="SIDA as NGO and NORAD from I"/>

 **Terminal Evaluation Staff**

EO Staff

TE Author

TE Reviewer

TE Peer Reviewer

 **Completion, Submission & Delays**

Project Completion

Project Expected Completion

Project Actual Completion

Project Completion Difference Months

TE Completion

TE Completion

TE Submission to EO

TE Submission to EO Difference Months

TER Completion

TER Completion

TER Submission to EO

TER Submission to EO Difference Months

Comments on Delays 

No delay in project implementation. However, an important point must be noted: As a very serious and recurrent problem identified during TE Reviews process for FY11 APR, the ICM report for this project has been found uploaded in 2008 to PMIS as a PIR, and WB delivered a GRM to GEFEO in November 2011 to be considered as a TE, as if an ICM had not been previously submitted in 2008.

The miscommunication between the World Bank and its IEG and GEF Secretariat (particularly the RBM Team) in relation to GEFEO has been leading to serious delays regarding the review of TEs.

Also, misunderstandings from both WB/IEG and GEFSEC personnel regarding the nature and terminology of WB documents have led to incorrect storage of PIRs. TEs and TERs in both PMIS and GEF's internal folders and drives (M:

 **Funding and Co-Financing**

	Amounts at CEO Endorsement	Amounts at Completion	Ratios
GEF Amount (US\$)	1,000,000	1,000,000	100.00 %
Cofinance Amount (US\$)	5,600,000		
Total Amount (US\$)	6,600,000		

Comments on Cofinancing

Unable to find the cofinance amount at completion either on ICM or on GRM.

Logical Framework

Quality of Logical Framework



Project Objectives -




The objective of the project was to undertake a Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) of the Lake Victoria Basin in order to identify a Strategic Action/Investment Program (SAP) addressing key environmental issues and poverty alleviation by promoting sustainable economic growth. The SAP should have been endorsed by the Regional Policy Steering Committee (RPSC) and the Ministerial Committee on Lake Victoria Development Program (CLVDP) and with appropriate involvement of Rwanda and Burundi.


Comment on Changes

Objectives have not changed.


Activities	Outputs	Outcomes	Assumptions & Risks	Impact Enablers	Intermediary States	GEB / Impact	
A1 - TDA: A Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) of the Lake Victoria Basin was undertaken, including the preparation of survey papers that summarize the existing scientific findings and available data from the first phase of the Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project (LVEMP) and other sources (on topics such as fisheries, water hyacinth, biodiversity, phosphorus, toxic substances, persistent chemicals, pesticide residues, blue-green algae, nitrogen, and land	O1 - TDA: TDA analyzed in a cooperative, participatory manner to design a SAP in the Lake Basin including identification of priority interventions in Burundi and Rwanda. The SAP will be used as an input into the design of the follow-on LVEMP2. TDA approved by the Ministerial Committee on Lake Victoria Development Program (CLVDP) and focal points in Burundi and Rwanda. O2 - SAP: A SAP was	O1 - Policy documents approved and improvement in project documentation: Burundi and Rwanda committed to include LVWMP 2 in their next CASS reports (as Kenya, Tanzania and Uganda), consistently with the national development strategies of other Lake Basin countries, which emphasize healthy ecosystems, poverty reduction, and sustainable economic growth. O2 - Legislation enacted,	A1 - SAP would be endorsed by the Regional Policy Steering Committee (RPSC) and the Ministerial Committee on Lake Victoria Development Program (CLVDP), with appropriate involvement of Rwanda and Burundi. R1 - Lack of consistency in pattern of efforts: The risk is considered to be Moderate (M) because important outputs have been produced, but the question is how these are deepened in terms of development of a more specific, prioritized program of investments, policy changes, and institutional	IE1 - Regional cooperation and integration mechanisms in place: This GEF grant required involvement of Rwanda and Burundi at a time when these two countries were emerging out of conflict and were not yet associated. Thus, one positive benefit of the activity was that it enhanced regional cooperation and integration. New ground was broken	IS1 - Enhanced quality of TDA and SAP: Although approved, the TDA and SAP's quality could have been improved if the prioritization of interventions was complemented with the analyses of costs-effectiveness, costs-benefits, and expected physical impacts, rather than ranking methodology alone. Given that these are living documents, these analyses could be undertaken during the future revisions.	GEB1 - Enhanced Sustainable economic growth: Following important policy, legislation and standards implemented in EAC, sustainable growth is observed in the Lake Victoria basin, with explicit inclusion of Burundi and Rwanda, as a consequence of SAP and TDA.	Edit Delete

<p>use). A Strategic Action/Investment Program (SAP) would also be designed in the Lake basin through the TDA.</p>	<p>identified, addressing of key environmental issues and poverty alleviation by promoting sustainable economic growth. After identification, an SAP was produced and approved by the CLVDP and focal points in Burundi and Rwanda with policy, legal, institutional and investment projects addressing key environmental issues and promoting sustainable economic growth.</p>	<p>regional EAC standards in force: At the regional level, the Protocol on Sustainable Development of the Lake Victoria basin was ratified by the EAC Partner States (Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda) in November 2004. It sets out the framework, and demonstrates regional commitments to sustainable utilization of transboundary resources and addressing environmental concerns in the lake basin. Further, the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC), established under the Protocol to coordinate development in the basin, became operational in July 2006. Finally, the EAC Partner States have adopted a shared Lake Victoria Development Vision and Strategy, which lists sustainable utilization of natural resources of the basin as one of its five policy areas. O3 - Priority interventions financed under national and regional frameworks. Basin-wide investment proposals developed to attract international financing. Environmentally friendly market-driven economic growth indicators were developed and are being used.</p>	<p>undertakings. The risk is considered low that work along these lines will not proceed since both the countries and IDA are committed to continue their efforts.</p>	<p>as Rwanda and Burundi were brought into discussions with the EAC and Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda on a technical issue of mutual interest. So this activity contributed in some way to strengthening relations among the countries and with the EAC, leading up to the integration of Rwanda and Burundi as full members into the EAC in November 2006.</p>		
<p>A2 - Public consultations: Public consultations with key Lake basin</p>	<p>O3 - Awareness raise: Awareness raised</p>	<p>O4 - Coordination and synergy established between</p>	<p>A2 - TDA and SAP serve as strategic documents for the Lake Victoria Development</p>			<p> Edit  Delete</p>

stakeholders undertaken under this project and two regional workshops convened. These consultations helped to gather inputs for the preparation of the TDA and also the SAP.	amongst key stakeholders on the root causes of environmental degradation in the Lake Victoria basin.	regional efforts addressing environmental issues in the Lake basin.	Program (LVDP) of the EAC and guide domestic and external investments promoting environmentally friendly market driven growth in the Lake Basin.					
A3 – Burundi- and Rwanda-specific issues included: TDA includes an analysis of key environmental issues in Burundi and Rwanda affecting the health of the Lake Basin ecosystem.		O5 – Chemical Stabilization: Water Nutrients (P or N levels) stabilized or reduced in Lake Victoria. Water hyacinth inflow from Kagera river reduced and managed at non-nuisance levels in the Lake.					 Edit  Delete	
 Add New Row...								

 **Project Performance**

[Copy Agency Review Ratings To GEFEO Ratings](#) [Copy Agency Review Comments To GEFEO Comments](#)


Overall Project Rating 

Comment

According to the TE, "Through stakeholders consultative process, the preparation of both the national (five) and a regional Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA), together with the Strategic Action Program (SAP) were completed, under the coordination of the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC) of the East African Community (EAC). The preparation of the five national TDAs was completed by June 2006. Further, the preparation of the regional TDA was completed in December 2006. The regional SAP was completed in March 2007, and adopted by the East African Community (EAC) Council of Ministers on Lake Victoria basin in April 2007."

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Outcomes 	Last PIR:	<input type="text" value="4 - Moderately Satisfactory"/>	
	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="4 - Moderately Satisfactory"/>	



			<p>The overall outcome of the Trust Fund is rated as Moderately Satisfactory. This is because so far, the five countries under the coordination of EAC have jointly committed to address the transboundary environmental concerns of the Lake Victoria basin using collaborative efforts to generate a "regional public good". The full realization of the overall outcome would depend on the actual implementation of the proposed interventions. In this regard, the EAC and five countries must incorporate the required policy, institutional, and legal reforms; priority investments; and regional management framework in the LVEMP 2 design. Note that the output indicators are expected to contribute eventually to outcomes via the planned Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project and other activities. Achieving outcomes directly with the MSP is/was unrealistic to expect, since the outputs generated represent only the beginning of a larger program – led by LVEMP, which is currently under preparation -- that would eventually achieve desirable outcomes.</p>
	Agency Review:	<input type="text" value="NA - Not Applicable"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	<input type="text" value="4 - Moderately Satisfactory"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Terminal Evaluation:	<input type="text" value="UA - Unable to assess"/>	




Relevance 









The preparation of the Lake Victoria Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Program (SAP) processes were important globally, that is why these processes have been supported by the GEF in the first place. They were also important regionally, since, for the first time, a basin-wide approach to Lake Victoria management has been taken under which all 5 countries have collaborated and identified the following prioritized key transboundary issues: (i) land, wetland, and forest degradation; (ii) governance, policy, and institutional weakness; (iii) fisheries, habitats and biodiversity loss; (iv) increased lake pollution, atmospheric deposition, and eutrophication; and (v) water balance, water resources management, and climate change problems. In addition, the Japanese PHRD grants have funded six national technical studies (applied research, natural resources interventions, private sector development, monitoring and communications, assessment of spatial planning tool, and institutional arrangements) in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. Further, Sida has provided grants to Burundi and Rwanda to develop their national LVEMP 2 components. Finally, the Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program (NELSAP), with support from the Sida and NORAD, has launched three river basin management projects (Kagera, Mara, and Sio-Malaba-Malakisi rivers), and studied the hydrology of the Kagera basin. The main objective of these projects is to develop basin-wide investment proposals, which will attract financing from other donors.
















The CASs for Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda list support to LVEMP2 as one of their key national priorities. Burundi and Rwanda are also committed to include LVEMP 2 in their next CAS reports. The Trust Fund was consistent with the national development strategies of the five countries, which emphasize healthy ecosystems, poverty reduction, and sustainable economic growth; and identify degradation of natural resources as a key impediment to achieving these shared results. At a regional level, the Protocol on Sustainable Development of the Lake Victoria Basin was ratified by the East African Community Partner States (Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda) in November 2004. It sets out the framework, and demonstrates regional commitments to sustainable utilization of transboundary resources and addressing environmental concerns in the lake basin. Further, the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC), established under the Protocol to coordinate development in the basin, became operational in July 2006. Finally, the EAC Partner States have adopted a shared Lake Victoria Development Vision and Strategy, which lists sustainable utilization of natural resources of the basin as one of its five policy areas.

2. Achievement of TF Development Objective
Discuss and rate the extent to which the Trust Fund development objectives have been met, with linkage to outcome indicators. This includes

	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory	
Effectiveness 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	
Efficiency 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	The planned activities were implemented, but for a longer than originally expected period because of the: (a) lengthy Bank's procurement procedures, particularly under the Quality and Cost Based Selection (QCBS) method, and (b) limited procurement management capacity both at the regional institution managing the grant (EAC) and the five countries' focal point ministries levels. The TDA and SAP costs remained within budget. Economic and financial returns are not applicable
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory	




Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Sustainability 	Last PIR:	UA - Unable to assess	
	Terminal Evaluation:	3 - Moderately Likely	The risk is considered to be Moderate (M). Important outputs have been produced. The question is how these are deepened in terms of development of a more specific, prioritized program of investments, policy changes, and institutional undertakings. The risk is considered low that work along these lines will not proceed, since both the countries and IDA are committed to continue their efforts.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Likely	Agrees with the TE.
Financial 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information provided in either the ICM or the GRM.
Socio-political 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	No information provided in either the ICM or the GRM.

Institutional and Legal 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No information provided in either the ICM or the GRM.
Environmental 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	No information provided in either the ICM or the GRM.


Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
M&E 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory 	The LVBC management monitored the TDA and SAP contracts reasonably well.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Beyond the 1 statement, there is no evidence in ICM or the GRM of M&E systems and their adequacy.
M&E Design 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Although there is no sufficient information provided in either the ICM or the GRM, M&E Design as per PAD is moderately satisfactory, since regular reports should have been taken place. During the preparation phase of the TDA and SAP only "process indicators" will need to be monitored. These simply include whether the TDA and SAP have been agreed and providing evidence of stakeholder involvement, functioning Inter-Ministerial Committees, and agreement on joint institutional frameworks to be pursued not only among the EAC countries but including Rwanda and Burundi.
M&E Plan Implementation 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	Apart from the ICM, no other reports have been submitted to GEF and, actually, the ICM has not been submitted to GEFEO, but to GEFSEC. The GEFEO has received a delayed GRM as if it was a Completion Memorandum.
M&E Funding and Budget Utilization 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO		

















Review: UA - Unable to assess ▼



Performance Audits costing USD 19,500 were disbursed in total, but no further information was provided in either the ICM or the GRM.




Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Quality of Implementation and Execution 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess ▼	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	Average between IA and EA quality rounded up to Satisfactory, as per guidelines.
Quality of Implementation - IA 	Terminal Evaluation:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	The Bank performance is judged to be satisfactory. Every effort was made from the Bank side to support the implementation activities by EAC and the countries involved and to take necessary actions from the Bank side with quick turn-around.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	Agress with the TE.
Quality of Execution - EA 	Terminal Evaluation:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory ▼	The execution of the task by the regional entity is considered moderately satisfactory. The delays in implementation stemmed in a large part from weak capacity, in particular the missing procurement expertise that needed to be brought in from the outside.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory ▼	Agrees with the TE.

 **Agency Specific Project Criteria**


Criteria	Document	Rating/Verification	Comment
Processes Affecting Attainment of Project Results			
Country Ownership / Driveness / Alignment to Country or Regional Priority 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess ▼	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable ▼	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory ▼	

			Even though this GEF grant required involvement of Rwanda and Burundi at a time when these two countries were emerging out of conflict and were not yet associated, this project enhanced regional cooperation and integration. New ground was broken as Rwanda and Burundi were brought into discussions with the EAC and Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda on a technical issue of mutual interest. So this activity contributed in some way to strengthening relations among the countries and with the EAC, leading up to the integration of Rwanda and Burundi as full members into the EAC in November 2006.
Financial Planning 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	4 - Moderately Satisfactory 	Regarding disbursements of GEF Grants, everything was well planned. However, no information regarding cofinancing was provided in either the ICM or the GRM.
Preparation and Readiness 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
Stakeholders Involvement 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to assess 	A TDA and an SAP have been produced. The process was participatory and involved representatives from all five countries of the Lake Victoria basin. The quality of the TDA and SAP, however, could have been improved if the prioritization of interventions was complemented with the analyses of costs-effectiveness, costs-benefits, and expected physical impacts, rather than ranking methodology alone. Given that these are living documents, these analyses could be undertaken during the future revisions.
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	5 - Satisfactory 	Agrees with the ICM.
Need for Follow Up 	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess 	This risk is managed by using LVEMP 2 as a catalytic instrument, whereby interventions aimed mainly at addressing key transboundary issues and their associated incremental costs are funded under this project. Other interventions proposed under the TDA and SAP will be recommended for incorporation into the respective national/sectoral project and programs.
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	Yes 	No reporting of cofinancing disbursements have been submitted to GEFEO, although project design had estimated a significant cofinance amount of USD 5,600,000.












Gender Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
Effects on Local Population 	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>


Criteria / Socioeconomic Nexus	Document	Verification	Comment
Poverty Reduction 	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
Crisis Prevention and Recovery 	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
Democratic Governance 	Terminal Evaluation:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	Unable to assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>


 **Progress to Impact**


Progress to Impact 	Terminal Evaluation:	UA - Unable to Assess <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Moderate Progress <input type="button" value="v"/>	<input type="text"/>




As an important factor of progress that allows for further achievement of GEBs following achievement of Outcomes, it may be noticed that, according to the ICM, this GEF grant required involvement of Rwanda and Burundi at a time when these two countries were emerging out of conflict and were not yet associated. Thus, one positive benefit of the activity was that it enhanced regional cooperation and integration. New ground was broken as Rwanda and Burundi were brought into discussions with the EAC and Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda on a technical issue of mutual interest. So this activity contributed in some way to strengthening relations among the countries and with the EAC, leading up to the integration of Rwanda and Burundi as full members into the EAC in November 2006.

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Foundational	Document	Verification	Comment
Information, Knowledge and Awareness 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	According to the ICM, The main expected outputs, namely the TDA and SAP documents have been produced, albeit with some delays, and there is still room for improving their quality during the planned periodic revisions. The Regional Policy Steering Committee on Lake Victoria development program, consisting of the Permanent Secretaries from Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda; and including representatives of Burundi and Rwanda approved the TDA and SAP documents on February 28, 2007. Therefore, at least some knowledge, information and awareness is being exchanged at the governmental level.
Legal, Regulatory and Policy Frameworks 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	According to the ICM, the TDA and SAP documents were endorsed by the 3rd EAC's Sectoral Council of Ministers for Lake Victoria development meeting, which took place in Kisumu, Kenya from April 1 - 5, 2007. The documents were later on adopted by the responsible Ministers in the Republics of Burundi and Rwanda on May 1, 2007 and May 2, 2007, respectively. Therefore, policy frameworks constitute an achievement of the project
Implementing Structures and	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes 	













































Arrangements 		Again, the Regional Policy Steering Committee on Lake Victoria development program, consisting of the Permanent Secretaries from Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda; and including representatives of Burundi and Rwanda approved the TDA and SAP documents on February 28, 2007.
--	--	--

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Demonstrational	Document	Verification	Comment
Piloting / Demonstration of technologies and approaches 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	

Criteria / Categorization of Results / Investment	Document	Verification	Comment
Financial mechanisms to facilitate adoption of the promoted technologies and approaches 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	

Criteria / Causal Pathway	Document	Verification	Comment
Replication 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	GEFEO Review:	N - No <input type="checkbox"/>	No evidence provided for replication of policy.
Upscaling 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	GEFEO Review:	Y - Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	Policy is meant to encourage regional cooperation thereby upscaling of local
Mainstreaming 	Terminal Evaluation:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable <input type="checkbox"/>	



Criteria / Evaluative Evidence	Document	Verification	Comment
	Terminal		

<p>Environmental Stress Reduction </p>	Evaluation	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NA - Not Applicable</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Not applicable to the nature of the project.</td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+ Add New Row...</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		NA - Not Applicable			Not applicable to the nature of the project.	 Edit  Delete	+ Add New Row...					Agency Review	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NA - Not Applicable</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+ Add New Row...</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		NA - Not Applicable				 Edit  Delete	+ Add New Row...					GEFEO Review	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NA - Not Applicable</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+ Add New Row...</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		NA - Not Applicable				 Edit  Delete	+ Add New Row...				
		Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments																																														
		NA - Not Applicable			Not applicable to the nature of the project.	 Edit  Delete																																													
	+ Add New Row...																																																		
	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments																																															
	NA - Not Applicable				 Edit  Delete																																														
	+ Add New Row...																																																		
	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments																																															
	NA - Not Applicable				 Edit  Delete																																														
+ Add New Row...																																																			
<p>Environmental Status Change </p>	Terminal Evaluation	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NA - Not Applicable</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>Not applicable to the nature of the project.</td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+ Add New Row...</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		NA - Not Applicable			Not applicable to the nature of the project.	 Edit  Delete	+ Add New Row...					Agency Review	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NA - Not Applicable</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+ Add New Row...</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		NA - Not Applicable				 Edit  Delete	+ Add New Row...					GEFEO Review	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>NA - Not Applicable</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> <tr> <td>+ Add New Row...</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		NA - Not Applicable				 Edit  Delete	+ Add New Row...				
		Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments																																														
		NA - Not Applicable			Not applicable to the nature of the project.	 Edit  Delete																																													
	+ Add New Row...																																																		
	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments																																															
	NA - Not Applicable				 Edit  Delete																																														
	+ Add New Row...																																																		
	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments																																															
	NA - Not Applicable				 Edit  Delete																																														
+ Add New Row...																																																			
Terminal Evaluation	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Visibility</th> <th>Boundary</th> <th>Intent</th> <th>Comments</th> <th></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Y - Yes</td> <td>Systemic</td> <td>Intended</td> <td>The preparation of the Lake Victoria Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Program (SAP) processes were important globally, that is why these processes have been supported by the GEF in the first place.</td> <td> Edit  Delete</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments		Y - Yes	Systemic	Intended	The preparation of the Lake Victoria Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Program (SAP) processes were important globally, that is why these processes have been supported by the GEF in the first place.	 Edit  Delete																																								
Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments																																																
Y - Yes	Systemic	Intended	The preparation of the Lake Victoria Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Program (SAP) processes were important globally, that is why these processes have been supported by the GEF in the first place.	 Edit  Delete																																															



Socioeconomic Status

They were also important regionally, since, for the first time, a basin-wide approach to Lake Victoria management has been taken under which all 5 countries have collaborated and identified the following prioritized key transboundary issues: (i) land, wetland, and forest degradation; (ii) governance, policy, and institutional weakness; (iii) fisheries, habitats and biodiversity loss; (iv) increased lake pollution, atmospheric deposition, and eutrophication; and (v) water balance, water resources management, and climate change problems. In addition, the Japanese PHRD grants have funded six national technical studies (applied research, natural resources interventions, private sector development, monitoring and communications, assessment of spatial planning tool, and institutional arrangements) in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. Further, Sida has provided grants to Burundi and Rwanda to develop their national LVEMP 2 components. Finally, the Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program (NELSAP), with support from the Sida and NORAD, has launched three river basin management projects (Kagera, Mara, and Sio-Malaba-

Change 

			<p>Malakisi rivers), and studied the hydrology of the Kagera basin. The main objective of these projects is to develop basin-wide investment proposals, which will attract financing from other donors.</p>	
Y - Yes	Systemic	Intended	<p>The CASs for Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda list support to LVEMP2 as one of their key national priorities. Burundi and Rwanda are also committed to include LVEMP 2 in their next CAS reports. The Trust Fund was consistent with the national development strategies of the five countries, which emphasize healthy ecosystems, poverty reduction, and sustainable economic growth; and identify degradation of natural resources as a key impediment to achieving these shared results. At a regional level, the Protocol on Sustainable Development of the Lake Victoria Basin was ratified by the East African Community Partner States (Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda) in November 2004. It sets out the framework, and demonstrates regional commitments to sustainable utilization of transboundary resources and addressing environmental concerns in the lake basin. Further, the Lake Victoria Basin Commission</p>	<p> Edit  Delete</p>

				(LVBC), established under the Protocol to coordinate development in the basin, became operational in July 2006. Finally, the EAC Partner States have adopted a shared Lake Victoria Development Vision and Strategy, which lists sustainable utilization of natural resources of the basin as one of its five policy areas.	
	+ Add New Row...				
Agency Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
	NA - Not Applicable				Edit Delete
	+ Add New Row...				
GEFEO Review	Visibility	Boundary	Intent	Comments	
	Y - Yes	Systemic	Intended	The preparation of the Lake Victoria Transboundary Diagnostic Analysis (TDA) and Strategic Action Program (SAP) processes were important globally, that is why these processes have been supported by the GEF in the first place. They were also important regionally, since, for the first time, a basin-wide approach to Lake Victoria management has been taken under which all 5 countries have collaborated and identified the following prioritized key transboundary issues: (i) land, wetland, and forest degradation; (ii) governance, policy, and institutional	Edit Delete










			<p>weakness; (iii) fisheries, habitats and biodiversity loss; (iv) increased lake pollution, atmospheric deposition, and eutrophication; and (v) water balance, water resources management, and climate change problems. In addition, the Japanese PHRD grants have funded six national technical studies (applied research, natural resources interventions, private sector development, monitoring and communications, assessment of spatial planning tool, and institutional arrangements) in Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda. Further, Sida has provided grants to Burundi and Rwanda to develop their national LVEMP 2 components. Finally, the Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Program (NELSAP), with support from the Sida and NORAD, has launched three river basin management projects (Kagera, Mara, and Sio-Malaba-Malakisi rivers), and studied the hydrology of the Kagera basin. The main objective of these projects is to develop basin-wide investment proposals, which will attract financing from other donors.</p>	
Y - Yes	Systemic	Intended	<p>The CASs for Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda list support to LVEMP2 as one of their key national</p>	 Edit  Delete



priorities. Burundi and Rwanda are also committed to include LVEMP 2 in their next CAS reports. The Trust Fund was consistent with the national development strategies of the five countries, which emphasize healthy ecosystems, poverty reduction, and sustainable economic growth; and identify degradation of natural resources as a key impediment to achieving these shared results. At a regional level, the Protocol on Sustainable Development of the Lake Victoria Basin was ratified by the East African Community Partner States (Kenya, Tanzania, and Uganda) in November 2004. It sets out the framework, and demonstrates regional commitments to sustainable utilization of transboundary resources and addressing environmental concerns in the lake basin. Further, the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC), established under the Protocol to coordinate development in the basin, became operational in July 2006. Finally, the EAC Partner States have adopted a shared Lake Victoria Development Vision and Strategy, which lists sustainable utilization of natural resources of the basin as one of

Arrangements for Impact M&E					its five policy areas.		
						Add New Row...	
	Terminal Evaluation		Visibility	Comments			
			NA - Not Applicable			Edit	Delete
			Add New Row...				
	Agency Review		Visibility	Comments			
			NA - Not Applicable			Edit	Delete
			Add New Row...				
	GEFEO Review		Visibility	Comments			
			Y - Yes	A TDA and an SAP have been produced. The process was participatory and involved representatives from all five countries of the Lake Victoria basin. The quality of the TDA and SAP, however, could have been improved if the prioritization of interventions was complemented with the analyses of costs-effectiveness, costs-benefits, and expected physical impacts, rather than ranking methodology alone. Given that these are living documents, these analyses could be undertaken during the future revisions.		Edit	Delete
			Add New Row...				

TE Report Quality

Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
TE Quality	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	Both the ICM and the GRM have fairly thin descriptions. The information available, is not sufficiently organized, complete or clarifying.
Outcome Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory	Both the ICM and the GRM have not enough information. The information available, is not sufficiently organized, complete or clarifying.
Consistency	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess	
Sustainability Assessment	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable	
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory	

			Only an overall assessment of risk has been provided, without clarifications regarding financial, institutional, socio-political or environmental sustainability.
Evidence-based Lessons and Recommendations 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	Lessons have been provided without further explanation of reasons behind them.
Clear Financial Assessment 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	3 - Moderately Unsatisfactory 	Although clear assessment of GEF grant has been provided, no information has been given regarding cofinance disbursements at all. Therefore, this is actually an issue for follow up.
M&E Assessment 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	2 - Unsatisfactory 	Besides providing an amount figure for how much have been disbursed with M&E assessment, neither the ICM or the GRM explain how the M&E assessment has been conducted.

Agency-Specific Criteria	Document	Rating	Comment
Attainment of Results based on Indicators 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
Consultation with Stakeholders 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
Compliance with Guidances 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
Compliance with UNEG Norms 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	Not applicable to WB projects.
Addressing of ToR requests 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	
Independence of Report 	Agency Review:	NA - Not Applicable 	
	GEFEO Review:	UA - Unable to assess 	

 **Lessons & Recommendations**



Type of Lesson	If other type, please specify	Lessons Learned	
Stakeholder Involvement		A positive lesson stems from GEF's insistence that a basin-wide approach must be taken. Also, the financing of the TDA and SAP should reap long-term benefits in the sense of directing policies, projects and investments in a more productive manner.	Edit Delete
Other	Project Design	The GEF, Bank managers and staff must have realistic expectations when working with regional institutions that have low capacity. Overambitiousness is recurrent in Bank projects.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			



Type of Recommendation	If other type, please specify	Recommendations	
Capacity Building		The technical capacity of the recipient (the regional entity managing the grant) is weak. It should be strengthened, which is one of the objectives of the planned LVEMP2 Project.	Edit Delete
Other	Multistakeholder Collaboration	Collaboration with Sida is excellent. There are, however, possibilities for improving donor coordination, e.g. with the EU on fisheries.	Edit Delete
Add New Row...			

[<< Back to Project Edit](#)

A product of the Global Environment Facility