Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2016

1. Project Data

Summary project data		
GEF project ID	3393	
GEF Agency project ID	3227	
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-4	
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	UNDP	
Project name	SIP: Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the cattle corridor of Uganda.	
Country/Countries	Uganda	
Region	East Africa	
Focal area	Land Degradation	
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	LD -3 – investing in innovative approaches in SLM	
Executing agencies involved	Government of Uganda	
NGOs/CBOs involvement	Community Based Organisations and local NGOs were involved for implementation and as beneficiaries but their names not provided in the TE.	
Private sector involvement	Uganda Land Alliance, LION- an insurance company through consultations	
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	12/22/2009	
Effectiveness date / project start	8/12/2010	
Expected date of project completion (at start)	12/31/2013	
Actual date of project completion	12/31/2015	
Project Financing		
	At Endorsement (US $M)	**At Completion (US $M)**

Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding	0.05	0.05
	Co-financing	0.01	N/A
GEF Project Grant		1.83	1.69
Co-financing	IA own	0.36	0.28
	Government	0.6	0.07
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	1.64	1.60
	Private sector		
	NGOs/CSOs		0.11
Total GEF funding		1.88	1.74
Total Co-financing		2.61	NA
Total project funding **(GEF grant(s) + co-financing)**		4.49	NA
Terminal evaluation/review information			
TE completion date		June 9, 2016	
Author of TE		Dr Arun Rijal and Dr. John Ejiet Wasige	
TER completion date		February, 2017	
TER prepared by		Ritu Kanotra	
TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)		Molly Fahey Watts	

2. Summary of Project Ratings

Criteria	Final PIR	IA Terminal Evaluation	IA Evaluation Office Review	GEF IEO Review
Project Outcomes	S	MS	N/R	MS
Sustainability of Outcomes		L	N/R	L
M&E Design		MS	N/R	MS
M&E Implementation		MS	N/R	MS
Quality of Implementation		S	N/R	S
Quality of Execution		MS	N/R	MS
Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report		-	N/R	MS

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

As per the Project Document (PD), the Global Environmental Objective of the project is 'Sustainable Land Management that provides the basis for economic development, food security and sustainable livelihoods while restoring the ecological integrity of the Cattle Corridor ecosystem'.

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

As per the PD, the Development Objective of the project is to 'provide land users and managers with the enabling policy, institutional and capacity environment for effective adoption of SLM within the complexity of the cattle corridor production system'. The project sought to achieve three outcomes as detailed below:

Outcome 1: The policy, regulatory and institutional environment support sustainable land management in the cattle corridor (in particular policy and legislation for sustainable charcoal and tenure security strengthened).
At least 10% of the land users have some form of secure tenure; One policy for sustainable production of charcoal and reduction of fuel-wood use (adoption of improved fuel-wood cook stoves; promotion of improved community kitchens; and provision of Casamance kilns in lieu of tree plantation); and recommendations for policy changes needed to legalize charcoal provided by mid-term and have government support by end of the project.

Outcome 2: Knowledge based land use planning forms the basis for improving dry lands sustainable economic development
At least 25% of cultivators adopting 3-5 forms of improved practices by mid-term and 75% cumulatively by project end; at least 15% of the agriculturalists and pastoralists taking decisions on the basis of the weather and drought early warning information by mid-term and 40% cumulatively by project end; at least 40% of land users and 30% of technical officers requiring to update skills have done so by mid-

term: by the end of project, at least 60% of land users and 75% of technical officers cumulatively have updated skills; and Lessons on improving land and resource tenure, range rehabilitation, sustainable charcoaling, improving livestock mobility, crop and livestock insurance, and other important project initiatives available for dissemination through the upscaling project.

Outcome 3: Local economic development strengthened through diversification and improved access to finance and insurance

At least 20% increase in agricultural produce for key crops for those adopting 3-5 improved practices consistently by mid-term and 50% cumulative by project end; at least 10% of pastoralists and agriculturalists participating in the index based insurance scheme by mid-term and 25% cumulatively by project end; at least 25% increase in numbers accessing micro-finance and credits; at least ten groups with sustainable charcoal production operations and earning money from carbon finance; at least 10 charcoal associations have rules and regulations for sustainable charcoal and are actively enforcing them; Number of charcoal producers using improved kiln in carbonization in pilot districts increase by at least 30% by mid-term and a cumulative 50% by project end; at least 50% of current mobile pastoralists still retain livestock mobility by the end of the project; at least 10% reduction in incidents of conflicts over land and resources in the pilot districts and a cumulative 50% reduction by project end; and at least 25% change in attitudes towards nomadic pastoralism among policy makers.

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

No.

4. GEF IEO assessment of Outcomes and Sustainability

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

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

4.1 **Relevance**	Rating: Satisfactory

The TE assesses the project to be 'relevant'. Based on the evidence in the TE and Project Document, this TER assesses the relevance of the project to be 'satisfactory'. The Uganda Cattle Corridor, covering nearly half (43%) of the country's land, is home to a population of 6.6 million people. Unsustainable land use practices in the corridor have led to land degradation in the form of soil erosion, declining soil fertility and deforestation, with serious disruption to the provision of ecosystem services for livelihoods, economic development and environmental management. Lack of policy related to energy/charcoal and

rangeland management meant that these issues remained unaddressed for a long time, with no coherent government response strategy. However, recently, the Government of Uganda adopted National Environment Management Policy (NEMP) and a number of other sectoral laws that include; the National Environment Statute 1995, Local Government Act 1997, Uganda Wildlife Statute 1996, Land Act 1998, Water Statute, 1995 and Fish and Crocodiles Act 1996, that acknowledge important sustainable land management and environmental protection. This project was designed to contribute to the policy reform and address weaknesses in the policy and policy implementation, weak capacity for the use of knowledge to guide land use planning and the lack of alternative income generating activities to support local economic development and sustainable land management. Hence, the project was relevant to the needs of the people and to the ecosystem as a whole and aligned well with the government priorities in this area in the recent past.

The project was formulated in the frame of the GEF focal area of land Degradation which aims at arresting and reversing current global trends in land degradation, specifically desertification and deforestation, and addresses focal area objectives of LD3 - Reduce Pressure on natural resources from competing land uses in the wider landscape.

4.2 Effectiveness	**Rating: Moderately Satisfactory**

The project was successful in establishing knowledge (data) base with access to policy makers and planners to facilitate evidence based planning and policy making for mainstreaming SLM in future. The project also demonstrated good models for SLM and was successful in developing SLM plans for project districts; facilitation of community level adaptation planning; construction of physical structures to curb land degradation; implementation of activities that increase food productivity and income generation; and strengthening institutional capacities to implement policies and training of local communities on SLM practices. At the policy level, the project succeeded in mainstreaming SLM into key national policies. Most importantly, it facilitated the launch of the National Strategic Investment Framework that set the pace for inter-sectoral cooperation amongst the relevant ministries for promoting SLM in Uganda. But the TE noted a 'slow pace of rolling out of the land tenure and energy policies'. As per the TE, 'the project did not adopt an aggressive advocacy campaign to bring a policy change or influence, rather there were no information and communication materials available until the original end date…[they] were later developed during project extension period'. Rangelands registering improvements (3000 ha of rangeland covered as compared to the target of 65300ha), soil erosion reduction in area brought under SLM (5% as against target of 40%) and woodlands recovery (about 15% as against the target of 25%) was way below the target, which as per the MTR and TE, was too ambitious to be achieved within the project budget and time frame. The initial delays in implementation caused by late disbursements also contributed to the failure to achieve targets within the project time. As per the TE, suggestion to change the target indicators was approved by the Project Board and, through UNDP CO, sent to GEF secretariat for approval but no response was received from the GEF secretariat till the date of final evaluation.

Outcome 1: The policy, regulatory and institutional environment support sustainable land management in the cattle corridor (in particular policy and legislation for sustainable charcoal and the security of tenure strengthened)

The objective of this outcome of creating an enabling environment, including strengthening of policies, institutions and related programs that support SLM, was partially achieved. The TE notes that the project achieved the target of revising national policies (4 as per the target) to mainstream SLM principles and facilitated the launch of National SLM investment Framework (USLMIF). The expected output that interventions under the project would increase security of tenure for land and resources that would act as an incentive for investing in SLM was largely unachieved. The TE reports about 15% (target of 50% of land users to have some form of secure tenure) of the communities secured land titles and about 7,631has was brought under SLM as against a target of 1,480,000ha. According to the MTR, these targets were set at the time of project preparation, when baselines were not available, and were too ambitious to be covered with the project resources. The project contributed to development of the legal framework for legalization of charcoal production by generating a set of relevant documents and recommended a standalone charcoal policy, which was yet not considered by the Ministry. The formation of Charcoal Producers' Associations through the project made charcoal processes more prominent, and made it easier to collect tax; however, the level of revenue returns from charcoal in districts didn't improve because of the legal status of charcoal at the time of TE. Guidelines for re-investing tax revenue into sustainable charcoal production approaches were developed, but still awaiting ratification and launching by MEMD.

Outcome 2: Knowledge based land use planning forms the basis for improving dry lands sustainable economic development

Against a target of 75% of cultivators adopting 3-5 forms of improved practices, the TE confirms that 50% farmers adopted improved practices in the target area. The TE also reports increase in soil fertility due to project interventions by 7% (against the target of 10%). Both the weather stations were installed but still didn't meet the purpose of providing early warning to the farmers at the time of the TE. However, the project officer assured the evaluators the technical issues with one of the weather stations would be fixed, and that weather information transformation systems to the farmers would be initiated from both the stations. At least 90% (target of 30%) of the Technical officers in the focus districts were trained and built capacity to share SLM practices. Similarly, at least 30% (target of 40%) of land users in the target districts reported improved skills on SLM practices. Information materials including leaflets, booklets and brochures in different languages were developed and disseminated to share information about the project. But results from several studies and policies reviews, such as the Manual for management of energy crops for charcoal and fuelwood production in the rangelands of Uganda; Increasing Security of Land Tenure in Cattle Corridor Areas of Uganda: Lessons to inform Policy Actions; Principles to be embedded in the charcoal legislation to support sustainable charcoal production in Uganda etc., were yet to be published and distributed at the time of the TE.

Outcome 3: Local economic development strengthened through diversification and improved access to finance and insurance

More than 50% of the farmers adopted 3-6 Conservation Agriculture practices including some SLM technologies that resulted in increase in yield of maize and beans by 150 to 200%. The target of 25% of agriculturalists and pastoralists participating in the weather index insurance was partially achieved. As per the TE, the project had set up the process for the index based insurance, identified farmers and crops to be covered under the insurance and identified the insurance company that already has the experience of setting up the systems and working in Uganda. The target of 25% increase in numbers accessing micro-finance couldn't be achieved as the service providers were still offering high lending

rates as agriculture still considered as a risky business. The project identified and trained 30 Charcoal Producers Association (target of 10) engaged in activities towards sustainable charcoal production but the group was yet to enter formal arrangements that would enable them to access benefits from carbon financing. The number of charcoal producer groups adopting improved kilns in carbonization increased by 25% (target of 50%) during the project period compared to the original users of traditional earth kilns, with communities reporting 50% more charcoal production with the new method.

Capacity building initiatives under the project led to reduction of at least 5% (target of 10%) of incidents of conflicts between land lords (land title owners) and settlers (bonafide occupants). The project helped create awareness amongst the ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, around the importance of pastoralism and its advantages to the national economy, and interactions during TE indicate an estimated change of at least 10% in their attitudes towards nomadic pastoralism. However, the project failed to facilitate sustainable mobile pastoralism because of changes in land tenure system dictated by the new land policy that encourages more sedentary behavior and practices.

4.3 Efficiency	**Rating: Moderately satisfactory**

This TER agrees with the rating assigned by the TE to the efficiency of the project to be 'moderately satisfactory'. The project was implemented with support from the government at all levels and local community groups that helped in reducing the overall cost of the project. As per the TE, 'one of its biggest strengths has come about through a design-decision to work directly with the community groups through the local government institutions rather than parallel project structures'.

But the project failed to mobilise the full co-financing contributions committed originally by the government. The TE notes that the project didn't exceed the overall budget but all the planned deliverables were not completed due to the time and budget constraints. While the project was granted an extension of 2 years, as explained in the section 5.2 below, the contributions from the government were not fully met. According to the original project proposal, these would have been used for upscaling or bringing more area/rangeland under SLM practices.. As per the TE, due to 'delays in the beginning and various other obstructions, the project could not complete all its activities on time and results of some of the activities couldn't be seen as these were still under implementation at the time of the terminal evaluation'.

Moreover, as per the TE, the management cost of the project, using GEF grant and co-financing, was USD 721,423 against the actual budget of USD 701, 747. But the total management cost (including GEF grant and co-financing) budgeted in the CEO endorsed document is of USD 393,073, which is way below the management cost indicated in the TE. If we consider just the GEF contribution to the management cost, the project spent USD 356,746 as against the original budget of USD 183,073 indicated in the CEO endorsed document. As evident from these figures, overall, the project spent almost 50% more on the management cost as compared to the original budget. This could be due to the extension of the project by 2 years. Considering the financial analysis provided by the TE, the total management cost comprised 33.5% of the total spend, which is way higher than an original approval of 9-10% of the total budget to be spent on the management cost.

4.4 Sustainability	**Rating: Likely**

The TER concurs with the rating assigned by the TE to the sustainability of the project to be 'likely'. The ratings assigned to the four dimensions of the sustainability are given below:

a. Financial sustainability: Likely

The TE assigns it a rating of likely and this TER concurs with the ratings. As per the TE, given the willingness of the MAAIF and the local government to continue their support to the project activities, with several projects being implemented in project areas that are likely to utilize the local capacities created through the project, will be directly or indirectly supporting the continuation of some of the project activities. The TE notes another GEF project under development at the time of TE, is expected to build on the outcomes of this project, especially to support the issues around land tenure.

b. Socio-political sustainability: Likely

The TE assigns it a rating of likely and this TER concurs with the ratings. The TE notes that awareness raising activities have been useful in changing people's minds at all levels about land degradation risk and the need for SLM. 'The empowerment of local communities through awareness raising and involvement in implementation of project activities has been one of the lynchpins upon which all behavioral change has occurred'. Thus, the project enjoys a supportive environment and a very wide support, which can be used to replicate the approach to other vulnerable areas.

c. Institutional and Governance: Likely

The TE assigns it a rating of likely and this TER concurs with the ratings. The project's contribution to the development of early warning systems for supporting farmers and pastoralists decision making; development of legislation to support SLM practices; integration of SLM practices into district plans and trained local communities and the government staff, assure sustainability of the project outcomes. Except issues like sustainable mobile pastoralism that still face challenges due to conflicting land policies, the TE states that overall government authorities are sensitised on land degradation issues and may prioritize outputs of this project in future. As per the TE, 'the local government officials at the pilot sites are not only extremely supportive of what has been accomplished but are also strong advocates of its achievements'. The MTR also confirms that the project built local capacity through support and training to 12 new CBOs, formally registered at the district level, have strong linkages with the District Local Governments (DLGs) and can access funds from districts and other donors to upscale or replicate some of the initiatives such as sustainable charcoaling, conservation agriculture and improved water harvesting, supported under the project.

d. Environmental sustainability: Likely

The TE assesses the environmental sustainability to be likely and this TER concurs with the ratings. Possible precautions taken under the project to safeguard against drought including water harvesting, practice of mulching and using organic manure, minimum tillage and contouring to address soil erosion, maintain soil fertility and productivity, address potential environmental risks and collectively ensure ecological sustainability.

5. Processes and factors affecting attainment of project outcomes

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

As per the TE, the project mobilised the co-financing from the local beneficiaries of USD 110, 562, which is not indicated in the CEO endorsed document. Both the TE and the MTR indicate the expected

government contribution of USD 100,000, against which the MTR reports the actualised contribution of USD 261,120 and the TE of USD 72, 828. But as per the CEO endorsed document, the government committed to make a co-financing contribution of USD 600,000 and neither the TE nor MTR analyse the co-financing from the government as compared to the original commitment given in the CEO endorsed document. The TE reports challenges in the analysis in the financial performance of the project due to limited time and delay in the receiving financial figures from the concerned authorities. The TE also notes that co-financing ratio and the amount was changed during project but doesn't delve upon the implication of the same on the progress under the project.

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

The project was scheduled to end on 31 December 2012 but due to several delays during the initial years, the project was granted a no cost extension with closing date pushed to December 2015. As per the MTR, slow implementation in the initial years was attributed to delay in disbursement of funds due to a lengthy or 'cumbersome procedure' of routing the funds through MAAIF and DLG accounts. This was, however, addressed later as UNDP and MAAIF agreed on the method of 'direct payment requests' that allowed UNDP to pay directly to the vendors or CBOs at the MAAIF and improved the delivery of the project. However, as per the TE, due to the 'delays in the beginning and various other obstructions, the project could not complete all its activities on time and results of some of the activities couldn't be seen as these were still under implementation at the time of the terminal evaluation'. The extension of the project also resulted in increase in the management cost.

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

The project implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) with active involvement of five other ministries and District Local Governments (DLGs) shows that the project had good support from the Government of Uganda. As per the TE, these government agencies were equally involved at the project development stage, reflecting commitment from the government towards issues addressed by the project. The results of the project also complemented the Government of Uganda's priorities and 2020 development strategy. The revision of the key policies to mainstream SLM practices and the development of SLM framework and interest in the formulation of the successor GEF project on SLM, indicates the interest of the government in replication and upscaling of some of the initiatives taken under the project. The interest and commitment of the District Local Governments (DLGs) could be seen from the technical support and allocation of financial resources for SLM activities in the district development plans. Hence, willingness of the district local government and central government to support continuation of the outcomes of this project as noted in the TE and MTR, reflect a good level of support and country ownership of the project.

6. Assessment of project's Monitoring and Evaluation system

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

component; Unsatisfactory=major shortcomings in this M&E component; Highly Unsatisfactory=there were no project M&E systems.

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

6.1 M&E Design at entry	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the M&E design at entry of 'moderately satisfactory'. The monitoring and evaluation plan given in the project document was comprehensive with clear output milestones, activities for each output and SMART indicators defined, with corresponding means of verification and time frame to monitor implementation and achievements under the project. As per the Project Document, the preparation of a participatory M&E system was integrated as one of the outputs under Outcome 2 and proposed the involvement of farmers and herders to monitor range condition and changes in the ecosystem health, which was quite appropriate as herders, in particular, are best suited to monitor changes as they develop unique knowledge of rangelands acquired from daily herding movements. The design also included an itemized and costed plan covering various M&E steps including the allocation of a clear set of responsibilities, but as per the TE, the provision for monitoring of technical aspects and feedback mechanism were not adequate for the system to work effectively. The TE notes that M&E budget was not realistic as the cost of MTR and Terminal Evaluation far exceeded the provisioned budget.

6.2 M&E Implementation	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

This TER agrees with the rating assigned to the M&E implementation of 'moderately satisfactory'. As per the requirement in the M&E plan in the project document, the logical framework was revised during inception workshop. But the TE notes that no major changes were made to the original framework, some of the targets were very 'ambitious' and not 'realistic' within the project timeframe and should have been revised during the preparation of the final M&E plan during inception. The monitoring and evaluation of the project was conducted at three levels – i. Progress monitoring; ii. Internal activity monitoring and iii. Impact monitoring, and took place quarterly and annually to meet the UNDP and GEF reporting requirements. Overall, the M& E system helped tracking the project activities and covered annual work plans but was weak in monitoring the progress on targets and impact of the project. As per the TE, 'weak progress monitoring affected adaptive management with impact on decisions making'. For instance, the TE notes that several trees species used in termite prone areas were exotic and prone to termite attack, but the damage couldn't be controlled due to lack of timely monitoring and feedback to the project authorities.

Moreover, the project didn't undertake final evaluation of the impacts as the baselines study on biophysical and socio economic situation were conducted late, requiring more time before tangible progress towards targets of the project could be observed.

7. Assessment of project implementation and execution

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

Please justify ratings in the space below each box.

7.1 Quality of Project Implementation	Rating: Satisfactory

This TER agrees with the rating assigned by the TE to the quality of project implementation as 'satisfactory'. As per the TE, the project benefitted from UNDP's experience in the field of SLM and biodiversity conservation, during the project development phase through to the implementation. The project also benefitted from UNDP in mobilizing additional funds, building capacity at the local level and supporting a policy review. UNDP CO was involved in approval of work plans and budgets, review of progress and was supportive throughout the implementation period, providing guidance and 'constructive criticism', and helped overcome particular problems as necessary. For instance, as per the initial arrangements, funds were transferred to MAAIF and through it to DLGs, CBOs and other partner ministries but due to this long processes, payments were delayed which resulted in delay in implementation of the activities. Later, the project Board and UNDP intervened and agreed to make direct payments to DLGs, CBOs and partner ministries to speed up program implementation. The TE notes that UNDP maintained quality technical and financial implementation of the project, assured activity implementation, monitoring as well as undertaking of mandatory and non-mandatory evaluations to ensure proper use of GEF funds to assigned activities.

7.2 Quality of Project Execution	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory

This TER agrees with the rating assigned by the TE to the quality of project execution as 'moderately satisfactory'. The project execution was coordinated by the Ministry of Finance, Economic Planning and Development and implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries. A project board, established at the central level, with the representation of all stakeholders and District Local Government representatives provided strategic guidance for the implementation of the project. The TE notes that the project benefited from regular meetings between the ministry and the UNDP CO to discuss progress and constraints faced by the project. The Project Management Unit (PMU) formed to coordinate and manage project activities, facilitated the achievement of targeted results on time, adequate and appropriate management practices, planning, proper implementation and timely reporting. The project hired qualified experts to conduct studies and demonstrations at sites levels. But, the TE notes that availability of the technical expertise to the project was limited as the original provision of two seconded staff from the ministry was not fulfilled. The ministry appointed the focal persons to interact with the project, who were not available full time to provide technical guidance to the project. The availability of the technical advisor to carry out the field work was also limited and likely to have affected the reporting and feedback on the technical aspects of the project.

But the project benefitted from the decentralized management as was implemented with close collaboration with the district administration and community groups. The district authorities were key partners in the consultation process to incorporate land degradation as a critical element into district SLM planning and implementation. District Coordinators were also involved in the quality assurance and monitoring of the on-going activities of the SLM. As per the TE, the project was executed with the involvement of community groups, various organizations specializing in specific fields and local government staff, which greatly contributed to creating an enabling environment for the progress of the project.

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

As per the TE, through the establishment and use of SAM retort kilns, 7 institutional stoves, use of wood saving cooking stoves in 25,000 households and use of improved Casamance kiln by 150 CPA members, the project contributed to mitigate emission of large quantity of carbon dioxide, but quantification of the same is not available in the documents due to lack of information and data on total quantity of firewood burned by the retorts and kilns and quantity of firewood used by schools.

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

The TE reports improvement in the household welfare for the ones that were approached by the project for implementing conservation agriculture practices, which increased maize yields by up to 200% and bean yields up to 150% compared to conventional farming methods. With establishment of several water-dams, animal loss from drought was brought to 1% in the recent dry season which was 50% at the beginning of the project. Water storage through water harvesting reduced women's drudgery. Similarly, rehabilitation of bare lands to grow new pasture increased forage for animals, enhancing animal productivity and improving livelihoods of the pastoralists. With the total number of households in the project areas as 28,000, about 8,000 households (29%) benefited from the project and had improved livelihoods.

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

a) Capacities

Overall, the project aimed at building Uganda's capacity to fulfil its commitments under the UNCCD and enabling Uganda to prevent the progression of desertification conditions in the already vulnerable cattle corridor of Uganda. At the national level, the project collaborated closely with the various ministries and helped raising awareness and capacity of the officials of these ministries and departments on SLM. The project helped in building capacity of the local government as well as community based institutions through improving technical knowledge and awareness on climate change, soil degradation and sustainable land management. Furthermore, through capacity enhancement, and establishment of a knowledge base, the project contributed in mainstreaming SLM and Climate Change in development planning process of local governments. The TE notes that the trained district coordinators and land users have become 'SLM champions' and their expertise and experience can be used in planning in other districts as well. As per the TE, 'tools provided at the district and local levels (training materials, approaches) for building local capacity for replicating and adapting the new community participatory management models of extension service have the potential to be useful for nation-wide dissemination'.

b) Governance

The project succeeded in reviewing and mainstreaming SLM principles into key developmental policies. The TE reports that newly approved National Agricultural policy (2014), the Biomass energy strategy (2014), the National Climate change policy (2014) and the National Development Plan (2015/16-2020) have all mainstreamed SLM. Most importantly, it facilitated the launch of the National Strategic Investment Framework (USLMIF) that set the pace for inter-sectoral cooperation amongst the relevant ministries for promotion of SLM in Uganda. The project conducted studies and generated knowledge on biophysical and socio-economic aspects to encourage evidence-based planning and policy making in future. The project also facilitated a review of 8 policies associated with regulation of charcoal production and recommended to develop a standalone charcoal policy for the country. However, the responsible ministry preferred to develop principles to be embedded in the charcoal law and to finalize the Biomass Energy Strategy, both of which were relevant for operationalizing the Renewable Energy Policy of 2014.

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

None.

8.5 Adoption of GEF initiatives at scale. Identify any initiatives (e.g. technologies, approaches, financing instruments, implementing bodies, legal frameworks, information systems) that have been mainstreamed, replicated and/or scaled up by government and other stakeholders by project end. Include the extent to which this broader adoption has taken place, e.g. if plans and resources have been established but no actual adoption has taken place, or if market change and large-scale environmental benefits have begun to occur. Indicate how project activities and other contextual factors contributed to these taking place. If broader adoption has not taken place as expected, indicate which factors (both project-related and contextual) have hindered this from happening.

The TE indicates that the government authorities were willing and expressed their desire to replicate/upscale the lessons learned from this project in other areas. The project helped in raising awareness about environment issues, desertification as well as the benefit of adopting SLM practices, among local communities and government. It also helped in building the capacity of local government as well as community based institutions, who can now act as 'champions' for promoting and implementing SLM projects in other areas. The TE notes that Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries as well as the Ministry of Environment had given priority to SLM and was working to generate support to replicate the project lessons in new areas. For instance, the project authorities informed the evaluators that more farmers would be brought under conservation agriculture through mobilization of USD 2million from Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa (COMESA), and additional resources from GEF for the Mount Elgon catchment conservation.

9. Lessons and recommendations

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

The key lessons mentioned in the TE are given below:

1. Community organisations lack scientific knowledge and are ill-equipped for handling such projects so support to enhance their knowledge and strengthen their capacity will help to encourage them to continue in adapting risk of climate change or desertification and there by facilitate a cooperative approach for reducing damage from land degradation.
2. Local knowledge should be promoted together with scientific knowledge to respond to local situation as they are more easily adapted by the rural communities.
3. The farmer exchange visits promoted was effective in farmer to farmer learning and technology transfer from one community to another.
4. Working directly with the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries, five other ministries and local government, rather than setting up parallel implementation structures, proved successful not only in empowering government by providing experience and training, but also in developing effective government 'ownership', engagement and motivation thereby promoting long-term sustainability of the project's achievements.
5. Designing a project linking various institutions from grassroots level institutions, government agencies, local authorities and communities generates huge benefits for sustainability, and through the synergies developed provides the intervention with much greater effectiveness than that which can be achieved by stand-alone projects.

6. Community participation in the project design, formulation of implementation modality, implementation and monitoring is very important. This will help to implement projects effectively and also make activities sustainable.
7. Local communities understand causes of land degradation and environmental problems but due to lack of livelihood alternatives they are forced to continue unsustainable practices so if project designs consider alternatives for betterment of livelihood by improving their practices then locals will cooperate.
8. Constant contacts with communities are vital to community-based land degradation risk management projects.
9. Implementation by the institution with long experience and capacity makes program technically sound.
10. High participation of women in groups and forming women's groups will assure more success. It was observed that the groups with more women and women groups were more efficient in implementation and functioning and able to generate expected results.
11. Low cost and environment friendly options for termite control are effective. Termite effect was less in moist areas. This means irrigation could help to address the termite problems. Mulching, tillage and other control strategies should be considered in the project design to address the termite problems in agriculture and in woodlots plantation.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

1. It is recommended that MAAIF and MWE share knowledge from pilots in this project with different institutions working in this field so that they could consider incorporating similar income generation aspects (e.g. production of bio-briquettes) into their future programming.
2. The cattle corridor has a large number of cattle and these generate large quantities of dung that could be used for biogas production to substitute wood use for reducing pressure on the forests. Slurry from the biogas plants could be further used as manure to improve fertility of the soil and help in pest (e.g. termite) control. It is recommended that Ministries (MAAIF, MWE and MEMD) consider incorporating renewable energy production in the implementation of local level development and sector interventions.
3. Solar technology was not considered in this project. It is recommended that future projects promote solar technologies like solar water pumps, solar cookers and dryers to substitute biomass energy demands.
4. It is recommended that future projects interventions consider simpler technologies (e.g. gradient pumping instead of using a fuel-operated pump) that can be easily maintained by community members and do not carry expensive maintenance costs.
5. It is recommended to strengthen implementation of monitoring and feedback mechanisms in future projects.
6. MAAIF and UNDP recommended to follow up and continue to support the process of securing land tenure by raising awareness among community members to encourage submission of application for formal land ownership.
7. It is recommended that MAAIF follows up on making the two weather stations installed under the project, functional and that dissemination of weather message and information to farmers is initiated.

8. It is recommended that the implementing ministries (including district governments) should support the implementation of land use plans developed under the project and the local governments should conduct programs to familiarize farmers on the land use planning guidelines.
9. it is recommended that the future projects of UNDP and also others working in coordination with MAAIF pay close attention to sequencing of activities, specially weather specific activities, prior to implementation to avoid delays and to realise impact of the activities within expected timeframe.
10. It is recommended to upscale and replicate lessons learned from this project by UNDP and other agencies involved in this project.

10. Quality of the Terminal Evaluation Report

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

Criteria	**GEF IEO comments**	Rating
To what extent does the report contain an assessment of relevant outcomes and impacts of the project and the achievement of the objectives?	The TE reported on the extent to which the targets under each output were met but didn't report adequately on the impact of the project as it was constrained by the lack of monitoring on impact/outcome targets.	**S**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report was more or less internally consistent and ratings well substantiated, except at few places, where the TE didn't provide enough details to support its ratings, for instance, there was not enough evidence in the efficiency section to support its ratings. TER had to make inferences and draw evidence from other sections to support its argument to assess 'efficiency' of the project.	**MS**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The TE assesses all the dimensions of sustainability, except discussing the environmental risks to the project.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive supported by the evidence in the main body of the report.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	The TE based its financial analysis on the financial figures provided by the project authorities, that didn't match with the budget in the Project Document. The TE mentions that project budget was revised but doesn't elaborate on the deviation from the original budget and also whether this was approved by GEF.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE elaborates on the different reporting systems and processes set for monitoring and evaluation but doesn't asses adequately the efficacy of the system, or challenges involved in monitoring the impact of the project of this nature.	**MS**
Overall TE Rating		**MS**

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