Terminal Evaluation Review form, GEF Independent Evaluation Office, APR 2020

1. Project Data

Summary project data	
GEF project ID	5797
GEF Agency project ID	628562
GEF Replenishment Phase	GEF-5
Lead GEF Agency (include all for joint projects)	FAO
Project name	Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape Dependent Communities: Linking Science with Policy to Advance Tenure Security, Sustainable Forest Management and People's Livelihoods
Country/Countries	Global
Region	CEX
Focal area	Land Degradation
Operational Program or Strategic Priorities/Objectives	LD-2.1; LD 2.2
Executing agencies involved	Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR)
NGOs/CBOs involvement	World Resources Institute (co-financer); International Union for Conservation of Nature-Switzerland (co-financer); Land and Governance Institute-Uganda (project partner); Forest Action Nepal (project partner); Organización Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas Andinas y Amazónicas del Perú (project partner)
Private sector involvement	Tetra Tech International Development (co-financer)
CEO Endorsement (FSP) /Approval date (MSP)	August 5, 2014
Effectiveness date / project start	October 8, 2015
Expected date of project completion (at start)	March 2017
Actual date of project completion	April 7, 2019

Project Financing		At Endorsement (US $M)	At Completion (US $M)
Project Preparation Grant	GEF funding		
	Co-financing		
GEF Project Grant		2	2
Co-financing	IA own	.3	.6
	Government		
	Other multi- /bi-laterals	3.43	5.59
	Private sector		.14
	NGOs/CSOs		.03
	Other	.82	.03
Total GEF funding		2	2
Total Co-financing		4.55	6.39
Total project funding (GEF grant(s) + co-financing)		6.55	8.39

Terminal evaluation/review information	
TE completion date	June 2019
Author of TE	Dr. William Jackson; Dr. Deborah Delgado Pugley; and Dr. David Hafashimana
TER completion date	1/22/2020
TER prepared by	Laura Nissley

TER peer review by (if GEF IEO review)	Molly Sohn

2. Summary of Project Ratings

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

3. Project Objectives

3.1 Global Environmental Objectives of the project:

The project's objective was "to improve the way knowledge about forest and land tenure reforms is understood, communicated and used so that decision makers, practitioners and forest dependent people in developing countries are well-equipped to develop and implement policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management" (TE pg. 1).

3.2 Development Objectives of the project:

The Project Document does not indicate a development objective separate from the project's objective, however it does note that "It is broadly recognized that secure access to and control over forests and tree resources is a necessary condition for reducing poverty, increasing food security and ensuring sustainable forest management. This project will contribute to achieving this necessary condition" (PD pg. 24).

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

There were no changes to the project's objectives or activities during implementation.

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 provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project relevance. This TER, which uses a different scale, provides a rating of **Satisfactory**. The project's outcomes are consistent with GEF-5 Land Degradation Objective 2: *Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in arid, semi-arid and sub-humid zones, including sustaining livelihoods for forest-dependent people*. In particular, the project is relevant to Outcomes 2.1: *An enhanced enabling environment within the forest sector in drylands*, and Outcome 2.2: *Improved forest management in drylands*. The TE also indicates that the project is highly relevant to land and forest tenure issues in the target countries of Indonesia, Peru, and Uganda. All three countries had ratified the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) and were in various stages of implementing action plans at the time of the project design (PD pg. 15). In Indonesia, the project took advantage of a new policy on social forestry by promoting forest tenure reform within the target sites. The project also took advantage of a letter of intent, Declaración conjunta de intención sobre REDD+, which was signed by the Peruvian government during implementation. The letter set requirements for avoiding deforestation and forest degradation, as well as clarifying tenure on indigenous peoples' collective land (TE pg.15). The project was also consistent with Uganda's Forestry Policy (2001) and the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act (2003), which made it clear that local people and communities could own forests on their lands as long as they were registered and managed them sustainably (TE pg. 16).

4.2 **Effectiveness**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for project effectiveness, and this TER concurs. The project was designed as part of a two-project initiative executed by the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). While the IFAD/EC/CIFOR project focused on developing an evidence-base for addressing tenure reform implementation, this GEF/CIFOR project was designed to strengthen the capacity of stakeholders in target countries (Peru, Indonesia, and Uganda) to implement tenure reforms equitably and effectively (Request for MSP Approval Document pg. 8). The TE indicates that the GEF project achieved all of its outcomes; effectively contributing to a better understanding of the barriers to implementing forest and land tenure reform, as well as improving the capacity of stakeholders to identify key opportunities and constraints to reform (pg. 18).

A summary of the project's achievements, by component and outcome, is provided below:

Component 1: Analysis and synthesis of the emergence of reforms and the interaction between customary and formal land and forest tenure.
Outcome 1: Increased awareness by policymakers of impact of and barriers to reform implementation across different sociopolitical and historical settings

Under this outcome it was expected that an assessment of structures, processes, and outcomes of tenure reforms would be produced. Additionally, it was expected that at least two national-level roundtables in three countries would be held to share information on approaches for recognizing customary rights and factors that catalyze and sustain reforms. It was also expected that policy and "infobriefs" would be produced on these topics (PD pg. 48). The TE indicates that the project met its targets for producing assessments on tenure reform, while exceeding targets for roundtables and policy briefs. The project held 17 roundtables (8 in Peru; 7 in Uganda; and 2 in Indonesia) with a total of 188 policymakers (150 were targeted) (TE pgs. 18-19).

Component 2: Analysis and synthesis of policy implementation processes and practices
Outcome 2: Increased awareness of ways to improve multi-actor collaboration and coordination

Under this outcome it was expected that strategies would be designed to address constraints to implementing tenure reform. Additionally, it was expected that the following would be achieved: (1) establishment of in-country platforms for key actors involved in the implementation of forest tenure reforms; (2) development and dissemination of short briefing papers on strategies to improve reform implementation; (3) development and dissemination of a practitioner guide; (4) cross country exchange would be held; and (5) a global policy forum would be held (PD pg. 51). The TE indicates that the project achieved its targets under this outcome through the establishment of the Participatory Prospective Analysis (PPA) process, which engaged stakeholders in developing action plans to address tenure implementation. The PPA process involved 833 people, including 130 policymakers and 64 NGO practitioners, exceeding the project's target of 150 policymakers/NGO practitioners. The TE also notes that the policy briefs and practitioner guide were developed, and the cross-country exchange took place (pgs. 19-21).

Component 3: Analysis of livelihoods and sustainability outcomes of tenure reform
Outcome 3: Increased awareness of reform impact on livelihoods and sustainability in target countries

Under this outcome it was expected that improved methods and frameworks for assessing tenure reform outcomes would be developed and a synthesis paper on reform outcomes would be disseminated at the country and global levels (PD pg. 51). The TE indicates that the project achieved its expected results for developing methodologies based on detailed, robust data on livelihoods and equity issues. The project produced the following knowledge products: (1) community research results reports for 22 villages; (2) regional level outcome reports and survey reports; and (3) a comparative synthesis paper. Additionally, an International Colloquium on Forest Tenure Reform and an International Colloquium on Recognition of Collective Tenure Rights and Challenges of Tenure Security were held (TE pg. 20).

Component 4: Knowledge management, sharing of information and best practices, and monitoring and evaluation
Outcome 4: Enhanced awareness and increased application of good practice in reform implementation by policymakers, officials, and customary authority

Under this outcome it was expected that the project would improve outreach to reform implementers and disseminate media and materials. The TE indicates that the project met its targets for disseminating its findings, despite a misunderstanding between FAO and the executing agency, CIFOR, which resulted in a number of knowledge products being taken down from their website (pg. 61).

Component 5: Capacity development of stakeholders for uptake results
Outcome 5: Enhanced skills in reform implementation

Under this outcome it was expected that tools and approaches for equitable and effective reform implementation would be developed to support stakeholders. Additionally, it was expected that forest dependent communities, policymakers, and practitioners would be trained in effective reform implementation (PD pgs. 53-54). The TE indicates that the project achieved its targets under this outcome, including the development of the PPA approach, as well as gender and conflict management tools. (TE pg. 21). In Indonesia, the project built the capacity of local communities in how to improve benefits of the land reform processes (in Lampung), and rights of communities under the Government's social forestry scheme (in Maluku) (TE pg. 21). In Peru, the project focused on sharing information and promoting interaction between sectors and levels of governance on issues of collective tenure, indigenous rights, and gender (TE pg. 21). In Uganda, the project built the organizational and technical capacity of public and private institutions to support innovation and transition to more sustainable agricultural production systems (TE pg. 22).

4.3 **Efficiency**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Highly Satisfactory** for project efficiency, which this TER downgrades to **Satisfactory**. The project was granted two no-cost extensions in order to complete its activities, extending the project's end date from March 2017 to April 2019 (TE pg. 17). The TE indicates that the project experienced delays at the national and district levels in Uganda, particularly in the approval of templates and statutory instruments for declaring and registering private and community forests (pg. 26). Additionally, the project experienced delays in Uganda due to the election period and a lack of District Land Boards in some of the districts (TE pg. 27). The TE also indicates that the project experienced administrative challenges, such as confusing, labor intensive reporting templates. However, the TE indicates that these challenges were relatively minor and did not impact the achievement of project outcomes (pg. 34). Overall, the TE indicates that the project used its resources in a "highly efficient manner." In particular, the TE notes that the use of post-doctoral staff in the target countries was "a notably efficient approach to ensuring scientific methods were applied and partners were engaged in project activities" (pg. 61).

| 4.4 **Sustainability** | Rating: **Likely** |

The TE provides a rating of **Likely** for overall project sustainability, and this TER concurs.

Financial Resources

The TE assesses the sustainability of financial resources as **Likely**. The TE indicates that there is "very little financial risk from the project as it focused on empowerment, capacity building, and knowledge generation" (pg. 64). In Uganda, the Ministry of Water and Environment/Forest Sector Support Department (MWE/SSD) committed funds to continuing project activities, including the registration and securing of forests/tree tenure (pg. 29).

Sociopolitical

The TE assesses sociopolitical sustainability as **Moderately Likely**. The TE indicates that sociopolitical risks include the influence of large-scale agri-business, changes in political agendas, and governmental institutional arrangements that are resistant to tenure reform (pg. 60). However, key stakeholders in Peru, Indonesia, and Uganda did demonstrate a strong commitment to continuing project activities. In Peru, the TE notes that there were "deeply engaged and committed NGOs and others who are using the project's research findings and likely to carry on" (pg. 28). In Indonesia, project partners noted that they were committed to using the Participatory Prospective Analysis Approach (PPA) if resources permitted. Additionally, forest agency staff in Indonesia integrated the project's conflict management approach into provincial level guidelines. Academic institutions also incorporated project methodologies and lessons into curricula and research agendas (TE pg. 28). In addition to committing funds for registration and tenure, the Ugandan government committed to scaling up outcomes of the project by supporting the implementation of forest management plans (TE pg. 29).

Institutional Frameworks and Governance

The TE assesses the sustainability of institutional frameworks and governance as **Likely**. The TE indicates two key institutional risks: (1) government agencies responsible for implementing land and forest tenure reform are often focused on enforcement and compliance versus service delivery to indigenous communities; and (2) decentralization processes result in new institutional arrangements which may not be conducive to land reform (TE pg. 64).

Environmental

The TE assesses environmental sustainability as **Likely**. The TE does not indicate any substantial risks to environmental sustainability. The TE does note that the project has "moderate potential to improve environmental conditions in the mid to long term if communities and indigenous groups are empowered to manage their resources and [are] protected from harmful external influences" (TE pg. 64).

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?

Actual co-financing ($6.39 million) exceeded expected co-financing ($4.55 million) by $1.84 million. The TE notes that the executing agency, CIFOR, was able to attract considerable support from donors, civil society organizations, and the private sector (pg. 25). The TE suggests this was in part to the FAO Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) which allowed CIFOR to leverage its existing network of partners (pg. 32-33). The TE does not indicate if or how higher levels of co-financing affected the achievement and sustainability of outcomes. The TE notes that "Given the difficulty that projects often face with securing co-funding, the factors that enabled co-funding in this case deserve further investigation than was feasible during the FE [final evaluation]" (pg. 33).

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 TE indicates that the project did experience delays in project implementation, particularly in Uganda, where government approval processes were slow. The Ugandan election period and lack of District Land Boards in some of the districts caused additional delays (TE pg. 27). The project received two no-cost extensions in order to complete its activities, extending the project's end date from March 2017 to April 2019 (TE pg. 17). Overall, delays in implementation did not affect the project's achievement and sustainability of outcomes.

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

The TE indicates that country ownership over the project was strong, in part due to CIFOR's selection of national and sub-national partners (pg. 33). Stakeholders in all three target countries reported a commitment to continuing project activities. In Peru, academic partners were committed to using the project's research related to land tenure. In Indonesia, partners committed to using the PPA process, as well as incorporating project methodologies into curricula and research agendas. In Uganda, the central government committed to registration and securing of forests/tree tenure (TE pgs. 28-29).

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**

The TE provides a rating of **Moderately Satisfactory** for M&E design, and this TER concurs. The project's results framework is logical and hierarchical, outlining the expected project outputs, outcomes, and objectives. However, the indicators, baseline, and target values included in the framework are of mixed quality. For example, the indicator for Outcome 2.1: *Increased awareness of ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination, inclusiveness during reform implementation in target countries* is a results statement rather than a SMART (specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and timely) indicator. Additionally, the baseline for this indicator is "limited understanding" and the target is "understanding," with little indication of what is meant by 'understanding' or how to measure it. The Project Document does however include a detailed M&E plan outlining the anticipated M&E activities, responsible parties, and timeframe for implementation. A dedicated budget of $90,988 is also provided for M&E activities, specifically for the inception workshop, field-based impact monitoring, and the final evaluation.

6.2 **M&E Implementation**	Rating: **Moderately Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for M&E implementation, which this TER downgrades to **Moderately Satisfactory**. The TE indicates that the project team did adjust some of the targets in the first year of implementation to make them more specific without affecting the intent of the outcomes. However, the TE also notes that the project continued to report on both the old and new targets, which was a burden on project staff (pg. 23). It is also evident from a review of the Project Implementation Reports (PIRs), that some of the indicators, baselines, and target values remained vague and were therefore not reported on accurately. For example, the outcome indicator noted above, *Increased awareness of ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination, inclusiveness during reform implementation in target countries*, was measured using attendance data rather than documenting any change in the 'understanding' of participants. Despite these inconsistencies, the TE does note that the project monitored activities and outputs regularly and reported on these to the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and the FAO in a timely manner. Additionally, the TE notes that the project team used data collected from the Participatory Perspective Analysis (PPA) to report on progress toward results. The project team also conducted a series of country-level case studies to assess the project's theory of change (TE pg. 23).

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

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for quality of project implementation, and this TER concurs. The implementing agency for the project was the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). The FAO partnered with the executing agency, CIFOR, using an Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) agreement, which the TE indicates was an effective and relevant approach for the project. The TE notes that FAO had strong links to the target countries, however the extent to which the project team and the FAO country offices interacted varied by country. In Peru, the project had positive interactions with the FAO country office, whereas in Uganda and Indonesia, the TE reports that the country offices did not actively use the results of the project (pg. 33). Under the OPIM agreement, FAO had to technically clear all publications produced under the project. The TE indicates that this created tension between the organizations, as some CIFOR staff felt that the technical reviews risked their scientific independence. Overall, the TE indicates that the project implementation challenges were "relatively minor" and addressed through the development of protocols and the Project Steering Committee (PSC), and ultimately did not affect the delivery of outcomes (pg. 34).

7.2 **Quality of Project Execution**	Rating: **Satisfactory**

The TE provides a rating of **Satisfactory** for quality of project execution, and this TER concurs. The executing agency for the project was the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). As a well-recognized and respected research organization, CIFOR was able to leverage its existing network of partner organizations to effectively execute the project (TE pg. 4). CIFOR was also able to attract considerable financial support from donors, civil society organizations, and the private sector, beyond what was expected during the design phase. The TE also indicates that the approach of engaging post-doctoral research fellows in each country was a highly effective and efficient approach. The TE also notes that "fieldwork research teams were gender balanced and included local people that had a deep

knowledge of cultural practices and social and political context" (pg. 25). Overall, the TE indicates that the project was well managed by CIFOR in all of the target countries (pg. 3).

8. Assessment of Project Impacts

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

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

> The TE does not indicate any environmental changes that occurred by project end.

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 does not indicate any socioeconomic changes that occurred by project end.

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

> By project end, the Participatory Prospective Analysis (PPA) process was used to develop plans of action to address tenure implementation. This multi-stakeholder process involved 833 people, including 130 policymakers and 64 NGO practitioners. The project also developed policy briefs and a practitioner guide for reform implementation (TE pgs. 19-21). Improved methods and frameworks for assessing tenure reform outcomes were also developed, and a synthesis report was prepared (TE pg. 20). Gender and conflict management tools were also produced (TE pg. 61). The TE also indicates that in Indonesia, local communities had the increased capacity to

secure benefits of the land reform processes, as well as understand the rights of communities under the social forestry scheme (TE pg. 21). In Peru, partners had a clearer understanding of collective tenure, indigenous rights, as well as gender and land issues, by project end (TE pg. 21). In Uganda, public and private institutional capacity for supporting innovation and sustainable agriculture production systems was increased (TE pg. 22).

b) Governance

The TE does not indicate any changes in governance that took place by project end.

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

The TE does not indicate any unintended impacts that occurred by project end.

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 the adoption of select GEF initiatives at scale. In Indonesia, provincial forest agency staff reported that the project's conflict management approach had been incorporated into guidelines. Additionally, Indonesian academic institutions reported incorporating project methodologies and lessons into curricula and research agendas (pg. 28). In Uganda, the TE notes that the Ministry of Water and Environment committed to scaling up outcomes of the project by supporting the implementation of forest management plans (TE pg. 29).

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 TE provides the following lessons learned (pgs. 40-41):

Lesson learned 1: A 'one size fits all' approach is not suited to improving the implementation of land and forest tenure reform. The Project benefited from being able to adapt to the actual situation in each target country and each field site. This enabled the Project to focus on the forest and tenure implementation issues that were of greatest relevance to the stakeholders.

Lesson learned 2: The use of participatory tools and the deliberate engagement of stakeholders requires flexibility and adaptation of research methods and strategies.

Lesson learned 3: A focus on implementing existing laws and policies related to tenure and forest reform has good potential to motivate stakeholders to engage in reform processes because they can often see the potential to realize benefits for their livelihoods and wellbeing.

Lesson learned 4: Having good policies, laws and regulations in place is not enough to improve tenure security. There is also a need for communities and governments to have adequate budgets to implement reforms (including funds for rigorous, participatory approaches) and undertake follow up.

Lesson learned 5: It is important to understand and take into consideration cultural values that communities attach to forests, including spiritual, sacred and medicinal values.

Lesson learned 6: Effective use of networks and pathways of change identified in theories of change requires sustained and effective engagement and management of the strategic partners in each country.

Lesson learned 7: Ideally, FAO Country Offices should be involved in the design, implementation and follow up of relevant OPIM projects. This will enhance opportunities to improve relevance, amplify results and assist sustainability of project outcomes. It may also help OPIM operational partners to better navigate FAO systems and procedures. Improved induction of executing partners into FAO systems and requirements prior to the project starting, or soon thereafter, will help partners navigate FAO systems.

9.2 Briefly describe the recommendations given in the terminal evaluation.

The TE provides the following recommendations and suggested actions (pgs. 5-6):

To FAO and CIFOR

Recommendation 1: Future projects that are focused on improving the implementation of land and forest tenure reform should consider including stronger elements of sustainable livelihoods so that communities and indigenous peoples are able to benefit directly from tenure reform, through, for example, improved supply of ecosystem services, enhanced skills in production and marketing and greater access to finances.

Recommendation 2: To improve the likelihood of the Project outcomes sustainability it is recommended to further support communities, indigenous peoples, NGOs and government agencies to implement the multi-stakeholder action plans developed during the implementation of the Project.

To FAO (Forestry Department in particular), CIFOR and GEF

Recommendation 3: The use of theories of change as conceptual frameworks and as a basis for monitoring, evaluation and adaptation should be encouraged within projects. Ideally, ToCs should be developed as part of the ProDoc and regularly revisited during project implementation to promote lesson learning and adaptation.

Recommendation 4: The use of the tools and methodologies developed by the Project, in particular historical institutional analysis and Participatory Prospective Analysis, and the approach of the Project to gender should be considered in other relevant projects.

To FAO

Recommendation 5: FAO should continue to develop and apply effective processes for inducting FAO's Operational Partners, including ensuring that these partners fully understand: FAO's reporting requirements, standards and normative guidelines; opportunities for accessing FAO's skills and knowledge; the need for engaging FAO Country Offices; and mechanisms for managing conflicts and agreeing on changes to project activities, outputs or outcomes**.**

To FAO and GEF

Recommendation 6: In the case of global and regional OPIM projects (such as the Project which is the subject of this evaluation), OPIM operational partners should be encouraged and supported to engage with FAO Country Offices. Links with Country Offices can help to a) communicate key messages from the project to policy makers at the national level; b) create with FAO a virtuous circle of lessons learnt across countries and; c) enhance quality of project delivery and sustainability of results from the capitalization of Country Offices' knowledge of the context and technical expertise.

Suggested actions:

- This can include discussions with Country Offices during the project design phase to ascertain relevance of the project to the work of the Country Office, engaging the Country Office in relevant activities during project implementation, ensuring the Country Office is provided copies of relevant publications and awareness raising tools, and briefing the Country Office at the conclusion of the project.
- Furthermore, in the case of global and regional OPIM projects, whenever possible and relevant, funds should be built into OPIM projects for FAO Country Offices. However, it should be noted that funding should not be a precondition of engagement between Country Offices and OPIM operational partners as engagement with relevant FAO offices is a requirement of OPIM projects.

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 expected results of the project could have been better articulated in the report. Additionally, it would have been helpful to include the annex on training, as the main focus of the project was on capacity building.	**MS**
To what extent is the report internally consistent, the evidence presented complete and convincing, and ratings well substantiated?	The report is consistent, and the evidence presented supports its ratings.	**S**
To what extent does the report properly assess project sustainability and/or project exit strategy?	The report adequately assesses project sustainability, although more detail could have been provided on financial and institutional risks.	**MS**
To what extent are the lessons learned supported by the evidence presented and are they comprehensive?	The lessons learned are comprehensive and supported by the evidence provided.	**S**
Does the report include the actual project costs (total and per activity) and actual co-financing used?	Actual co-financing is included in the report, but the actual project costs are not disaggregated by component or activity.	**MS**
Assess the quality of the report's evaluation of project M&E systems:	The TE does not adequately assess M&E design at entry, particularly regarding the project's results framework.	**MU**
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).

Request for MSP Approval Document (2014)