Final Evaluation of
"Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (Kagera TAMP)"
GCP /RAF/424/GFF
GEF ID 2139

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: http://www.fao.org/evaluation

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, Office of Evaluation (OED)
Food and Agriculture Organization
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153 Rome
Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

Acknowledgements

The Evaluation Team would like to thank the FAO technical and financial team, Dr. Sally Bunnings and Dr. Stefan Schlingloff as well as FAO ODD team for giving us the unique opportunity to participate in the final workshop of the Kagera TAMP project. This workshop provided us with unique opportunities to collect important information at the beginning of this evaluation assignment. We would also like to thank Ms. Natalia Acosta for her meticulous efforts to introduce us into the assignment and provide all documents as well as Mr. Omar Awabdeh to guide us throughout the assignment. Thank you also to the Regional Project Manager - Joseph Anania, the National Project Managers - Fidelis Kaihoura, Emanuel Muligirwa and Wilson Bamwerinde, for kindly organizing our trip to see the impressive demonstration of project efforts within the major sites. Special mention for the warm welcome by all communities we visited, often accompanied by dance performances and lunch invitations. We sincerely hope that the current momentum that the project achieved will be maintained and benefit them in the future.

Composition of the Evaluation Team

Evaluation team

Mr. Jean-Joseph Bellamy (independent reviewer) - Canada
Dr. Ingrid Hartmann (Team Leader) – Germany
Prof. Bancy Mati (Senior Consultant) – Kenya

FAO Office of Evaluation:
Mr. Omar Awabdeh

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acronyms and abbreviations

AEOA	Agro-Ecological Assessment
BH	Budget Holder
CBO	Community Based Organization
CCA	Common Country Assessment
CD	Capacity Development
CEO	Chief Executing Officer
DOE	Division of the Environment, Vice President's Office
DPAE	Direction Provinciale de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage
EAC	East African Community
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FAOSTAT	Food and Agriculture Organization Statistics
FBA	Field Budget Authorization
FFS	Farmer Field School
GEB	Global Environmental Benefit
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEFSEC	Global Environment Facility Secretariat
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GIS	Geographical Information System
HRBA	Human Rights Based Approaches
HQ	Headquarter
IEM	Integrated Environmental Management
IGEBU	Institut Geographique Du Burundi
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
IWRM	Integrated Watershed Resources Management
K-TAMP	Kagera Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme
LADA	Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands
LDFA	Land Degradation Focal Area
LOA	Letter Of Agreement
LTO	Lead Technical Officer
LTU	Lead Technical Unit
LUS	Land Use System
LVBC	Lake Victoria Basin Commission
LVEMP	Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAAIF	Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries

MDG	Millennium Development Goal
MINAGRI	Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources
MINAGRIE	Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MTR	Mid-Term Review
NAADS	National Agricultural Advisory Service
NAP	National Action Programme
NBI	Nile Basin Initiative
NELSAP	Nile Equatorial Lades Subsidiary Action Programme
NEPAD	New Partnership for African Development
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NPSC	National Project Steering Committee
NPM	National Project Manager
NRL	Natural Resources and Environment (FAO)
NSC	National Steering Committee
OED	Office of Evaluation Division (FAO)
OP	Operational Program
PDF	Project Development Facility
PES	Payment for Ecosystem/ Environmental Services
PIF	Project Identification Form
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PNIA	Plan National d'Investissement Agricole
PPP	Private-Public Partnership
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PY	Project Year
QA	Questionnaire on Approaches (WOCAT)
QM	Questionnaire for Maps (WOCAT)
QT	Questionnaire on Technologies (WOCAT)
RAB	Rwanda Agriculture Board
RBM	Results Based Management
RCU	Regional Coordination Unit
RPC	Regional Project Coordinator
RPSC	Regional Project Steering Committee
SIP	Strategic Investment Programme (Terrafrica)
SLaM	Sustainable Land and Agro-Ecosystem Management
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SMART	Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant and Time-bound

SO	Strategic Objective
SPAT	Strategic Plan for Agricultural Transformation
STAP	Scientific and Technical Advisory Panel
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
TAMP	Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme
TOR	Terms of Reference
ToT	Training of Trainers
UN	United Nations
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNDAF	United Nations Development Assistance Framework
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNEP	United Nations Environment Program
USD	United States Dollar
VICOBA	Village Community Banks
WOCAT	World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies

Executive Summary

ES 1. The Kagera River Basin is shared by Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda, supporting the livelihoods of 16.5 million people. The conservation of the flow regime is essential for maintaining water levels of Lake Victoria and outflow to the Nile, while the wetland areas are vital to sustain water quality. Yet the basin's land and freshwater resource base is threatened by land degradation, declining productive capacity of croplands and rangelands, deforestation and encroachment into wetlands. The project aims to offset these threats through conducting a Transboundary Agro-ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (Kagera TAMP). Its overall environment and development goal is to support the adoption of an integrated ecosystems approach for the management of land resources in the Kagera Basin to generate local, national and global benefits. The project collaborates with a wide variety of stakeholders. Besides communities, which build the backbone of implementation, service providers were hired to facilitate the adoption of new technologies on the ground. Governmental stakeholders on all levels from district to national scales took over the role to mainstream and sustain the achievements through policy frameworks.

ES 2. The project supported a vibrant knowledge transfer/exchange among farmers, which made it possible to move to higher levels of land protection and agricultural production by stimulating innovation through knowledge transfer/exchange among farmers.

ES 3. The vehicle created for this knowledge transfer/exchange - the creation of Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) and producer groups through these FFSs - gave an important signal to the traditional extension approach in place in the four countries. From "blanket" technologies promoted through top-down approaches, the FFS model provides a more effective approach at the farmer and community level, which, if it is proven institutionally sustainable, should be an agent of change for the future of agricultural extension in these countries.

ES 4. The project has substantially enhanced the bio-productivity and ecological health of agro-ecosystems within the Kagera Basin and at the same time enhanced transboundary benefits through the reduction of water stress caused by the sedimentation due to erosion within the ecosystems of the basin countries.

ES 5. The project has also created tremendous economic vibrancy in some areas; in particular where farmers could convert from extensive land management to sustainable forms of land management, and by extension improving livelihood, which allowed many farmers to build new houses and give their children an appropriate education.

ES 6. The Evaluation Team found that project interventions to improve agricultural productivity would have required more intensive data collection, research and extension to demonstrate good results. Gathering more data would have provided convincing information, and would have also enhanced visibility of the project interventions and promoted technologies where soil conservation and yields are dependent on the input level. For instance, the project should have collected yield data as responses to appropriate crop spacing. In particular, it should have collected data on manure application on a defined space and the resulting yields.

ES 7. An obvious weakness when improving agricultural productivity is the low integration of livestock in SLM technologies. While there was a certain awareness within the project that

more livestock was necessary to gain soil nutrients, livestock numbers are sometimes inadequate in areas with grasslands, and sometimes the wrong type of livestock is chosen. More research and monitoring would have been needed to identify measures that would have improved agricultural productivity. The same limitations apply to agro-forestry. While agro-forestry activities were implemented on all project sites, the impacts of these activities on yields and soil nutrients were not measured. There was also no standard data used on nutrient demands and nutrient accumulation through the respective tree varieties.

ES 8. Better data collection would have also been necessary for the wider landscape. For instance, although biodiversity was returning or improving after the implementation of conservation measures of slopes and catchment areas, these results should have been monitored regularly as recommended by the project managers. Additionally, appropriate run-off data and erosion rates are only available as qualitative observations made by communities such as no households item from the upper catchment are transported to the lower catchment area. The project did also not evaluate the downsides of some of the measures implemented with the support of the project such as taking too much space by Soil and Water Conservation measures like terracing. The lack of data collection made it also difficult to report appropriately on the indicators measuring the progress of the project toward its expected results.

Recommendation 1
Institutional capacity development and collection of key data, such as of agricultural production factors and environmental stocks and flows within agroecosystems should receive higher attention, to enhance impacts of FAO's knowledge management strategies and facilitate adaptive learning.

Recommendation 2
The SLM Monograph, the reported WOCAT tools and other technical information products should be updated with knowledge on nutrient and water flows as influenced by land degradation and the various SLaM technologies in an appropriate quantitative way. Nutrient transport through pastoralism or livestock movements in general should also be included. In particular, the project should analyze more critically the nutrient flows through integration of livestock.

WOCAT tools should be updated with respect to livestock-crop interactions, grazing technologies and pastoral technologies as well as technologies for pasture improvements in general and for the basin in particular.

Recommendation 3
Manuals should be produced for FFS facilitators and farmers themselves. They should contain clear advice on water and nutrient management through various technologies transported through SLaM and standard data. These manuals should include information such as how many animals of which type would be needed to produce how much manure; how much quantity would have to be applied on which types of soils to improve how much yields for which types of crops. The same information should be given for the application of wood-ash, compost, chemical fertilizer, and for fertilizer trees.

Recommendation 4
Provide also standard figures in these manuals on nutrient demand for nutrient flows translated into farmers' practices (composting, wood-ash, fertilizations, agroforestry contrasted to nutrient demands for various crops) and provide additional training activities.

Recommendation 5
Integrate carbon sequestration into SLaM planning through improved understanding of underlying carbon balances in SLaM technologies.

Recommendation 6
Avoid overestimation of PES as a financing option and ensure appropriate monitoring before implementing PES schemes.

Recommendation 7
Analyze the full working calendars of women and identify critical points where their labor burdens could be reduced or shared with men (for instance water / food fetching, fire making, cooking, etc..) and how the value of these activities could be estimated and paid for. Ensure that monetary activities do not require overstretching women's physical capacities and instead ensure that all types of work are rewarded similarly without at the same time discriminating their access to income generating activities.

Project Final Evaluation Ratings

Evaluation Criteria	Rating	Comments	Ref. Section
Achievement of Objectives Component 1	MS	• Due to low achievements in transboundary issues and Monitoring System, while other outputs of the component were not really relevant to the outcome	
Achievement of Objectives Component 2	S	• From a policy perspective, the component was rather MS, but the mapping efforts HS, therefore the average is S	
Achievement of Objectives Component 3	S	• Close to HS, but rated as S due to neglect of quantitative issues	
Achievement of Objectives Component 4	HS	• Due to numerous activities with positive impacts, high participation and high vibrancy	
Attainment of outputs and activities	S	• At the end, all technical outputs attained, except the policy ones	
Transboundary issues	MS	• SLaM hardly tackled with a basin view, other issues neglected	
Effectiveness	S	• Contribution to local, national and global and transboundary targets, no real scope to basin ecology and boundaries	
Efficiency	S	• Average cost efficiency high, despite some unnecessary expenses, but technical approach is not targeted enough to project goals	
Impact	HS	• Visible impacts on ecosystem improvements and economic well-being	
Risk and Risk management	S	• Risks properly assessed and monitored regularly.	
Sustainability	L	• Financial Sustainability now more likely than during MTR. Institutional sustainability likely, if FFS prove to become key institutions for SLM on the ground.	
Stakeholder participation	HS	• The most satisfactory aspect of all: at community level there is clear community engagement.	
Country ownership	S	• National steering committees well-formed and evidence of ownership emerging.	

Evaluation Criteria	Rating	Comments	Ref. Section
Capacity building	S	• FFS highly effective approach. However, certain elements are technically not acceptable. Higher impact through institutional capacity building possible.	
Replicability	S	• WOCAT tools mainly replicated based on empirical findings and unclear selection technologies, unfounded by many agricultural scientific parameters, but FFS approach easy to replicate and recommendable	
Monitoring and evaluation	MS	• Plan too complex, with doubtful cost-effectiveness. Basic data is available in the field but reporting was poor.	

1 Introduction

1.1 Background and purposes of the evaluation

1. The evaluation of the Kagera Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme (TAMP) was conducted under the overall responsibility of the FAO Evaluation Office (OED). OED was consulted throughout the evaluation process, provided advice on the Terms of References (TOR) and the evaluation team composition, and made comments on the zero-draft evaluation report and quality assessment of the final report.

PROJECT TITLE: TRANSBOUNDARY AGROECOSYSTEM MANAGEMENT PROGRAMME FOR THE KAGERA RIVER BASIN

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION START: SEPTEMBER 2009
PROJECT END: JUNE 30TH, 2015
BUDGET: GEF-FINANCING: USD 6,363,700, Expected Total Budget: USD 30,872,910

DATES OF EVALUATION: MAY 15, 2015 – JULY 30, 2015 - 40 WORKING DAYS FOR EACH CONSULTANT

2. An independent final evaluation was foreseen in the contribution agreement to focus on effectiveness of development results as stated in the log-frame and the organizational efficiency in terms of implementation and partnership arrangements (see TORs in Annex 1). In addition, the final evaluation will review project impact, analyze sustainability of results and whether the project has achieved its development and global environmental objectives. Provided that a comprehensive Mid-term evaluation been conducted in 2013 that covered activity/output level achievements, the scope of the final evaluation will focus on the project's contribution to Outcome level results and the follow-up actions taken after the Mid-term evaluation.

3. The evaluation was guided by key evaluation questions:
   - To what extent has the project implemented the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation?
   - To what extent are the coordination, information sharing and M&E mechanisms promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands?
   - To what extent has the project created an enabling policy, planning and legislative environment that supports and facilitates a collaborative sustainable management and land restoration of the Kagera basin agro-ecosystems?
   - To what extent has the project enhanced/improved the technical capacities of farmers and communities and has expanded the knowledge management for sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management amongst the farmer groups and communities?
   - To what extent has the project facilitated the development and implementation of participatory land management plans by the farmer groups and communities? And to what extent has the implementation of sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management practices increased the benefits of the land users?

1.2 Methodology of the evaluation

4. The evaluation was conducted in accordance with the guidance, rules and procedures established by FAO and GEF. It was undertaken in line with GEF principles, which are *independence*, *impartiality*, *transparency*, *disclosure*, *ethical partnership*, *competencies* / *capacities*, *credibility* and *utility*. The evaluation team also applied the principles of *integrity*, *respect* and *anonymity*, so that confidential information cannot be traced back to the respective informants.

5. The basic methodological approach to assess the performance criteria and their relation to the project cycle and log-frame is presented in Annex 2. The schedule of the field mission is presented in Annex 3.

6. The Evaluation Team used various evaluation tools and resources in accordance with FAO and GEF evaluation policies to ensure that the evaluation was effective. This variety allowed a triangulation of findings obtained throughout this assessment and to verify their validity. The major tools used were:

   Document Review: An initial document review was conducted by the team prior to the field mission. It consisted mainly of the list of documents made available by the OED office for a first review. Additional documents from the project website were also reviewed. During and after the field mission the Evaluation Team obtained additional documents, mainly from National Project Managers (NPMs) and secondary sources to complete the information (*see list of documents reviewed in Annex 4*).

   Participatory Observation: This tool was used during two major occasions:
   - The Evaluation Team participated in the final regional technical workshop and the Regional Project Steering Committee (RPSC) meeting, which were held in Mwanza, Tanzania. It had the chance to observe all presentations and discussions among key project staff, members of the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and other key resource persons present at this final conference. This opportunity was an important first step to gain initial information on the project.
   - Participatory observation was also a major tool during the field visits, when consultants were given the opportunity to visit various project sites and farmers field and learn from project staff and beneficiaries about project activities and achievements.

   Focus Group Interviews: The team conducted focus group interviews with community members at the project sites, using an open questionnaire guideline. This instrument was adapted to each respective country and activities implemented within each site. However, key questions, which required comparisons of perceptions and views, of approaches, technologies, countries and sites, were kept standard for all interviews.

   Individual Interviews: Individual interviews were conducted using questionnaires and questionnaire guidelines, which were adapted in a similar way as the questionnaires for the focus group interviews (see list of people met in Annex 5).

   Evaluation Matrix*:* The evaluation matrix listed the major questions to be evaluated, including the methodological tools and resources to use in order to collect the information necessary to answer these questions (see Annex 2). The evaluation matrix was selectively used to establish questions and questionnaires for individual and focus group interviews.

1.3 Limitations of the Methodology

7. The evaluation was very well facilitated, therefore hardly any limitations occurred with respect to the intended programme and methodology. However, due to internal conflicts prior to the elections in Burundi, the security situation prevented the Evaluation Team from conducting field visits in Burundi. They had to rely mostly on interviews with the NPM

from Burundi who attended the Mwanza final regional technical workshop and the Regional Project Steering Committee (RPSC) meeting. The Evaluation Team also used the presentations and discussions during these events and the documentation on the project component implemented in Burundi. However, considering that the political support to the project in Burundi was the highest among the four countries, a more in-depth assessment of the project component implemented in Burundi may have showcased additional project results achieved under optimum political support.

2 Background on the Project

2.1 Context of the Project

8. The Kagera River Basin is shared by Burundi, Rwanda, Tanzania and Uganda, supporting the livelihoods of 16,5 million people. Maintenance of the flow regime is essential for maintaining water levels of Lake Victoria and outflow to the Nile, while the wetland areas are vital to sustain water quality. Yet the basin's land and freshwater resource base is threatened by land degradation, declining productive capacity of croplands and rangelands, deforestation and encroachment into wetlands.

9. The project aimed at offsetting these threats through the development of a Transboundary Agro-ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (Kagera TAMP). Its overall environment and development goal is to support the adoption of an integrated ecosystems approach for the management of land resources in the Kagera Basin to generate local, national and global benefits. It meets in this way the regional development objectives of the East African Community (EAC) for extensive political cooperation and integration in the region, which is similarly reflected by the Nile and the Lake Victoria Basin Initiatives. The project is also in congruence with the "*Environment Programme and Action Plan"* of New Partnership for African Development (NEPAD) and in particular of NEPAD's "*Comprehensive Africa Agriculture Development Programme"*, which is also a key entry point for integrating SLM in agriculture and natural resources in national priorities such as poverty eradication, improved food security, accelerated economic growth and development, promotion of women in development and international Millennium Development Goals (MDGs) as well as the implementation of obligations committed under the three Rio Conventions.

10. The project collaborated with a wide variety of stakeholders: communities are the backbone of implementation of the project on the ground, while governmental and regional stakeholders are supposed to take over the role to mainstream and sustain the achievements through policy frameworks. The formulation of the project was a very long process. It started in November 1999 and the project was finally endorsed by the GEF-CEO in May 2009; almost 10 years after.

2.2 The Theory of Change

11. The baseline describes the increasing land degradation in the Kagera Basin, which has negative impacts on the structural and functional integrity of ecosystems and agroecosystems, threatening the livelihoods of 16.5 million people who are inhabiting the basin. The accelerating break-down of traditional agricultural practices (rotations, fallow, shifting cultivation and nomadic livelihoods) as well as unsustainable intensification give rise to food shortages, poverty and economic vulnerability and also have negative impacts on biodiversity and capabilities of communities to adapt to or mitigate climate change.

12. The project document documented the barriers to offset this situation as follows:
    - Limited government support and lack of incentives for natural resources management.
    - Inadequate policies, laws and regulations and their enforcement and poor extension services.
    - Weak local government land resources planning capacity.
    - Uncoordinated policies driven by separate land, environment, agriculture, forest and water policies, institutions, strategies and action plans.
    - lack of awareness and understanding of land users and local governments of potential negative impacts of land use practices on soils, water, vegetation, biodiversity and ecosystem services and on options of improved land use techniques which might avert negative effects and simultaneous provide options to contribute to income generation and human well-being.

13. The suggested GEF alternative to address these barriers was based on a theory of change which assumed that improved natural resources and agro-ecosystems management (land, water, biological resources and their diversity) and protection of the more fragile areas through sustainable land management are critical for sustaining agricultural productivity and livelihoods and thereby maintaining hydrological, social, economic and political stability within the basin countries and the wider Nile Basin. This approach would facilitate the transition from unsustainable or unviable to viable and sustainable intensification, would improve agricultural productivity and conserve natural resources to improve food security, and reduce poverty and economic vulnerability. In order to succeed, the theory of change of this GEF alternative required coordinated and concerted policy actions on cross-boundary and cross-sectoral levels to harmonize the policy framework throughout the Kagera Basin and to develop capacities of local, national and regional governmental organizations.

2.3 Log-frame

14. The theory of change is well represented in the log-frame of the project with four main components:
    1) Enhanced regional collaboration, information sharing and monitoring;
    2) Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions;
    3) Increased stakeholder capacity and knowledge at all levels for promoting integrated agro-ecosystems management; and;
    4) Adoption of improved land use systems and management practices generating improved livelihoods and environmental services.

Table 1: Summary of Project Expected Outcomes and Outputs

Project Expected Results
OVERALL GOAL: Adoption of an integrated ecosystems approach for the management of land resources in the Kagera Basin will generate local, national and global benefits including: restoration of degraded lands, carbon sequestration and climate change mitigation, agro-biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, protection of international waters and improved agricultural production, leading to increased food security and improved rural livelihoods.
ENVIRONMENT AND DEVELOPMENT OBJECTIVES
The **environmental objective** is to address the causes of land degradation and restore ecosystem health and functions in the Kagera basin through the introduction of adapted agro-ecosystem management approaches.

Project Expected Results
The **development objective** is to improve the livelihood opportunities, resilience and food security of rural communities (men, women and children) in the Kagera Basin through adoption of more productive and sustainable resource management practices that are technically feasible and socio-economically viable.
Outcome 1. Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands. 1.1. A Basin Wide Coordination Mechanism is established to facilitate trans-boundary dialogue, basin-level planning, policy harmonization and coordination of national/sub-national actions 1.2. An Efficient Basin-Wide Knowledge Management System is established to support information requirements and decision making processes at all levels. 1.3. Project Monitoring and Evaluation systems supporting TAMP implementation and decision making 1.4. Kagera TAMP project management structures are operational and effective
Outcome 2 Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions are in place to support and facilitate the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land. 2.1 Sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems (SLaM) mainstreamed in national development policies and programmes, enhancing synergy among sector strategies and across the river basin 2.2 Regulatory actions developed and used to promote - or remove existing barriers to - sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management 2.3 A coherent strategic and planning framework developed and implemented (from river basin to district/provincial and community levels) to support SLM efforts by rural communities.
Outcome 3. Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin. 3.1 Methods and approaches to promote the adoption of SLM practices and agro-ecosystems (pastoral and cropping) are identified, developed and validated through participatory action-research. 3.2 The quality of services provided to rural communities enhanced, particularly through inter-sectoral approaches that build on local knowledge and innovations for improved agro-ecosystems management
Outcome 4. Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices are implemented and benefiting land users for the range of agro-ecosystems in the basin. 4.1 Participatory land management plans are developed and implemented in targeted communities, micro-catchments and wider land units. 4.2 Improved land use and agro-ecosystem management practices are successfully adopted by farmers and herders in targeted communities and replicated in other areas. 4.3 Market opportunities and other incentive/ benefit sharing mechanisms for the provision of environmental services identified, demonstrated and promoted among land users.
Outcome 5. Project management structures operational and effective

Intervention Logic

15. The project document did not include a description of the intervention logic. The review conducted for this final evaluation revealed that the overall implementation of the project would have been easier if a clear logic of intervention would have been described in the project document. The difficulties to implement this project and the lack of a clear project's intervention logic are illustrated in PIR reports and in national reports. The review of these reports indicate that they are not clear on what to report under which component. One possible explanation could be the fact that the project implementation was divided into

separate thematic components – transboundary issues (component #1), policy coordination (component #2), capacity building (component #3), but also divided along levels of intervention – national (component #2), local (components #3 and #4).

16. Based on the assessment conducted during this final evaluation, the implementation of the project might have been easier if the project implementation strategy would have been divided into components along thematic areas and outputs along levels of intervention - from transboundary to local. This might have enhanced smoother transitions between levels. For instance, if output #1.1. and #2.1. would have been under the same outcome it would have facilitated the merging of national policies into transboundary mechanisms. Alternatively, outcomes could have been organized along scales and outputs along thematic areas, and the interactions between outcomes and outputs could have been explained in the intervention logic. Finally, mapping, group formations and training activities take place in almost all outcomes. Instead, these activities could have been organized under one outcome with various policy development processes and geographical levels clearly delimited under different outputs.

17. When considering the project document, it is very difficult to explain the intervention logic of this project. For instance, the integration of knowledge management issues into policy and institutional issues, as it is anticipated under outcome #1 and #2 assumes that knowledge is directly instrumental in reaching policy goals. It is not always the case, and, sometimes, institutional activities may be necessary. Additionally, the review of expected results stated in the log-frame indicates some duplication on project arrangements under output #1.4 and outcome #5.

18. Furthermore, outputs are also not always instrumental in achieving the targeted outcomes, or activities in implementing the respective outputs. Often, outputs and activities statements simply repeat the respective outcome statements, using different words instead of stating a combination of targeted actions or expected outputs which together would lead in reaching the respective expected outcomes. An example is provided below:

    - "Outcome 1: Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands."
    - "Output 1.1. A basin-wide Coordination Mechanism is established to facilitate transboundary dialogue, basin level planning, policy harmonization and coordination of national/sub-national actions".
    - "Activity 1.1.5 National and transboundary mechanisms for coordinated policy and legal approaches and increased support to communities/districts".

19. Moreover, comments made by the GEFSEC on the project document stating that output "*2.1 Sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems (SLaM) mainstreamed in national development policies and programmes*" was not clear in its meaning has never been addressed and reviewed. Also, the request from the GEFSEC for more quantitative measures was not addressed neither.

20. Finally, in some cases, there are preparatory activities needed to achieve the expected outcome that were missing. For instance, in order to develop a "*Payment for Ecosystem Services (PES)*" the measurement of environmental flows was needed before establishing a payment system. It could not rely only on the monitoring framework as per the anticipated development of a PES described in the project document.

Indicators

21. Following a recommendation from the MTR, the project management team revised the list of indicators used to monitor the progress of the project. From a list of 16 outcome indicators to measure the overall performance of the project and an additional 49 output indicators used to monitor the day-to-day implementation of the project, the list was reduced to 13 indicators to monitor the performance of the project after the recommendation made in the MTR (*see table 2 below*). The review conducted for this final evaluation indicates that these 13 outcome indicators are SMART. These indicators are accompanied by a set of targets. It provided a good M&E framework to monitor the project and measure how well the project has been achieving its expected results.

Table 2: List of Outcome Indicators and Targets

Performance Indicators	Targets
Environmental objective*:* To address the causes of land degradation and restore ecosystem health and function and generate a range of global environmental benefits across the Kagera basin through the introduction of adapted agro-ecosystem management approaches. **Development objective:** To improve the livelihoods and hence contribute to reduced poverty of rural communities in the Kagera Basin through more productive and sustainable resource management practices that are technically feasible and socio-economically viable.	
1. Transformation of 43,700 ha of land by PY3 and 100,000 ha. by PY5 towards productive and sustainable agricultural ecosystems	• 100,000 ha (initial target), then reduced to about 20-25,000 hectares following a recommendation from the MTR.
2. Potentially 6 percent of today's basin population (some 1 million people) aware of project activities in target communities, micro-catchments, agro-ecological units through demonstrations and outreach.	• 6% of basin population aware of project activities
Outcome 1: Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands.	
3. Transboundary agro-ecosystem management programme (TAMP) to reverse land degradation being implemented and monitored by the 4 riverine countries in 21 districts, reviewed by national and regional PSCs, and project activities & achievements widely shared and available (PY5).	• 21 districts engaged in transboundary coordination and information sharing
4. Best practices for addressing TB land-related constraints through integrated ecosystems and inter-sectoral approaches mainstreamed in planning and development processes, including. NAPs, and pilot actions implemented to address TB issues in 68 communities (PY3) and replicated in 21 districts (PY5).	• Best practices for addressing transboundary issues replicated in all 21 districts
5. Regular Government budget allocations to transboundary coordination & collaboration in the Kagera basin increased by 10 percent (PY5)	• Increase of budget allocations by 10%
Outcome 2: Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions are in place to support and facilitate the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land.	
6. Priority policy, legal and Transboundary issues	• 68 communities in 21 districts involved in

Performance Indicators	Targets
identified and agreed at community (68), district (21) and river basin levels for SLaM (end PY2) and resulting in supporting policy decisions, regulatory mechanisms and community bye-laws for improved harmonization and application (PY5).	policy, legal and transboundary issues
7. At least 2 policy recommendations per country developed that support national policy-decisions and regulatory mechanisms, and 1 per country that support by-laws, etc. at district/ community level.	• 2 policy recommendation per country developed at national level; • 1 policy recommendation per country to support by-law at district/community level
Outcome 3: Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin.	
8. Trained technical staff and policy makers in 21 districts - supporting SLaM planning and implementation and using project information resources in their district and communities (PY5)	• Technical staff in 21 districts trained in SLaM planning and implementation and using project information resources in their districts and communities (300 technical staff and 200-250 policy makers in target districts)
9. Community members/local decision makers sensitized on SLaM techniques for pastoral, arable, mixed systems and their on- and offsite impacts and benefits (PYs 1-5)	• 72 communities
10. FFS members trained and adopting SLM and promoting upscaling on community territory	• 120,000 community members/local decision makers sensitized on SLaM techniques for pastoral, arable, mixed systems and their on- and off-site impacts and benefits (PYs 1-5)
11. Training materials on best practices /approaches widely available and SLM demonstrations in place.	• Advocacy and training materials available from community information centres and districts as and when required in the basin (PY 5)
Outcome 4: Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices are implemented and benefiting land users for the range of agro-ecosystems in the basin.	
12. SLM practices implemented by pilot communities (68 by PY3; 200 by PY5) in demonstrations and farmer plots covering a total of 45,000 ha of land (by PY5) and showing: a. Effective control of soil erosion (no new visual signs) in all target sites; b. 4 target micro-catchments (PY5) identified and sediment loads monitored (subject to identifying sites where SLM interventions can be applied on a significant area of the catchment and hydrological monitoring can be supported by partner Kagera IWRM, NBI-NELSAP and LVEMP projects); c. 30 percent increase in vegetation cover (above and below ground biomass) on pilot 23,000 ha arable and 7,500 ha pasture lands where alternatives to slash and burn are applied (PY5) d. 20 percent increase in soil carbon stores on farmer study plots and sample arable and pasture lands (PY5) inferred on 30,500 ha of land where SLM is practiced/planned. e. 10 percent increase in production (crop; livestock; other goods) by trained farmers/	• SLM practices implemented by 200 pilot communities on 11,250 ha • All project sites have effective erosion control • 2 target micro-catchments identified and sediment loads monitored • 30% increase in vegetative cover on (23,000 ha arable land + 7,500 ha pasture lands) • 20% increase in carbon stores on farmer study plots (on 30,500 ha) • 10% increase in crop and livestock production by trained farmers and herders

Performance Indicators	Targets
herders contributing to livelihoods (income; food security; reduced vulnerability)	
Outcome 5: Project management structures operational and effective.	
13. Project activities executed and outputs delivered in line with work plan and budget	

Source: Project Implementation Review (PIR) 2015

Baselines

22. The implementation approach formulated in the project document suggested the need to establish a baseline for targeted micro-catchments within the first or the second year of implementation. The objective of this baseline was to develop a comprehensive understanding of the status and trends in pasture/range, cropland, wetlands, in terms of agrobiodiversity and energy, and quantifying land cover/degradation status (for project M&E, with support of the regional GIS/RS center and as required a competent GIS/RS institute in each country). This baseline information would then be used to scale-up form the targeted micro-catchments to wider areas across the basin. The project completed these baselines, including the identification of the major agricultural issues, the institutional and political components, the institutions, legislation and regulatory frameworks, the bylaws and ordinances, the gender issues and the local knowledge.

Technical Approach

23. The technical approach of the project is very well thought-out, starting from the development of land use and land degradation maps at national levels, which would be used to identify land degradation hotspots at local levels, followed by the establishment of community maps and the integration into community plans of best practices at community and village levels through an SLM approach. Finally, the impacts of those best practices were to be assessed through Agro-Ecological Assessments done at the farmers' level which was also to be used for fine-tuning the site assessments simultaneously.

Political/Institutional Approach

24. On the other hand, the political/institutional approach described in the project document is incomplete. It does not sufficiently incorporate governments institutions in the project strategy and it does not provide a clear institutional mechanism which should be established. This is, for instance, illustrated by the indicators used to measure implementation of components 1 and 2. In component 1, indicators are related to the implementation of management plans and best practices and in a third place to the budget allocations by ther respective governments. In component 2, one indicator relates to the identification of priority policy, legal and transboundary issues which would result in the strengthening of policies and institutional mechanisms, but no indicator is measuring the effective establishment of these mechanisms.

2.4 Risk Management and Underlying Assumptions

25. The strategy of the project described in the log-frame was based on underlying assumptions that a given situation would prevail, such as political institutions ready to prioritize land

degradation and SLM, unhindered communication and commitment for regional collaboration and others. Most of these assumptions can also be seen as barriers to the implementation of the project. It was noted by the Evaluation Team that the project document did not highlight a clear strategy to mitigate the risks attached to these assumptions. However, on the other hand the project design is based on a sound risk assessment for environmental and agricultural risks as well as financial, political and management and human capacity which is realistic. This risk assessment is also complemented by a good risk mitigation analysis, which is reviewed annually and reported in the PIR documents.

3 Analysis of the implementation process

3.1 Project / Programme Management

Management and Institutional Arrangements

26. Management Arrangements were not altered after the MTR. It includes the FAO as the GEF Executing and Implementing Agency for this project. The Land and Water division (NRL) at FAO-HQ has been the designated Lead Technical Unit (LTU) and Operational Unit (Budget Holder).

27. The various project units at the country and regional levels are:
    - The *Kagera TAMP Regional Coordination Unit (RCU)* is hosted and supported by the FAO Representation in Kigali, Rwanda. The RCU is led by a *Regional Project Coordinator (RPC)* and is responsible for the successful cross-country coordination and implementation of the project.
    - The *Designated National Authorities* in the 4 riparian countries of the Kagera River are:
        - Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MINAGRIE) in Burundi;
        - Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) in Rwanda;
        - Division of the Environment, Vice President's Office (DOE/VPO) in Tanzania
        - Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) in Uganda;
    - A *Regional Project Steering Committee (RPSC)* for transboundary and collaborative issues guides the project across countries. It comprises senior level government officials from each country (designated by the national executing partners/Ministries) and representatives from the major regional programmes, which are relevant for Kagera TAMP.
    - A *National Project Steering Committee (NPSC)* guides the implementation of the project in each country. Members of the NPSC were nominated by participating Ministries and include representatives from Districts, Ministries (or Departments) as well as relevant non-governmental, civil society and private sector organizations. The NPSC reviews and endorses the annual national work-plans and budgets, including guidance for work within the country over the following year. It also oversees the timely implementation of the work-plan, which is implemented under the lead and supervision of the National Project Manager.
    - One *National Project Manager (NPM)* was recruited for each of the four project countries by FAO. They have been acting as fulltime national technical advisor and SLM expert supporting the implementation of the project in their respective country and collaborating on cross-border activities. Two NPMs are based in the capitals: Bujumbura in Burundi, and Kigali in Rwanda and two NPMs are based in districts that are within the Kagera river basin, which is relatively remote from the capitals:

Bukoba in Tanzania, and Kabale in Uganda.

- The project document also included an ad-hoc *Regional Technical Advisory Committee* whose members were nominated by the four countries. Additional members could be called upon independently for reviewing project outputs and results, such as technical documents, and to provide specific technical support as required.

28. While the MTR found that these management arrangements for this type of project are adequate, during the final evaluation it was stated by FAO Country Representatives as well as by Project managers themselves, that they would have needed more support staff to supervise the work on the ground. Indeed, at the time of the final evaluation, the FAO Country Representatives would have welcomed a better involvement and participation in the project. The Evaluation Team found that the development of an intermediate structure between FAO Headquarters and the management of the project may have benefited the implementation. It may have reduced the pressure on all sides caused by expectations, frustrations, projections which emerge when only one or two persons are held responsible for the success of the project. Furthermore, the setting up of an intermediate structure in FAO country offices with more permanent and/or semi-permanent staff may have reduced the need for short term consultants and provided a better continuity of project support in the field. It is a lesson learned to be considered in future similar projects.

29. The FAO Headquarters provided backstopping support at the technical level with the engagement of FAO staff. It benefited the project and the PSCs, though this support was viewed as unequal and irregular by the project implementation teams in the four countries. It was not due of an unwillingness of FAO Headquarters in providing support to the project but these teams stated that sometimes they did not receive advice or feedback from Headquarters. They did not know if reports were accepted or not and how reports could be improved. Additionally, these teams stated that backstopping on administration issues was almost inexistent due to unclear FAO project administration rules. The reason for these weaknesses was attributed to weaknesses of some links in the service delivery chains within FAO. In the case of Uganda, the personal initiative of the FAO Country representative to employ a person for the facilitation of project reporting facilitated the reporting process; however, it was not initiated by the LTU at FAO Headquarters.

30. Taking into account the differences in the political enabling conditions in the various countries, the management of the project at national levels was highly satisfactory in all countries despite differences in achievements, which were explained by the fact that in some countries it was more difficult to overcome barriers and obstacles hampering the implementation of the project.

31. In conclusion, the Evaluation Team agrees with the findings of the MTR, that despite the adequate numbers of committees and their responsibilities – such as the RCU in Kigali, Rwanda, the four national PSCs and one regional PSC, fieldwork at national and local levels was well organized, but the coordination among the various bodies and the project staff was not used to their full extend. As a result, the assessment expressed in the MTR, that the project is made up of four juxtaposed sub-projects, which are not really integrated and which create little synergetic effect at the regional level, remained valid until the end of the project. It also contributed to the low achievements under outcome 1, which is described further below in this report.

3.2 Financial resources management

32. The total GEF grant for the project was USD 6,363,700. By the end of the project this amount had been almost fully spent equally between countries, regional activities and global support according to the Table 3 below.

Table 3: Allocation of Funds to Countries and Outcomes

Entity receiving Fund	Amount received in million USD	Outcome	Expenses per Outcome (USD)
Global	1.40	Outcome 1	1,766,876
Uganda	1.15	Outcome 2	423,343
Rwanda	1.23	Outcome 3	1,230,003
Tanzania	1.17	Outcome 4	2,360,683
Burundi	1.41	Outcome 5	582,795
Total	**6,363,700**		**6,363,700**

33. The highest amount of more than USD 2M. was allocated to outcome #4, the least amount to outcome #2 on policy issues with USD 0.42M. For the implementation of direct SLaM activities about USD 400,000 were spent per country; mainly through contract agreements. The training component on SLaM costed about USD 300,000 per country. In addition to land users (farmers), a wide range of local, national and regional partners were involved and benefited directly and indirectly from the project. However, it was noted that the costs (including travel costs) for technical reports written by international consultants were about USD 0.5M and about USD 0.2M for local consultants, which seems to be a high amount spent on temporary external expertise.

34. The MTR had highlighted that 55% of the total GEF grant had been disbursed as of the end of April 2013. However, the disbursements by outcomes varied a lot: outcome #2 budget was almost expended (97%) during the time of the MTR, followed by outcome #3 and #4 with 70% and 65% respectively, then outcome 5 with 50% and finally outcome 1 with only 24% of the budget spent. It indicated that planned activities for transboundary coordination (only 24% of the budget spent) were behind policy and planning activities (97% of the budget spent). Disbursements for activities under other outcomes (#3, #4 & #5) were more aligned with the overall project timeline.

35. Under contract agreements, disbursements were at times delayed due to FAO requirement of appropriate and timely reporting before the next instalment could be made. This requirement overstretched the reporting capacities of some local partners, which had received less formal education. In some cases, these delays to receive the funds (instalments on contract agreements) impacted negatively the scheduling of targeted agricultural activities by reporting these activities to the next season. Furthermore, these delays also impacted the FFS groups which got discouraged and sometimes lost their members.

36. The terms of payment of these contract agreements signed with service providers included two instalments to be paid in advance, and a third and last instalment of 20% of the contract agreement value to be paid after completion of the contact. In several cases, service providers could not or did not want to pre-finance the last phase of these contract agreements. As a result, some of them abandoned their contract before this last phase (20%), which required the project implementation team to recruit/hire additional service

providers. These situations were particularly encountered during the first phase of the project.

3.3 Contributions by Countries and Governments

37. A total co-financing of USD 24,309,210 were committed at the formulation stage of the project. However, co-financing commitments have not materialized as planned due to the long delay in starting the project (in June 30, 2014). Among the four countries, only Burundi had secured a good co-financing by the government, representing 107% of the committed amount in cash and in kind. Furthermore, expectation of additional co-financing through enhanced governmental commitments for SLaM during the project lifetime, turned out to be unrealistic. Nevertheless, at the end of the project, all countries should fulfil their co-financing commitments. The details on co-financing are presented in annex 6.

38. Most governments had a positive attitude towards upscaling SLaM activities and recognized the project achievements. However, an effective financial commitment by governments to continue to finance SLaM activities after the end of the project was only reached in Burundi. None of the four governments changed their policies and development frameworks to integrate the SLaM approach supported by the project. Nevertheless, it was noted by the Evaluation Team that Burundi and Uganda met their co-financing commitments, while co-financing in Tanzania was increased to over 50% of its original commitment, and co-financing in Rwanda was also increased from 8% to 63% of its original commitment. Major sources of co-financing were in kind, mainly through the participation of farmers or farmer organizations and limited from governments entities.

4 Analysis of Results and Contribution to Stated Objectives

4.1 Review of Results

39. The overall goal of the Kagera TAMP was to support the adoption of an integrated ecosystems or landscape approach for the sustainable management of land resources in the Kagera Basin to generate local, national and global benefits including: restoration of degraded lands; carbon sequestration and adaptation to climate change; agro-biodiversity conservation and sustainable use; and increased agricultural production, thereby contributing to food security, sustainable rural livelihoods and protection of the international waters of the wider basin. It focused especially on the identification, piloting, demonstrations and dissemination of best practices and technologies adapted to the various agro-ecological and socio-economic contexts. The focus was placed on three main farming systems:

    i. The ***extensive agro-pastoral systems on drier lowlands and floodplains*** with erratic rainfall between 600 and 1,000 mm per year;
    ii. the ***intensive mixed banana and annual cropping systems*** (maize, beans and vegetables) in the wetter more productive areas along Lake Victoria; and
    iii. the ***mid altitude plateau*** at 1,500 to 1,900 meters, and reliable rainfall between 1,000 to 1,400 mm).

40. As detailed in section 2.3 above, the project was implemented through five (5) outcomes: (i) the first outcome was supporting activities to improve the transboundary coordination and the promotion of technical solutions to improve agro-ecosystems productivity while restoring degraded lands; (ii) the second outcome was to support activities to improve the enabling environment for the proper management of agro-systems and the restoration of degraded lands; (iii) the third outcome was about developing capacities for the sustainable

management of lands and agro-systems in the Kagera basin; (iv) the fourth outcome was the implementation of technical solutions to improve the management of lands and agro-systems in the basin; and finally (v) the fifth and last outcome was about the provision of an effective management of the project.

41. When reviewing the results of the Kagera TAMP, the Evaluation Team noted the excellent FAO publication[1] documenting extensively the results of this project. It recorded some of the many lessons learned by the project over the period 2010 to 2014 and it is organized into five themes: (i) Farmer field schools approach for successful learning and uptake of adapted SLM technologies at farm and ecosystem level; (ii) Catchment planning and local governance for integrated land resources management; (iii) Agro-ecosystem management for multiple benefits (production, SLM, climate and biodiversity and ecosystem services); (iv) Natural resources and livelihoods diagnostics and Impact assessment for SLM planning and monitoring; (v) Inter-sectoral cooperation, planning and policy for addressing transboundary land resources management.

42. A good overall summary of what the project tried to accomplish was given in this publication:

> *This transboundary project was designed to demonstrate how "bottom-up" approaches with farming communities could restore degraded land and provide a basis for sustainable management across the diverse agroecosystems in the basin of the Kagera River. The process started by involving communities in conducting a diagnostic of their land resources, management practices and livelihoods and finding-out and developing with them a vision for their land and livelihoods and for restoring productive systems and food security during the project and in the longer term (20-30 years). The communities were then helped to develop and implement concrete action plans for selected micro-catchments, farmer field schools were established for learning, sharing and adapting SLM practices at farm and hillside level and catchment committees were established for identifying problems and conflicts and developing and promoting by-laws for improving natural resources management and gradually scaling out SLM across the landscape.*

43. The performance of the project was measured through 13 indicators, with their respective targets to be achieved by the end of the project. The table below presents the progress made at the end of the project against the indicators and targets.

[1] FAO, GEF, 2016, *SLM in practice in the Kagera Basin - Lessons learned for scaling up at landscape level - Results of the Kagera Transboundary Agro-ecosystem Management Project (Kagera TAMP).*

Table 4: Progress Status at the End of the Project

Performance Indicators	Targets	Progress at End of Project
Environmental objective*:* To address the causes of land degradation and restore ecosystem health and function and generate a range of global environmental benefits across the Kagera basin through the introduction of adapted agro-ecosystem management approaches. **Development objective:** To improve the livelihoods and hence contribute to reduced poverty of rural communities in the Kagera Basin through more productive and sustainable resource management practices that are technically feasible and socio-economically viable.		
1. Transformation of 43,700 ha of land by PY3 and 100,000 ha. by PY5 towards productive and sustainable agricultural ecosystems	• 100,000 ha (initial target), then reduced to about 20-25,000 hectares following a recommendation from the MTR.	• 49,844 ha under SLM
2. Potentially 6 percent of today's basin population (some 1 million people) aware of project activities in target communities, micro-catchments, agro-ecological units through demonstrations and outreach.	• 6% of basin population aware of project activities	• More than 6% of the basin population (a total of 228,850) are aware of the project's activities. Given the intensification of project sensitization of various institutions at local and national level and improved communication channels
Outcome 1: Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands.		
3. Transboundary agro-ecosystem management programme (TAMP) to reverse land degradation being implemented and monitored by the 4 riverine countries in 21 districts, reviewed by national and regional PSCs, and project activities & achievements widely shared and available (PY5).	• 21 districts engaged in transboundary coordination and information sharing	• 21 targeted districts are informed and engaged in addressing transboundary issues through adapted SLaM interventions. • Reviews have been conducted and technical and policy recommendations developed to enhance livestock biodiversity and fire management, and address conflicts over land and natural resources.
4. Best practices for addressing TB land-related constraints through integrated ecosystems and inter-sectoral approaches mainstreamed in planning and development processes, including. NAPs, and pilot actions implemented to address TB issues in 68 communities (PY3) and replicated in 21 districts (PY5).	• Best practices for addressing transboundary issues replicated in all 21 districts	• Best SLM practices have been selected, assessed and documented using WOCAT tools (QT/QA), then demonstrated in project catchment sites in all 21 districts and are being scaled up on the basis of catchment plans that address, as appropriate, transboundary issues (e.g. erosion and sedimentation, crop-livestock integration, grazing management, reduced burning through pasture restoration, etc.). This is done by communities without direct support from the project.

Performance Indicators	Targets	Progress at End of Project
		• The application of these best practices at the catchment level and the resilience to climate change are being reviewed using WOCAT tools (QW and QC) in selected catchments.
5. Regular Government budget allocations to transboundary coordination & collaboration in the Kagera basin increased by 10 percent (PY5)	• Increase of budget allocations by 10%	• Governments (district; national) have allocated funds to SLM through in-kind contribution to the project activities and the project provided important lessons for scaling up SLM (incl. costs and benefits) across communities' districts, countries in Kagera basin. However, it has not yet been fully assessed what this means in terms of regular SLM budget allocations in and across countries. (TB mechanism not yet in place as MOU only signed by NBI Council of Ministers in June 2015 to establish Kagera river basin organization and IWRM program for Kagera (and Nile).
Outcome 2: Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions are in place to support and facilitate the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land.		
6. Priority policy, legal and Transboundary issues identified and agreed at community (68), district (21) and river basin levels for SLaM (end PY2) and resulting in supporting policy decisions, regulatory mechanisms and community bye-laws for improved harmonization and application (PY5).	• 68 communities in 21 districts involved in policy, legal and transboundary issues	• 68 communities and 21 districts are involved in supporting policy decisions, and legislation (bye laws etc.) for SLM at catchment level and their wider application by districts, including addressing transboundary issues through improved NRM and conflict resolution.
7. At least 2 policy recommendations per country developed that support national policy-decisions and regulatory mechanisms, and 1 per country that support by-laws, etc. at district/ community level.	• 2 policy recommendation per country developed at national level; • 1 policy recommendation per country to support by-law at district/community level	• Based on identified transboundary issues and best practices for SLM, policy briefs are in development in all four countries and at the basin level for advocacy and to facilitate decisions by policy makers. At catchment level, communities have established committees with by-laws to safeguard SLM and watershed management (water sources and riverbank protection, woodlot management and fire control) • In 2015, Burundi institutionalised the FFS approach (incl. SLM) at national level, following the promotion of this approach by the project. • Project results consolidate the FFS approach in extension policies in Uganda & Rwanda. All four countries are applying several by-laws

Performance Indicators	Targets	Progress at End of Project
		for SLM at the community/catchment level such as controlled grazing, and buffer zone protection.
Outcome 3: Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin.		
8. Trained technical staff and policy makers in 21 districts - supporting SLaM planning and implementation and using project information resources in their district and communities (PY5)	• Technical staff in 21 districts trained in SLaM planning and implementation and using project information resources in their districts and communities (300 technical staff and 200-250 policy makers in target districts)	• 90% of technical staff in all 21 districts and service providers have been sensitised and trained in SLM planning and implementation and target communities are benefitting from improved support in SLM and environmental management.
9. Community members/local decision makers sensitized on SLaM techniques for pastoral, arable, mixed systems and their on- and offsite impacts and benefits (PYs 1-5)	• 72 communities	• 68 communities (about 90% of the target) are currently benefiting from project support through service providers and technical staff from local government.
10. FFS members trained and adopting SLM and promoting upscaling on community territory	• 120,000 community members/local decision makers sensitized on SLaM techniques for pastoral, arable, mixed systems and their on- and off-site impacts and benefits (PYs 1-5)	• 139 SLM/FFS groups (4,500 members) have been established in all four countries. 200 FFS facilitators been trained and supported by the project. A total of 60,000 community members are estimated to be sensitized in SLaM techniques through SLM field days, community meetings (umuganda), village meetings (baraza) and farmer extension centres
11. Training materials on best practices /approaches widely available and SLM demonstrations in place.	• Advocacy and training materials available from community information centres and districts as and when required in the basin (PY 5)	• SLM demonstrations in place in 21 districts. SLM fact sheets developed and used for training. Manual on FFS-SLM for FFS being used and validated in English and French • SLM practices on the ground being assessed and documented for further development of materials.
Outcome 4: Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices are implemented and benefiting land users for the range of agro-ecosystems in the basin.		
12. SLM practices implemented by pilot communities (68 by PY3; 200 by PY5) in demonstrations and farmer plots covering a total of 45,000 ha of land (by PY5) and showing:	• SLM practices implemented by 200 pilot communities on 11,250 ha	• SLM practices are now implemented in 68 communities on a total of 14,423 ha of demonstrations and farmer plots. o 2,000km of contour ditches o Nearly 500 km riverine buffer strips • Strategies and mechanisms set up to mainstream and upscale

Performance Indicators	Targets	Progress at End of Project
		through key partners and institutions (local authorities, new projects e.g. LVEMP-2, Vi-Agroforestry, etc.)
a. Effective control of soil erosion (no new visual signs) in all target sites;	• All project sites have effective erosion control	• Soil erosion control structures in place and stabilised with vegetation. Contour farming, vegetation strips, bench and progressive terraces, water retention ditches, runoff ponds in place in sloping areas in all project sites. In most of the treated catchments, the recovery had been quick and reduction in degradation was notable within one year.
b. 4 target micro-catchments (PY5) identified and sediment loads monitored (subject to identifying sites where SLM interventions can be applied on a significant area of the catchment and hydrological monitoring can be supported by partner Kagera IWRM, NBI-NELSAP and LVEMP projects);	• 2 target micro-catchments identified and sediment loads monitored	• In line with MTE, 2 micro-catchments in Rwanda (Marebe) and Burundi (Giheta) selected and hydrological monitoring, measurement of sediment load and river flow is in place with local authorities, technical institutions and FFS groups have been engaged to demonstrate the impact of SLM in reducing sediment load. This will provide required data for establishing PES agreement between downstream water users and upstream land users
c. 30 percent increase in vegetation cover (above and below ground biomass) on pilot 23,000 ha arable and 7,500 ha pasture lands where alternatives to slash and burn are applied (PY5)	• 30% increase in vegetative cover on (23,000 ha arable land + 7,500 ha pasture lands)	• SLM activities to restore vegetation cover (planting of trees and grass fodder) in 50 project sites (with 20-60% increase in vegetation cover) implemented on a total of 16,265 ha of pasture and arable land, buffer zones, river banks and SLM demos; In addition, catchment plans for improved practices including vegetation cover on 35,421 ha are being implemented. The project team facilitates measurement by FFS groups and facilitators to compare farmer and improved SLM practice (LADA methods) in demo plots and catchments to assess impact on vegetation cover and other indicators see below. (inadequate government staffing to consolidate data)
d. 20 percent increase in soil carbon stores on farmer study plots and sample arable and pasture lands (PY5) inferred on 30,500 ha of land where SLM is practiced/planned.	• 20% increase in carbon stores on farmer study plots (on 30,500 ha)	• Teams in each country were trained in April 2015 to apply carbon-balance analysis (using the FAO EX-ACT tool) to estimate the project impacts on GHG emissions and carbon sequestration. Direct project actions on 65,900 ha lead to a C balance equivalent to the annual mitigation of some 282,000 tCO2-e, or an annual mitigation benefit of 4.3 tCO2-e per hectare. Main benefits generated through establishment of agroforestry systems (2.5 M tCO2-e) and

Performance Indicators	Targets	Progress at End of Project
		prevention of further land degradation through contour lines and improved hillside management (1.4M tCO2-e). also improved management of annual cropland (-720,000 tCO2-e) and afforestation measures (-680,000 tCO2-e)
e. 10 percent increase in production (crop; livestock; other goods) by trained farmers/ herders contributing to livelihoods (income; food security; reduced vulnerability)	• 10% increase in crop and livestock production by trained farmers and herders	• Based on records from FFS, more than 10% average increase in production realised by trained famers and herders and often much higher (results varied from site to site and across crops, livestock (cattle, dairy cows, small ruminants), estimated biomass from woodlots (slow growing), and other products.
Outcome 5: Project management structures operational and effective.		
13. Project activities executed and outputs delivered in line with work plan and budget		

Source: Project Implementation Review (PIR) 2015 and observations made by the Evaluation Team

<u>Outcome 1</u>: Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands.

44. Under this outcome, key activities included transboundary coordination and information sharing, regional meetings and workshops, as well as transboundary exchange visits among countries and transboundary studies, which were also translated into policy briefs with recommendations.

45. Overall, the project met its objectives under this outcome; most indicators/targets were met. However, as it is shown in the table below, the focus was mostly in identifying transboundary issues, but limited further activities followed the studies conducted under the project. The project reached a good first step with the identification of transboundary issues and some technical solutions; however, the long-term sustainability of these achievements resides in the ability of local, national and regional institutions to apply and upscale these solutions.

46. The review found that the project's definition of a transboundary mechanism to better manage the Kagera river was not easy to understand. Was it just a project mechanism only or a political/institutional instrument to develop with the support of the project and to be sustained within the realm of regional institutions and politics? Activities such as the monitoring framework and the establishment of the project office indicate that it would rather be the former definition; however, exchange visits and transboundary studies refer more to a mechanism beyond the project itself. This question of definition was also reflected in the fact, that almost all maps used/produced by the project have political or national boundaries. Hardly any of the maps produced by the project uses the hydrological or ecological basin boundaries. This lack of clarity for a common identity led to a situation of four juxtaposed projects beside each other, which was already expressed in the MTR. The lack of opportunity to collaborate with other transboundary projects like LVEMP II and/or with political organizations such as EAC might have also played a role in limiting a more transboundary approach when supporting project activities.

Table 5: Project Actions to Address Identified Transboundary Issues

Transboundary Issue	TAMP Actions	Achievement
Harmonize laws and regulations	At national level and across the basin, to address the interlinked issues of agriculture, land degradation, biodiversity conservation, carbon sequestration, protection of international waters and sustainable livelihoods and food security.	With respect to linkages of agriculture, land degradation and biodiversity conservation partly achieved in all countries on national level, low to now achievement on transboundary level except to policy papers.
Promote application of policy/laws	Through local consultation, experience sharing and capacity building for community-driven conflict resolution/management solutions between user groups (herders, farmers, foresters, park wardens). Lessons of GEF Cross-borders project; LVEMP, NELSAP, ASARECA, etc.)	Conflict resolution mechanisms introduced, hardly any conflicts practically addressed, no lessons, low collaboration with LVEMP, NELSAP, ASARECA, partly because those projects had their core activities not at the same time as Kagera TAMP project

Transboundary Issue	TAMP Actions	Achievement
Optimize communications/exchange of information	Among countries and sectors (food security, agriculture, environment) for effective collaboration, coordination and early warning across river basin (joint GIS/RS systems/databases, planning, training, electronic conferencing for committee meetings, stakeholder consultation).	Achieved
Control and management of Bush fires	Community awareness of negative effects of repetitive burning and potential value/alternative uses of biomass (grasses, crop residues, etc.) such as CA/zero grazing, and methods for managing vermin. Laws and by-laws.	Identified but no action
Control of Livestock movements, trade and disease transmission	Links and guidance from existing transboundary programs (PACE; tsetse control, AU-IBAR) to strengthen actions. Assess impact of land use change - loss of pastures, conversion of cattle corridors to ranches, commercial farms and their implications/ impacts on access to grazing/ water in dry season/drought periods.	Poorly identified, no action
Control of soil erosion, sedimentation and impacts on rivers, wetlands and flood risk	Improve land management practices (cropping, livestock, forestry) through integrated approaches and local adaptation of conservation agriculture, agroforestry, zero grazing, fodder and rangeland management. Community monitoring/assessment of impacts on runoff, soil erosion, sedimentation, siltation of wetlands, rivers and inland waters, improved productivity and ecosystem function (hydrological regime, nutrient cycling, carbon emissions etc.)	Major activity of the project, fully achieved
Water resources management (quality and quantity)	Guidance and capacity building on integrated approaches for land, water and biological resources planning and management to reduce soil erosion, sedimentation, pollution (e.g. horticulture; paddy) and improve HEP generation. Coordinated, complementary actions with LVEMP and NELSAPs projects (water allocations, information, resource management, water use efficiency).	Hardly achieved
Control of Health issues related to water quality	Address human health and well-being issues as part of integrated resources management. Assess effects of land use and wetland protection /management on water quality (e.g. suspended solids that exacerbate bacteria/water-borne diseases (dysentery, typhoid, cholera, bilharzia, malaria).	Not achieved and hardly addressed
Control of sources and spread of Water hyacinth	Through expansion of actions of NELSAP and LVEMP to upstream branches of the Kagera (from Lake Victoria) Assess effects in reducing effects: asphyxiation, effects on aquatic life, fish stocks, water quality.	Indirectly addressed, no data about achievements

Transboundary Issue	TAMP Actions	Achievement
River bank and lakeshore protection and management	Assess situation and develop community driven, coordinated solutions across borders for protection and management, conflict resolution and local regulations.	Successfully addressed on national levels, but not on cross-boundary level
Wildlife management and control	Assess effects of movement, hunting, harvesting of wildlife species (animal + plant). Develop plans/options to enhance wildlife conservation and community benefit sharing arrangements across borders (e.g. Akagera national park).	Identified but not addressed
Impact of refugees on land resources and community based management	Assess and identify options to reduce effects/threats to security of refugee movements on sustainability and investment in land resources management, (e.g. Burigi-Akagera boundary areas and Lake Mburo National park).	Not addressed
Charcoal making and sale	Assess extent and implications of cross border wood harvesting and burning for charcoal and propose solutions through community plans and consultation.	Partly addressed and achieved in Burundi and Tanzania through improved cook stoves
Control of Crop pests and diseases movements and outbreaks	Identify and exchange bio-control practices and disease resistant germplasm and promote participatory breeding/propagation approaches among communities in the basin.	Well addressed and substantial progress was made

47. One of the major achievements made by the project was the control of transboundary vectors of plant diseases, like the banana bacterial wilt and the cassava mosaic virus. Despite this good result, the review conducted for this final evaluation indicates that it was not addressed as a transboundary problem but rather as a national problem common to the four countries. Addressing it as a transboundary issue would have probably required pathogenic controls at the national borders.

48. The control of soil erosion and sedimentation was addressed by the project within the context of protecting the Kagera River and its secondary and tertiary tributaries. However, similar to the issue of vectors of plant diseases, the approach was not really a transboundary approach but nationally based approaches juxtaposed in the four countries. As a result, it did not create a common identity among the various initiatives implemented in each country and supported by the project

49. The weak transboundary approach used all along the life of the project might explain why, despite all efforts, at the final project meeting in Mwanza, Tanzania, project members were still at the point of identifying possible transboundary issues to be addressed in the exit strategy. It might also explain the low co-financing of the project by governments, whereby only the government of Burundi made a co-financing cash contribution of USD 157,000.

50. The analysis of the lack of a transboundary approach and a limited improvement for a regional cohesion led to the identification of two possible reasons. One reason could be that the project was expected to collaborate with other large regional initiatives such as the NELSAP program, the LVEMP project and the EAC. Due to the timing and other reasons this collaboration did not happen and the project alone, was not able to raise the political level in addressing these transboundary issues. The second reason seems to lie in an inappropriate project design, which focused much more on technical issues rather than on

institutional issues. In order to achieve any impact at a transboundary level, any project needs to focus on appropriate transboundary institutional mechanisms and on the development of an enabling environment (policies and legislation) at both national and regional levels, supporting the technical solutions to be implemented. Finally, the capacities of project committees to oversee the implementation of the project and provide a platform for regional dialogues may have also been overestimated.

<u>Outcome 2</u>: Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions are in place to support and facilitate the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land.

51. The project has conducted substantial activities to reduce barriers to SLaM, mainly through sensitization activities. The establishment of community catchment committees for further planning of SLaM integration on landscape planning was certainly one of the key activities to guide and facilitate the landscape approach, as well as the establishment of by-laws, which were mainly implemented to address issues of pasture development. The implementation of by-laws and their enforcement has depended mostly on the strengths and willingness of traditional authorities such as local Elders, to support these by-laws. Without their support, some communities did not dare to enforce them such as, for instance, requesting fines from perpetrators. Another issue, which might play a role in this context is also the visibility of these by-laws. For instance, mobile herders coming from outside the area might not be informed that communities had now established a new by-law which would forbid them to graze in their improved pasture land.

52. Similarly to outcome 1, the project did not support enough targeted actions in this area to have a significant influence on planning, legislative and policy matters. Low visibility of the project in some of the countries, weaknesses in the design of a policy advocacy mechanism and probably an unrealistic assessment of the capabilities of the project committees and their influences might be other reasons. Also, the number of inter-sectoral workshops and meetings with concerned ministries and institutions were insufficient; additionally, most of these workshops and meetings took place at the beginning of the project and few thereafter. Therefore, although all governments show a positive attitude to the project at the end, they are far from endorsing and mainstreaming SLaM in their government systems and to move more toward a river basin approach with tangible support, including budget allocations (except Burundi) and legislative changes. Nevertheless, the project has compiled successful experiences, best practices, knowledge and expertise which can be mainstreamed, once the above mentioned political willingness for mainstreaming is created.

<u>Outcome 3</u>: Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin

53. This outcome was the preparatory phase for outcome #4. It is therefore composed of a sensitization and awareness raising element, a preparation phase of training materials on SLM technologies, and the dissemination of these technologies through the training of trainers (ToTs) and demonstrations.

54. The review indicates that activities supported under this outcome contributed greatly to the vibrancy of the project. The transfer of technologies created a lot of enthusiasm from all sides, which was reinforced by the fact that innovatively the project successfully integrated traditional knowledge into the best practices from WOCAT. Combining this transfer of technologies with the FFS approach promoted by the project turned out to be highly

successful. It was also much better received by communities than the promotion of blanket technologies by governments services through best farmer approaches. Based on this success, it can be assumed that this approach will be replicated among the basin countries by governments after the end of the project. Governments may have wished, that the FFS approach would have also been taught to government institutions; however, it was not initially planned by the project.

55. Training activities included the dissemination of monitoring technologies, such as hydrological monitoring and the recording of rainfall data. These technologies were transferred to FFS members and IGEBU staff in Burundi and to communities in Butare, Rwanda, including the training on the collection of hydrological and rainfall data. As a result, hydrological data were obtained in Burundi. However, the Evaluation Team raised the question about partnership: why no partnership has been established with HydroMet Services, either to train them, or use them as trainers for these new technologies?

56. The project was very ambitious and very committed to disseminate knowledge. However, with a focus of the project on identifying technical solutions and the dissemination of this knowledge through the FAO-FFS approach, it was weak on developing lasting capacities of related institutions, which should sustain these results over the long-term. This point was already raised by the MTR with a recommendation to focus more on developing the capacity of these related institutions and of an enabling environment to provide adequate policy, legislation and governance frameworks. This experience is a lesson learned for further projects, whereby transferring technical solutions directly to communities/farmers is not enough to produce a sustainable change.

<u>Outcome 4</u>: Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices are implemented and benefiting land users for the range of agro-ecosystems in the basin

57. This outcome was one of the most important elements of the project. The project supported interventions initially in pilot communities and selected micro-catchments - 12 communities in Uganda, 12 communities in Tanzania, 24 communities and 12 micro-catchments in Rwanda and 20 communities and 10 micro-catchments in Burundi – as well as in other key targeted land units such as pasture/range, wetlands/riverbanks, and woodlots. During the last 2 years of the project, it was anticipated that the project would disseminate its results more widely throughout up-scaling approaches across the Kagera basin.

Some key Project Deliverables

- 17,097ha received SLM interventions: soil fertility improvement using organic manures, tree planting and agroforestry, soil moisture conservation with mulching, disease and pest control for banana, digging of terraces, ditches/trenches for erosion control, and pasture improvements.
- 135 Farmer Field Schools impacting directly 23,649 farm households
- Two sites were identified and equipped for sediment monitoring, one in Burundi and the other in Rwanda.
- A total of 1,314,676 trees and 5,355,656 agroforestry shrubs were planted through the project and 156 tree nurseries established. The survival rate of trees has been estimated at 80%
- 49,161 ha of pasture lands were improved, mostly in Burundi, Tanzania and Uganda, through closure to grazing, grass reseeding and removal of invasive species
- SLM interventions contributed to improvements in soil carbon stocks: 2,451 ha of agricultural lands received soil fertility improvement, 2,385 ha were mulched and use of farmyard manure was enhanced on 1,180 ha. Terraces were excavated on 5,804 ha and 2,673 km of ditches/trenches were constructed. 1,495 km of vegetative strips/grass strips were planted for soil conservation.
- The interventions increased food security and incomes of beneficiary communities by over 10 percent through introduction of high yielding crops such as 141,400 improved bananas were planted, and 233ha of vegetables for income generating activities.
- Distributed 3,966 goats, 50 cows and 121 pigs

58. The results under this expected outcome are doubtlessly the highlight of the project. They clearly show FAO's traditional expertise in land management as the owner and creator of the LADA methodology and WOCAT tools.

59. The success of activities supported by the project under this outcome does not only refer to the development of technologies and the transfer of these technologies, but also to the social cohesion and social learning element which was emphasized throughout the project. Music and dancing were part of the implementation of project activities and used as an approach to overcome critical situations. Technically, the project has tackled the daunting tasks of combining environmental goals and agroecosystem productivity. The approach taken by the project to create synergies between environment and agriculture might even be taken as a model to be replicated elsewhere.

60. However, the Evaluation Team observed minor flaws in the coordination chain, which would need to be addressed in the future when implementing similar approaches. Despite a successful implementation of activities in communities, those activities related to assess the impact of project activities would need to be strengthened. It includes the need to address weaknesses in the monitoring system, as well as to improve the implementation of farmers' own research and feedback systems in the agro-ecological assessment that was mostly irrelevant.

61. These weaknesses prevented a good feedback loop to the project implementation team,

which should have used this farmers' own experience to improve the approach. Additionally, institutional research was not promoted by the project, even though it would have been instrumental in providing important quantitative data on environmental flows and agricultural production factors. In conclusion, the Evaluation Team found that despite the FFS approach, which was the cornerstone for the vibrancy in capacity development within the project, and the development of SLaM technologies, which were successfully merged with indigenous technologies, the measurements of participatory and scientific impacts are missing to allow the use of adaptive management when needed.

62. More detailed information on achievements of the project at the output level is presented in annex 7; annex 8 presents the list of activities implemented in each country.

4.2 Gender equality

63. Gender relations are power relations, and it is these power relations which determine inequalities. Within projects gender relations can be influenced within the public space, largely over improving equality in financial and political power and by improving the general capabilities of the less powerful to enhance their power. Political power can be determined by the right and ability to speak, be listened to, not being ridiculed, overlooked or commanded, the right of not being exploited or overworked. Capabilities are determined by access to education, training, skills etc. Financial power is mainly constituted by access to monetary income generation opportunities, access to credit and rights to inherit. The latter one is to a large degree determined by gender relations itself.

64. The project conducted a comprehensive and detailed gender assessment on how gender roles and relations were affected by project activities, and how the roles of the less powerful – women in these cases – could be strengthened. This assessment was aligned with the FAO Gender Equality guidelines, which are all related to political and financial power. The FAO gender guidelines are:
    a) Women participate equally with men as decision-makers in rural institutions and in shaping laws, policies and programs.
    b) Women and men have equal access to and control over decent employment and income, land and other productive resources.
    c) Women and men have equal access to goods and services for agricultural development, and to markets.
    d) Women's work burden is reduced by 20 percent through improved technologies, services and infrastructure.
    e) The share of total agricultural aid committed to projects related to women and gender equality is increased to 30 percent.

65. The gender assessment indicated a high sensitivity towards gender inequity, particularly when taking into account the different rights, including inheritance and education, roles and burdens of women. In order to balance the political power of gender relations, the project took mainly a quota approach such as trying to have at least 50% of women in committees, trainings, FFS, etc. The project also tried to balance the financial power of gender relations through the development of special income generating niches for women.

66. The project was particularly supportive to women-headed households and to women who are solely responsible for agriculture. It was particularly true in some mining areas in Rwanda, where men work in mines, and women in their home villages get access to improved income generation through river bank stabilization and vegetable gardening.

67. In other places, where women and men cultivate their fields together, benefits and burden sharing was done at the family level. However, equal training did not guarantee equal burdens or equal benefits. The field visits revealed that the financial profits from most banana production systems were administrated mostly by men while women benefited from enhanced yields or higher production diversity for households. It was also observed that with pasture improvement - one of the ecologically most beneficial activities - women could not really earn profits from it, since it was men who were the major livestock owners, despite the fact that women were mostly doing the work.

68. The review of the FAO Gender Objectives indicated that a major blind spot lies in the assumption that both men and women would have the option to be equally and full-time involved into agricultural activities if there would just be equal opportunities. It is not a holistic picture of the status of women in most cases, whereby the majority of their time is occupied by child raising, housework, cooking, water and wood fetching etc. Another aspect is that it is still a gender-biased system, which determines whose work is paid and whose work is not paid. For instance, within the project it was decided to pay farmers for soil conservation. While women equally participated in this activity and were equally paid, equity was still not reached since due to physical vulnerability of women, especially in certain periods of their life cycle like pregnancy and lactation, women might suffer from physical damages if they are involved into this work. While indeed women appreciated to have access to some work like creating soil bunds and being equally paid as men, one women said during the field visits: "*It is for us the first time to realize that we can work equal to men and being paid equally*". However, further discussions with women in these communities revealed that women also realized that they could not do this for a long time. In conclusion, it seems that such initiatives do not reduce the burden on women, but enhance it, therefore violating the respective objective. Moreover, equal payment is still not equal, since men still have more opportunities to generate incomes. Therefore, although the project has made some achievements in enhancing paid work for both sexes, this paid work should not be restricted for tasks that are traditionally done by men. The approach for paid work should also consider the traditional tasks conducted by women such as cooking, water fetching, raising children, etc. which remain in the unpaid shadow economy. If the project looks for relief of the labor burden on women, this relief should be provided for this type of tasks.

4.3 Capacity development

Capacity Development of Farmers

69. The heart of capacity development in the project was the Farmer Field School (FFS) approach. The FFS approach was new to some countries, such as Uganda, where the common way used by national institutions had been to promote technologies through best farmers' approaches. However, at the startup of the project, the FFS approach was already known in Tanzania and Rwanda. The use of communal fields for demonstrations was also well adapted to the Tanzanian culture.

70. A major feature of the FFS approach was the training of trainers which preceded training activities for groups of farmers. These groups are also called producer groups, which were assembled under a certain topic such as a crop or a certain technology like soil conservation or pasture development. These producer groups were engaged into the full value chain, which also includes marketing and had also made profits. As a result, adoption and

dissemination of information received during these FFS training activities had been high.

71. Two other features of the FFS did not add much value to farmers' capacities due to the type of training activities that were conducted. It included research activities conducted on farmers' lands where basic issues relevant to farmers where, sometimes, not researched such as comparing different manuring techniques or agro-fertilizer trees.

72. The AEOA (agro-ecological assessment) promoted by the project appeared to have been of little use in some countries. On one hand, the assessments could hardly be done properly through field technologies, such as nutrient demand; on the other hand, farmers were taught to record whole production functions but no training were offered to analyze and interpret these collected records. Without feedback mechanisms to the project, farmers' efforts and knowledge were not used to create adaptive management. The main value of these assessments were in the identification of pests and diseases and in the determination of soil types for site selection, which were also part of the local knowledge. Based on this experience, it is recommended that, if farmers are requested to record data, to evaluate this data carefully, and furthermore, assessing the existing indigenous indicator systems and integrate them into FAO's field assessment technologies.

Capacity Development of Institutions and Partner Organizations

73. An issue which was recommended by the MTR to be addressed, was the strengthening of institutions. This recommendation has not been addressed and the management response to the MTR interpreted this recommendation as mostly a question of visibility. However, based on the findings from this final evaluation, developing the capacity of related institutions could have had important positive impacts.

74. For instance, the National Agricultural Advisory Service (NAADS) in Uganda ceased to exist during the lifetime of the project. Some staff members of NAADS benefited from some training activities supported by the project; however, discussion with the Ministry of Agriculture indicates that if the project would have supported activities to strengthen NAADS, this service may still be around to continue, sustain and possibly scale-up project's achievements. Over the lifetime of the project, it became evident that the approach promoted by the project through the FFS approach promoting farmers' own selection of technologies for SLM was much more effective than the existing national approach of supplying blanket technologies to farmers. However, institutions remain weak to take over these achievements.

75. The project could have also strengthened institutions mandated with hydrological monitoring and carbon monitoring, as well as supported the establishment of soil and plant laboratories to institutionalize and contribute to the long-term sustainability of project's results achieved at community level. With more emphasis on institutional strengthening, the project would have had a greater impact to address the causes of land degradation and restore ecosystems health and functions in the Kagera basin.

76. The project supported the development of capacity of service providers through "*train the trainer*" (ToT) activities. This final assessment found that the results are mixed. Many service providers were - by their mandate or professional background - not originally agricultural institutions; and, in some cases, they were lacking basic knowledge (such as beekeeping) despite the training received. It would have been expected that in these cases,

the project would have equipped these service providers with adequate manuals and key data such as, for instance, basic water and nutrient requirements and nutrient removals of different crop varieties, nutrient contents of manure, fertilizers, wood-ash, quantities to be applied, etc. The Evaluation Team found that these issues were not addressed to full satisfaction, including in the SLM publication[2] which is under development.

4.4 Partnerships and Alliances

Letters of Agreements

77. The project signed letters of agreements with a large variety of institutions to act as service providers. It was a long trial-and-error process, which ended up with a "short list" of service providers that were reliable, responsible and financially and technically capable of conducting tasks required by the project. The process was particularly difficult in Tanzania with numerous unreliable and non-capable service providers.

78. Based on the project experience, it was found that the collaboration with CBOs was more effective than commercial service providers; due mostly to the fact that these CBOs were engaged in these communities over the long-term. It is a lesson learned for future projects of this nature.

MoUs for Regional Partnerships

- The Kagera TAMP project signed an MoU with the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) in May 2012 to define their collaboration in the Kagera River Basin;
- The project also signed an MOU with Vi-Agroforestry on October 2012 to address the management of natural resources and agro-ecosystems as well as knowledge generation and dissemination including programmes, projects and activities related to the sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems;
- A third MOU was signed with the Lake Victoria Basin Commission (LVBC) for collaborating with the LVEMP-II project in the Kagera River Basin.

79. Despite the MOUs with LVEMP-II/LVBC and Vi-Agroforestry, the only viable MOU for Kagera TAMP was the partnership with NBI, which allowed the project to have some impacts at the regional level. The other Partners, despite the signed MOUs, were not in place during the project lifetime.

UN-Partnerships

80. At the initial stage of identification of this project, UNEP was to be part of the implementing agency team; though it was finally decided that FAO will implement and execute the project. Nevertheless, FAO commented in a response to the STAP review, that it intended to invite/contract UNEP to help for specific tasks. In particular, UNEP could link FAO with other UN institutions. It has not happened, and, in the view of the Evaluation Team, it was a missed opportunity whereby other UN agencies could probably have supported the political endeavors of the project.

Table 6: Project Participants and Partners at all levels

[2] FAO-GEF, *SLM in practice in the Kagera Basin – Lessons learned for scaling up at landscape level*.

Levels	Participants/Partners
Local	- Farmers mainly subsistence farmers, but also intensive perennial banana-coffee based farmers - Pastoralists/Herders - Households practicing a combination of farming or herding with fishing or forestry activities - Women and vulnerable groups - Farmers groups and associations - Local level leaders and decision makers - District authorities and government bodies
National	- National and international NGOs - Researchers from national institutions - The private sector - The donor community and related projects - FAO country offices

Regional	- Nile Basin Initiative (NBI)
	  o Nile Equatorial Lakes Subsidiary Action Programme (NELSAP)
	  o Kagera Transboundary Integrated water resources management project (TIWRMP)
	- Lake Victoria Environmental Management Programme (LVEMP-II)
	- Other regional programmes such as VI-Agroforestry (called VI-Life in Rwanda), Africa 2000, IFDC, UNECA, ICRAF, CIAT etc.

Global	- FAO (Land and Water Division-NRL, FAO-GEF Unit, Technical Cooperation Department -TCI)* - GEF (Global Environmental Facility)

5 Analysis by evaluation criteria

81. Before going into detailed analysis by evaluation criteria, the Evaluation Team found that overall, the project demonstrated its strengths in addressing technical issues but also weaknesses in policy development, which, to a great extent, are rooted in the project design.

5.1 Relevance

Relevance towards Country Objectives and Communities

82. Through the use of the LADA methodology and WOCAT tools the project contributed toward the GEF Strategic Objective: SLM-rev2 "*Demonstrate and up-scale successful SLM practices for control and prevention of desertification*" within the GEF Operational Program: *Sustainable Land Management* (OP15) and also with some relevance under OP13 and OP12.

83. According to FAOSTAT 2008, less than 3%, of total cropland in Sub-Saharan Africa (SSA) are under SLM using low-cost productivity enhancing land management practices, which is equivalent to 5 million ha in total. The promotion and dissemination of SLaM should, therefore, be one of the foremost priorities in all policies that include combatting land degradation in their objectives, including in the four countries in the Kagera basin. It is well-known, that the economic and personal well-being, resilience and stability, sometimes survival of many rural communities depend on the products of their land, therefore also on successful SLM practices, which is where individual, community and national objectives of poverty reduction, food and water security and natural resource protection meet.

84. Considering the importance of implementing SLM practices, the various maps and knowledge products developed with the support of the project, including the monograph

on SLM that is under development, are relevant to various planners. LADA-WOCAT maps can have a wide range of use, spanning from a general analysis, to planning at national level, prioritization of interventions, definition of best practices, and analysis of the potential costs involved in the scaling-up of SLM technologies. Additionally, datasets and the resulting analyzed information and maps can be used to inform the project intervention strategy. Finally, this information can inform policy making, planning and budgetary allocations by the concerned technical sectors at district and transboundary levels and serve as a baseline for more integrated landscape management approaches and the identification of good practices.

Relevance towards Farmers and Agricultural Technologists

85. As much as the project is relevant to country objectives, the Evaluation Team is not equally convinced that the knowledge products developed with the support of the project would be equally relevant for agricultural technologists. Many parameters required for agricultural production or agro-ecosystem analysis are not provided, in particular with respect to nutrient and water flows.

Relevance towards Basin Ecology and Hydrology

86. The Evaluation Team is equally critical of the relevance of the maps and knowledge products towards the ecology and hydrology of the basin as one entity. It might have required to design maps more to the boundaries of the basin and its specific hydrological dynamics, like recharge, discharge areas etc.

Global and Transboundary Benefits

87. The project has obviously, a strong relevance for achieving global and transboundary benefits. It includes the increase of global knowledge through its activities, of carbon sequestration by enhancing the bio-productivity of ecosystems, and of water services, in particular of water stress through enhanced sedimentation due to erosion and run-off. However, the Evaluation Team found that, so far, the project did not manage to deliver credible data that would have provided evidence of these benefits.

Relevance for Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy

88. The project design is consistent with the objectives of the Land Degradation focal area strategy and Strategic Program for GEF-4. The project is particularly well aligned with the Strategic Program 1 (SP-1 element b) when considering that the main focus of the project is on restoration of the health and functioning of the different agro-ecosystems in the Kagera basin through promoting sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management. The project is also aligned with the following strategic objectives of the overall TerrAfrica/SIP programme:
    - Identification and demonstration of innovative SLM approaches and their implementation;
    - Building capacity and skills of communities and government for inter-sectoral planning, management, legislation and harmonized policies and generation of knowledge and coordination mechanisms at community, national and river basin levels.

Relevance of Consultancy Reports

89. Differing from the MTR, the final evaluation is less convinced about the relevance of some of the consultancy reports. Some of these reports either repeat much of the project document (such as M&E), are too general and do not tackle the practical problems on the ground (Natural Conflicts), or have nothing to do with the actual project implementation (fire management). The ToT materials developed for implementing the FFS approach seem to be designed to farmers' needs, including the Agricultural Economics Association of South Africa (AEASA) material on soils and these materials are of excellent quality. However, despite the usefulness of the data that farmers were requested to record, the interpretation and assessment of this data requires university level education. As a result, this information collected/recorded by farmers has remained un-reviewed/unused. Furthermore, the consultancy on policy and legal issues identified a lot of local and transboundary problems. However, these issues have not been taken up by the project. Finally, a valuable background on the analysis of natural resources in the Kagera basin was developed by the consultancy on biodiversity. However, the Evaluation Team found that it is somewhat naïve to assume that SLaM could be the blueprint for biodiversity conversation as stated in the introduction of this report.

5.2 Efficiency

90. Efficiency can be tested by comparing costs and benefits of the situation without the project intervention against the situation with the intervention. Therefore, efficiency is closely related to project effectiveness.

Financial Efficiency

91. With respect to the major outcomes and outputs of the project, the findings on efficiency can be summarized as follows:

- Transboundary Issues (outcome 1): The cost efficiency in establishing a transboundary mechanism was rather low, as no real institutional or legal mechanism was effectively created, despite that the budget allocated to this component was high. Furthermore, several consultancies on transboundary issues were conducted; however, results of these consultancies were hardly implemented/used. In particular, the Evaluation Team found that no real transboundary issues were addressed by the project.
- Institutional and legislation issues (outcome 2): Little financial resources were spent on these issues, and not many achievements were made, therefore, the cost efficiency under this outcome was medium.
- Knowledge issues, SLM and FFS: All knowledge issues and activities with respect to the implementation of SLM and FFS were very cost efficient. This efficiency is particularly evident when comparing the cost efficiency of the project in this area with the average cost of SLM technologies as calculated in the TerrAfrica Publication "*Where the grass is greener*". In this publication, it is stated that implementing SLM technologies cost an average of USD 100 per hectare. Using this average cost of USD 100 per ha under the project where SLM technologies were implemented over 40,000 ha would have cost a total of USD 4,000,000. This is twice as much as the actual cost expended by the project in these areas.

Time Efficiency

92. The initial time inefficiency manifested in various delays in the first project phase as

reported in the MTR was compensated later during the second phase of the project. The Evaluation Team found that the project implementation team was very active and supported the implementation of many activities. However, this activism was not really converted into results, such as the many workshops conducted on policy issues, which did not fully work out. It is also the case with various training activities conducted in communities, which might have had better impacts if they would have been conducted at the institutional levels. Nevertheless, the energy input in the project was so high, that the effectiveness, to be discussed in the following chapter, did not suffer.

5.3 Effectiveness

93. As said at the beginning of chapter 5, the effectiveness of project implementation was best at the technical level but less effective at the political and institutional levels, in particular with regard to transboundary issues.

Effectiveness in Meeting Policy Goals

94. The low political effectiveness has its roots in the project design. For instance, although the project document provides the necessary baselines for policies, laws and institutions which could mainstream SLaM, it does not detail the appropriate activities which would be required to establish the targeted results under outcome 1. The only instrument planned under the outcome 1 in the project document was to promote the knowledge of the technical advantage of SLaM through various training and awareness raising activities. Implementing this instrument was not sufficient to improve the policy, legislation and institutional frameworks. This lack of a clear roadmap reflects the technical bias of the project. The focus of the project on technical matters was also observed at the PSC level where discussions focused mostly on technical aspects when assessing the performance of the project and not much on the necessity of mainstreaming SLaM into policy, legislation and institutional frameworks.

95. The Evaluation Team found that the project was particularly ineffective in transforming laws at the national level and in introducing related by-laws. Comparing to similar projects in Kenya and Uganda implemented by IUCN where over 200 bylaws were signed on matters related to local planning for wetland protection and wetland protection was introduced in national legislation through project advocacy, the achievements of this project in this area are negligible. One possible reason for this lack of effectiveness may reside in the fact that FAO's core expertise is more technical than developing the capacity of institutions and improving the enabling environment for implementing SLaM.

Effectiveness in Meeting Land Degradation Reduction Targets

96. The effectiveness of the project to identify land degradation problems at the national and global levels using LADA technologies and the resulting maps was high. It reflects the long-term and genuine expertise of FAO in this area. The maps produced with the support of the project can serve as baseline information for national planning and will effectively add knowledge to the global database of the LADA project. However, regarding the low resolution of maps, the Evaluation Team is not completely convinced that they were really required for the purpose of site selection, given the fact that the outer boundaries of sites were already determined by the boundaries of the basin and further refined by local expertise. Additionally, these maps were done using local expertise; therefore, these maps did not add much in term of knowledge required for selecting the sites.

Effectiveness in Improving Agricultural Productivity

97. The Evaluation Team found that project interventions to improve agricultural productivity would have required more intensive data collection, research and extension to demonstrate good results. Gathering more data would have provided convincing information, and would have also enhanced visibility of the project interventions and promoted technologies where soil conservation and yields are dependent on the input level. For instance, the project should have collected yield data as responses to appropriate crop spacing. In particular, it should have collected data on manure application on a defined space and the resulting yields.

98. An obvious weakness when improving agricultural productivity is the low integration of livestock in SLM technologies. While there was a certain awareness within the project that more livestock was necessary to gain soil nutrients, livestock numbers are sometimes inadequate in areas with grasslands, and sometimes the wrong type of livestock is chosen. More research and monitoring would have been needed to identify measures that would have improved agricultural productivity. The same limitations apply to agro-forestry. While agro-forestry activities were implemented on all project sites, the impacts of these activities on yields and soil nutrients were not measured. There was also no standard data used on nutrient demands and nutrient accumulation through the respective tree varieties.

99. Better data collection would have also been necessary for the wider landscape. For instance, although biodiversity was returning or improving after the implementation of conservation measures of slopes and catchment areas, these results should have been monitored regularly as recommended by the project managers. Additionally, appropriate run-off data and erosion rates are only available as qualitative observations made by communities such as no households item from the upper catchment are transported to the lower catchment area. The project did also not evaluate the downsides of some of the measures implemented with the support of the project such as taking too much space by Soil and Water Conservation measures like terracing. The lack of data collection made it also difficult to report appropriately on the indicators measuring the progress of the project toward its expected results.

Effectiveness in Meeting Ownership Issues

100. The national committees were highly engaged and had good relationships with the project managers. Most of the Steering Committee Members were government representatives, which contributed to ensuring a certain level of national ownership of the project.

101. The project implementation team developed and funded numerous consultancies. The assessment conducted for this final evaluation revealed that the reports from these assignments have not been adequately utilized. Considering that a budget of USD 0.5M was allocated to international consultancies for these assignments, it is doubtful that these assignments created some sort of local ownership, which was particularly needed to tackle transboundary issues. Furthermore, when considering that most mapping activities using GIS technologies were sourced out to international consultants, the Evaluation Team was particularly concerned that the creation of national ownership of GIS technologies in the four countries would not be sufficient to ensure long-term sustainability of project

achievements.

Effectiveness in Meeting Agroecosystem Issues

102. Among the UNCCD scientific community, the LADA technology is controversially known as inaccurate due to being based only on expert knowledge. However, it is still considered as the best technology to meet the information demand on land degradation; particularly when it is compared with other more accurate but time and cost demanding technologies. For agricultural agro-ecosystems, which are much smaller units, the technology might have rather been based on assessing parameters that are relevant for agricultural production, such as humus and NPK contents of soils, water storage capacities of soils, soil depths as well as nutrient and water flows.

103. Additionally, despite that this approach would not be fully aligned with the WOCAT tools, we must remember that WOCAT tools are empirically selected and disseminated without adequate quantitative descriptions. It makes it generally difficult for farmers to adapt WOCAT tools to their own sites and for planners to decide how a particular WOCAT tool can sustainably be up-scaled within an ecosystem. None of the WOCAT tools were scientifically evaluated with respect to their relation to agricultural production factors and yields. These technologies were only assessed for their impacts on soil erosion. They might be sufficient to combat land degradation at the ecosystem levels, but we don't know their potential impacts on agroecosystems.

104. In addition, the review of the WOCAT technologies that were selected and disseminated by the project do not appear to be sufficiently consistent. For instance, in one country, the assumed "best" technology was identified for each province. In another country, several technologies appearing to be useful were disseminated and in a third country, SLaM technologies were suggested by some facilitators to be catalogued as WOCAT tools. Based on the review conducted by the Evaluation Team the technologies proposed and selected by farmers seem to the most consistent with the overall project approach and also the WOCAT philosophy itself.

105. Overall, more information on agricultural parameters would be useful; including in the SLM monograph that is under development. This monograph reports for instance on livestock numbers, manure per livestock, and has consolidated these data into calculations of nutrient availability within an ecosystem versus nutrient demand, however, more information on agricultural parameters is needed. Ultimately, one can assume that for a project focusing on agro-ecosystems, a catalogue of standard data should include the number of goats or pigs required to fertilize your banana plot, the number and type of calliandra and other trees mixed in your farm to meet nutrient requirements and their spacing, under which types of slope conditions, etc. Such catalogue could be used for extension work; however, currently the information available is not fulfilling the information requirements at watershed level and even less at the transboundary ecosystem level.

106. Lastly, the Evaluation Team is not convinced that the project has added value to the management of the environment and related knowledge in the four countries covered by the project; particularly on matters related to watershed management. The Evaluation Team found that watershed management was known to communities, in particular Rwanda, which could act as a model to the world in watershed management and soil protection

through terraces.

5.4 Sustainability

Institutional Sustainability

107. From the project document, institutional sustainability at the basin level was expected to be achieved through the project achievements under outcome 1 and 2. However, considering that the project was not effective in building up a regional transboundary mechanism, the sustainability of regional co-operation as anticipated in the project document will not be achieved.

108. Nevertheless, the regional sustainability of some project efforts may be achieved through other transboundary efforts, such as the Nile Basin Initiative, by sharing information, coordinating plans and actions, and leading to strengthening inter-sectoral collaboration (water, agriculture and environment). This collaboration was successfully initiated and maintained through the project. The regional sustainability should also be ensured through the mainstreaming of project achievements into the LVEMP initiative, which was coordinated by the project implementation team as an exit strategy one month before the end of the project. The East African Community (EAC) could also be the major institution to take over the long-term responsibility for transboundary cooperation; hence, ensuring the sustainability of land and agro-ecosystem management in the Kagera basin. However, this institution still does not have the necessary executive powers, be dedicated and focused on the task, and be endowed with a mechanism to prepare decisions and to follow them up.

109. Institutional sustainability at the community level was to be developed through capacity development and the establishment of the necessary local committees and institutions. The sustainability of FFS groups, which depends on their registrations as legal entities, should continue to collaborate on further promoting SLM at the catchment level, with the planning of SLM implementation activities at the catchment level to be conducted by the catchment committees. Overall, the review conducted for this final evaluation reveals that there is some likelihood that this exit strategy will work out, depending on the functioning of FFS groups and catchment groups in each country. In order to strengthen the likelihood that the catchment groups will be sustained, it is recommended to conduct a two-day workshop for these groups to train them about landscape planning skills. The sustainability of FFS groups is rated as marginally likely. However, due to the lack of a baseline on the existence of FFS approach in countries and a final assessment of their acceptance, it cannot be guaranteed that the FFS groups will become that common institutions for SLM in the basin, such as, for instance, the Water User Associations in IWRM or the Forest User groups in Forestry. The sustainability of catchment groups remains particularly questionable.

110. In conclusion, the institutional sustainability of the project is rated as moderately likely. However, the project has the merit of attempting the establishment of potential institutions for SLM on the ground in the Kagera basin.

Environmental Sustainability

111. Environmental sustainability is the core of the project objective and it can be expected as a direct result of outcomes 3 and 4; sustainability is already inscribed in the term SLM. Considering that the implementation of activities under these two outcomes was effective, it is very likely that environmental sustainability is ensured over the long-term. The positive

impacts of SLM will act as an incentive to sustain these practices in future, which has been supported by the capacity development efforts of the project but also dependent on the institutional sustainability discussed above. In summary, the more effective use of land resources and agro-ecosystems, the conservation and restoration of the resource-base and the better functioning of ecosystems, which led simultaneously to the generation of more benefits in terms of yields, incomes, utilization of biodiversity for various household purposes and needs, and the reduced burdens through hard labor, will have created sufficient interest in the communities to maintain the status quo.

112. Environmental sustainability was also strengthened through the handing over of knowledge produced with the support of the project to governmental institutions at the end of the project. One factor which still could be strengthened is the replicability of technologies. The project could improve the presentation of SLM technologies in a way to facilitate their replicability, an issue which is further discussed in the respective section.

Financial Sustainability

113. The final evaluation is more optimistic about the financial sustainability of the project than the MTR. Although many of the expectations to create financial sustainability as mentioned in the project document did not materialize, such as institutionalization of regular support from governments, linkages with transboundary investment programmes (LVEMP, NELSAP), PES and benefits from carbon sequestration, the project, since the MTR, has substantially improved the basis for its financial sustainability. It includes the governmental support and investment and saving capacities of communities like VICOBA in Tanzania; the support of national institutions through complementary actions, such as the support for district land use mapping in Tanzania and PES in Burundi. There is also a commitment to support financially the project achievements in Uganda and Rwanda, which contributed to the correction of the co-financing gap noted in the MTR.

114. Financial capacities have also been developed at the community level that should contribute to the financial sustainability of project achievements at this level. The project intervention has substantially enhanced the savings of communities and also established saving institutions in villages within the project sites; it even led to the foundation of an own District Bank in Uganda. Community investments are generally the backbones of African rural economies, and their role in rural development can hardly be overestimated. Based on the achievements during the second phase of the project, the Evaluation Team found that the financial sustainability of the project is much more likely that the MTR did.

115. Finally, an issue which was raised by Project Managers is that the method to assess the financial sustainability in agricultural projects and agriculture as a sector should be fully revised. There is hardly any agricultural systems within developing countries that are not heavily subsidized. This is already implicit in the law of Engel, who stated already in the 19th century that the monetary value of agricultural products declines in relation to the monetary value of industrial products with increasing development. While this is compensated in industrial countries through the subsidies to agriculture from the profits of industrial production (nowadays also cultural production and services), this cannot be expected from developing countries in the same way, including those countries that are focusing on agriculture development, because they are still exposed to Engels' law through the international trade relationships. It is therefore a challenge which goes far beyond the capabilities of individual projects. To sort out this issue, the criteria of financial

sustainability in agriculture should be revised or be abandoned.

5.5 Impact

116. The project supported a vibrant knowledge transfer/exchange among farmers, which made it possible to move to higher levels of land protection and agricultural production by stimulating innovation through knowledge transfer/exchange among farmers.

117. The vehicle created for this knowledge transfer/exchange - the creation of Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) and producer groups through these FFSs - gave an important signal to the traditional extension approach in place in the four countries. From "blanket" technologies promoted through top-down approaches, the FFS model provides a more effective approach at the farmer and community level, which, if it is proven institutionally sustainable, should be an agent of change for the future of agricultural extension in these countries.

118. The project has substantially enhanced the bio-productivity and ecological health of agro-ecosystems within the Kagera Basin and at the same time enhanced transboundary benefits through the reduction of water stress caused by the sedimentation due to erosion within the ecosystems of the basin countries.

119. The project has also created tremendous economic vibrancy in some areas; in particular where farmers could convert from extensive land management to sustainable forms of land management, and by extension improving livelihood, which allowed many farmers to build new houses and give their children an appropriate education.

6 Lessons Learned

120. The combination of LADA tools, the FFS approach and the WOCAT tools provided a useful framework to address combined problems of land degradation and agricultural productivity. However, this approach would benefit from better quantification of agricultural production factors and environmental stocks and flows.

121. The approach to promote and disseminate knowledge is more effective through CBOs than through commercial service providers.

122. Training and awareness raising activities are not sufficient to influence the policy level. To produce a change at this level, it needs more constant and targeted actions, including activities focusing on the integration of policies into regulatory frameworks.

123. The implementation of PES is not possible without a viable monitoring system for environmental services already in place. Generally, the capacity of PES to generate revenues is currently overestimated; the PES approach is still in its infancy. Therefore, before a PES approach is integrated into projects or programs, it would be better to experiment first with projects which only build monitoring capacities for environmental flows and test the feasibility of PES schemes instead of integrating PES into projects, whose overall objectives are devoted to other purposes.

124. There seems to be a substantial potential in enhancing income generation options for farmers solely by improving current farming technologies and integrating them into landscape or watershed planning.

7 Conclusions and Recommendations

7.1 Conclusions

The following conclusions are formatted as responses to the evaluation questions.

- *To what extent has the project implemented the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation?*

125. The MTR Recommendations[3] #3 – #6 and #9 – #10 were fully implemented, to the great benefit of the project, particularly with respect to reducing the targets, the expected co-financing and the exit strategy. Recommendation #1 on demonstrating the effectiveness of the LADA/WOCAT approach as well as on documenting the successful FFS approach and achievements in land coverage with SLM/SLaM is currently being compiled and a SLM monograph is under development at FAO. Following an initial write-shop by project staff, this monograph is promising and should be published soon. However, a more quantitative evaluation in particular with respect to the initially envisaged impacts with respect to hydrological, carbon, nutrient flows on all scales, from farming system over agro-ecosystem to the whole catchment level would be desirable.

126. It is still the view of the evaluators, that the project could have better focused on institutional capacity development, such as developing the capacity of institutions for agricultural extension and laboratories, including their respective Ministries to enhance the impact and effectiveness of the project. However, the MTR recommendation #2 was also not well formulated in this respect, which was also mirrored by the management response that understood this recommendation only as a question of visibility.

127. The degree of implementation of Recommendations #7 and #8 were too much dependent on subjective views by stakeholders to be properly reviewed. As a result, the Evaluation Team did not assess their implementation.

- *To what extent are the coordination, information sharing and M&E mechanisms promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands?*

128. This is the genuine area of expertise of FAO. The promotion of sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land was most successful. The project was implemented through a two-pronged coordination and information-sharing mechanisms, which merged land degradation assessments at national, district, and community levels with applied empirical and participatory research and knowledge exchange at farmers' level. This approach allowed the project to address the daunting tasks of combining environmental goals and agroecosystem productivity. This approach to create synergies between environment and agriculture should be taken as a model to be replicated elsewhere.

129. However, despite a successful implementation of this approach, the Evaluation Team still found some flaws in the coordination chain, which should be addressed in the future. It includes the less successful implementation of some adaptive parts of SLM technologies, such as the farmers' own research results that were not properly assessed and recommendations made for further improvements; and institutional research that was not promoted by the project, which would have been instrumental in providing important

[3] List of the MTR Recommendations are presented in Annex 9.

quantitative data on environmental flows and agricultural production factors.

130. The framework developed to monitor and evaluate the project was an overambitious framework, which had to be mostly abandoned due to the lack of resources available to conduct the monitoring and evaluating activities. Based on this assessment, the Evaluation Team found that most indicators, particularly those related to monitoring environmental impacts, would have been better accommodated as research questions to be answered by research institutions. This would particularly apply to hydrological issues, carbon sequestration, and all questions of nutrient cycling from the farm level to the agroecosystem level. It should include questions on how suggested technologies applied at the farm level would impact local agroecosystems.

- *To what extent has the project created an enabling policy, planning and legislative environment that supports and facilitates a collaborative sustainable management and land restoration of the Kagera basin agro-ecosystems?*

131. The project has had slight successes in the creation of by-laws, and ensuring governments commitments to implement SLaM and, in the case of Burundi, to finance SLaM implementation. However, in general, the project was less successful in addressing policy and legislative issues than addressing technical issues. This observation made by the Evaluation Team was due to a great extent to flaws in the project design which did not construct the necessary activities and tools to influence the policy, planning and legislative environment. Additionally, due to bad timing, the anticipated linkages with EAC, VLEMPII and NELSAP to collaborate on improving the policy and legislation environment did not materialize as planned. An overestimation of the readiness of governments to collaborate with the project when in fact they allocate only small budgets to this area might be another reason for the lack of progress in improving the enabling environment. As a result of limited progress in this area, the project has not really created a regional or transboundary momentum and the project's mission, vision and achievements are also not really incorporated into national frameworks.

- *To what extent has the project enhanced/improved the technical capacities of farmers and communities and has expanded the knowledge management for sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management amongst the farmer groups and communities?*

132. The project has achieved a lot in enhancing farmers' readiness to experiment, being innovative and exchange experiences, which might be of much higher value than simple learning of new technologies etc. The project has also enhanced social cohesion among farmers' groups. The project has been very successful in introducing watershed management technologies and also by raising the overall awareness about the importance of watershed management and the reduction of run-off and erosion for agro-ecosystem productivity. Furthermore, the project has brought a lot of technologies into farming systems which enhanced the overall bio-productivity through the merging of WOCAT tools with indigenous technologies, which also overcame the constraints of common blanket technologies which had been promoted by various governments. The integration of livestock into the farming systems as well as the use of fertilizer trees were new to some farming communities, as well as the various practices of mulching, intercropping, composting, riverbank stabilization and the combat of erosion. Farmers have also enhanced their theoretical knowledge in many aspects on how farming systems relate to global environmental services. The FFS approach turned out to be most successful here, and within the FFS approach it seemed that CBOs as partner organizations were more effective

than commercial service providers. With all these success stories, one might still have wished, that more simple quantitative knowledge on agricultural production technologies would have been transmitted, such as how much water and mulch/manure/fertilizer/fertilizer trees are necessary to apply in a maize/cassava/banana field, how many animals are needed for that, which organs of the plants are stimulated by manure, which ones by wood-ash and why?

- *To what extent has the project facilitated the development and implementation of participatory land management plans by the farmer groups and communities? And to what extent has the implementation of sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management practices increased the benefits of the land users?*

133. All FFS exercises were preceded by the drafting of participatory land management plans, which included social and physical maps. These land management plans were instrumental in the identification of activities within the watersheds. These activities, intervening at the watershed level, contributed to a better protection of farms, particularly against floods and erosion. In the long run, more organic matters were produced on farms, leading to higher productivity, which, unfortunately was not measured by the project. Better management of watersheds in the upper catchments reduced labor efforts for erosion control within the lower catchments, and of course water run-off, so that water could be better utilized for the benefit of farms productivity. The highest benefits observed due to the intervention of the project were achieved through fruit and vegetable production, but also through improved pastures and on banana plots. Land users had substantial income benefits, which mainly depended on farm sizes. As examples, some Ugandan farmers gained an additional 1 to 2 Million Ugandan shillings (equivalent to USD 500) monthly just from their banana plots while also benefiting from a diversity of many other elements in their farming systems. Other farmers in Tanzania earned about USD 50 each from communal pineapple farms. These benefits, however, are inadequately recorded by the project. Women also benefitted substantially from the project. Again, what is missing in mapping are the addition of more quantitative elements. For instance, the question "to which extent the environmental flows within the agro-ecosystems and their capacities would really allow up-scaling of higher intensification of all farming systems?", cannot be answered by community mapping, but only by research.

Other Conclusions

134. The project has substantially added to the global and regional knowledge landscape, particularly on matters related to the implementation of UNCCD obligations such as contributions to the LADA knowledge base by adding several maps in the four countries, addition of new technologies to the WOCAT tools and dissemination of knowledge produced with the support of the project through various technical reports, lessons learnt and other products published on various websites.

135. The project has proven to be gender competent and gender sensitive.

136. However, the project has several flaws in establishing appropriate institutional mechanisms and mainstreaming SLaM into governmental national and regional frameworks, which could be due to flaws in the design of the project or due to the absence of collaboration with appropriate complementary partners on international and national levels.

7.2 Recommendations

Recommendation 1 (to NRL)

Institutional capacity development and collection of key data, such as of agricultural production factors and environmental stocks and flows within agroecosystems should receive higher attention, to enhance impacts of FAO's knowledge management strategies and facilitate adaptive learning.

Recommendation 2 (to NRL)

The SLM Monograph, the reported WOCAT tools and other technical information products should be updated with knowledge on nutrient and water flows as influenced by land degradation and the various SLaM technologies in an appropriate quantitative way. Nutrient transport through pastoralism or livestock movements in general should also be included. In particular, the project should analyze more critically the nutrient flows through integration of livestock.

WOCAT tools should be updated with respect to livestock-crop interactions, grazing technologies and pastoral technologies as well as technologies for pasture improvements in general and for the basin in particular.

Recommendation 3 (to NRL)

Manuals should be produced for FFS facilitators and farmers themselves. They should contain clear advice on water and nutrient management through various technologies transported through SLaM and standard data. These manuals should include information such as how many animals of which type would be needed to produce how much manure; how much quantity would have to be applied on which types of soils to improve how much yields for which types of crops. The same information should be given for the application of wood-ash, compost, chemical fertilizer, and for fertilizer trees.

Recommendation 4 (to NRL)

Provide also standard figures in these manuals on nutrient demand for nutrient flows translated into farmers' practices (composting, wood-ash, fertilizations, agroforestry contrasted to nutrient demands for various crops) and provide additional training activities.

Recommendation 5 (to NRL)

Integrate carbon sequestration into SLaM planning through improved understanding of underlying carbon balances in SLaM technologies.

Recommendation 6 (to NRL)

Avoid overestimation of PES as a financing option and ensure appropriate monitoring before implementing PES schemes.

Recommendation 7 (to NRL)

Analyze the full working calendars of women and identify critical points where their labor burdens could be reduced or shared with men (for instance water / food fetching, fire making, cooking, etc..) and how the value of these activities could be estimated and paid for. Ensure that monetary activities do not require overstretching women's physical capacities and instead ensure that all types of work are rewarded similarly without at the same time discriminating their access to income generating activities.

8 Ratings

137. Below is a table summarizing the ratings as requested in the TORs. It includes all the required performance criteria rated as per the rating scales presented in the Annex of the TORs.

Table 7: Project Final Evaluation Ratings

Evaluation Criteria	Rating	Comments	Ref. Section
Achievement of Objectives Component 1	MS	• Due to low achievements in transboundary issues and Monitoring System, while other outputs of the component were not really relevant to the outcome	
Achievement of Objectives Component 2	S	• From a policy perspective, the component was rather MS, but the mapping efforts HS, therefore the average is S	
Achievement of Objectives Component 3	S	• Close to HS, but rated as S due to neglect of quantitative issues	
Achievement of Objectives Component 4	HS	• Due to numerous activities with positive impacts, high participation and high vibrancy	
Attainment of outputs and activities	S	• At the end, all technical outputs attained, except the policy ones	
Transboundary issues	MS	• SLaM hardly tackled with a basin view, other issues neglected	
Effectiveness	S	• Contribution to local, national and global and transboundary targets, no real scope to basin ecology and boundaries	
Efficiency	S	• Average cost efficiency high, despite some unnecessary expenses, but technical approach is not targeted enough to project goals	
Impact	HS	• Visible impacts on ecosystem improvements and economic well-being	
Risk and Risk management	S	• Risks properly assessed and monitored regularly.	
Sustainability	L	• Financial Sustainability now more likely than during MTR. Institutional sustainability likely, if FFS prove to become key institutions for SLM on the ground.	
Stakeholder participation	HS	• The most satisfactory aspect of all: at community level there is clear community engagement.	
Country ownership	S	• National steering committees well-formed and evidence of ownership emerging.	
Capacity building	S	• FFS highly effective approach. However, certain elements are technically not acceptable. Higher impact through institutional capacity building possible.	
Replicability	S	• WOCAT tools mainly replicated based on empirical findings and unclear selection technologies, unfounded by many agricultural scientific parameters, but FFS approach easy to replicate and recommendable	
Monitoring and evaluation	MS	• Plan too complex, with doubtful cost-effectiveness. Basic data is available in the field but reporting was poor.	

nnex 1: Terms of Reference

Office of Evaluation

Terms of Reference for the final evaluation of

The FAO-GEF Project:
"Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (Kagera TAMP)" - GCP /RAF/424/GFF

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations

Office of Evaluation (OED)

This report is available in electronic format at: http://www.fao.org/evaluation

For further information on this report, please contact:

Director, OED
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla 1, 00153
Rome, Italy
Email: evaluation@fao.org

1. Background of the Project

1.1 Programme Overview

1. The 4 countries sharing the transboundary Kagera River Basin, notably Tanzania UR, Uganda, Rwanda and Burundi, endorsed the project in 2006 document and thereby declared their willingness to work together to develop a coordinated programme of action to support the adoption of an integrated agro-ecosystems approach for the management of land resources in the Kagera Basin. Subsequently, the full size project document was developed under the PDF phases A and B in 2006-08, and endorsed by the GEF CEO in May 2009. GCP/RAF/424/GFF became operational in FAO after all four countries had signed the project document by April 2010.

2. The full size Kagera TAMP project is envisaged as a 4.5 year[4] long project with 2 phases, during the first two years to pilot SLM practices at catchment and Farmer Field School (FFS) levels in each of the 21 districts and during the subsequent 2 years to scale up successful practices and approaches through developing and testing enabling policy and planning tools at various levels.

3. The project is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF), with estimated co-funding contributions from the four project countries through partnership arrangements and from FAO and other Programmes according to the Project Financing Plan below. The project grant from GEF amounts to 6.363.700 USD (excluding 10% Implementing Agency fee). In the land degradation portfolio the project grant is aimed at leveraging 3-4 times the amount in co-financing with a view to greater sustainability.

Financing Plan	USD
Project Development	
PDF A	25,000
PDF B	700,000
FAO (in cash and kind)	200,000
Governments (in kind)	205,000
UNEP	10,000
Sub-Total PDF	1,140,000
Full size Project	
GEF grant (including IA fee)	7,000,000
GEF grant (excluding IA fee)	6,363,700
Project Co-financing	
FAO (in kind)	351,000
Government of Burundi	6,260,000
- Districts	860,000
- Govt/Partner programmes	5,400,000
Government of Rwanda	6,293,760
- Districts	768,000
- Govt/Partner programmes	5,525,760
Government of Tanzania (U.R.)	2,463,050
- Districts	418,650
- Govt/Partner programmes	2,044,400
Government of Uganda	3,707,800

[4] Extended to 30 June 2015

Financing Plan	USD
- Districts	260,800
- Govt/Partner programmes	3,447,000
Other Partner Programmes and donors	5,433,600
Sub-Total Co-financing	**24,509,210**
Total Project Cost	**32,012,910**

4. The Food and Agriculture Organisation of the United Nations (FAO) is the GEF Implementing Agency and Executing Agency for this project under the Land Degradation GEF Focal Area of GEF-4 Strategic Programs LD SP-1, Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management, and LD SP-3, Investing in New and Innovative Approaches to Sustainable Land Management. The project is executed in close consultation and collaboration with the designated National Authorities in the four riparian countries of the Kagera river, which are:

- Ministry of Agriculture and Animal Resources (MINAGRI) in Rwanda;
- Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF) in Uganda;
- Ministry of Agriculture and Livestock (MINAGRIE) in Burundi;
- Division of the Environment, Vice President's Office (DOE/VPO) in the United Republic of Tanzania in close collaboration with the Ministry of Agriculture, Food and Cooperatives (MAFC).

5. The project is also part of the larger TerrAfrica/SIP for SLM in Sub-Saharan Africa.

6. There are 4 components to the project with a substantial share of the resources for SLM on the ground through contracting and improve a capacity of local service providers.

- Component 1: Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms.
- Component 2: Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions.
- Component 3: Capacity and knowledge for the promotion of and technical support for Sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management across the basin.
- Component 4: Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices implemented and benefiting land users in all agro-ecosystems in the basin.

7. A 5th component covers the project management and operational structures which support the effective implementation across all four above-mentioned components.

8. The implementation of these four components is expected to mobilize collaboration and co- funding support from a range of partners from governmental technical and academic bodies, NGO/ CSO partners and partner projects to support investments in SLM in the Kagera basin. The agreed incremental costs associated with the project implementation are expected to lead to measurable impacts in transboundary land and water management and in terms of sustainable cropping, livestock and forest systems and livelihoods of the populations that depend on them.

Financing of Project Components	GEF Financing	%	Co-Financing	%
Component 1: Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms	1,766,873	28%	2,316,520	9%
Component 2: Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions	423,342	7%	1,273,320	5%
Component 3: Capacity and knowledge for the promotion of and technical support for Sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management across the basin	1,230,003	19%	3,636,520	15%
Component 4: Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices implemented and benefiting land users in all agro-ecosystems in the basin	2,360,682	37%	15,682,850	64%
Component 5: Project management structures operational and effective	582,800	9%	1,600,000	7%
Total Project Cost	6,363,700		24,509,210	

1.2 Project objectives

9. The overall long-term environment and development goal of the project is to support the adoption of an integrated ecosystems approach for the management of land resources in the Kagera Basin which will generate local, national and global benefits including: restoration of degraded lands, carbon sequestration and climate change mitigation, agro-biodiversity conservation and sustainable use, protection of international waters and improved agricultural production, food security and rural livelihoods.

10. The environmental objective of the project is to address the causes of land degradation and restore ecosystem health and function and generate a range of global environmental benefits across the Kagera basin through the introduction of adapted agro-ecosystem management approaches.

11. The development objective is to improve the livelihoods and hence contribute to reduced poverty of rural communities in the Kagera Basin through more productive and sustainable resource management practices that are technically feasible and socio-economically viable.

12. In order to reach the above closely inter-related development and environment objectives through its five components, the project is expected to achieve the following outcomes:

> **Outcome 1**: Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands.
> **Outcome 2**: Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions are in place to support and facilitate the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land.
> **Outcome 3**: Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin.

Outcome 4: Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices are implemented and benefiting land users for the range of agro-ecosystems in the basin.

1.3 Kagera TAMP execution and management structure

13. FAO is the GEF Implementing Agency and Executing Agency for this project, and the Land and Water division (NRL) at FAO HQ is the designated Lead Technical Unit and Operational Unit.

14. The Kagera TAMP Regional Coordination Unit (RCU) is hosted and supported by the FAO Representation in Kigali, Rwanda, and is led by the Regional Project Coordinator (RPC), and is responsible for successful cross country coordination and implementation of the project.

15. The project is guided for transboundary and collaborative issues across the countries by a Regional Project Steering Committee (RPSC) comprising senior level government officials from each country (designated by the national executing partners/Ministries) and representatives from the major regional programmes which are relevant for Kagera TAMP. The regional project steering committee (RPSC) for the full project was set up and first met on 18th March 2011 (at the end of the project development phase a regional SC had reviewed and endorsed the project including with representatives of the Government of Burundi which was not involved in the PDF due to insecurity).

16. The implementation of the project in each country is guided by the National Project Steering Committee (NPSC). Members of the NPSC were nominated by participating Ministries and include representatives from Districts, Ministries (or Departments) as well as relevant non-governmental, civil society and private sector organizations. The NPSC considers and endorses the annual national workplan and budget, including specifications for work within the country over the next year, and supports the timely undertaking of the workplan through activities of the National Project Manager, consultants, and letters of agreement with service providers. The 4 national project steering committees first met respectively in Rwanda and Burundi in October 2010, in Uganda in November 2010 and in Tanzania in February 2011 (postponed by Government). They reviewed the project log-frame, agreed on their TOR and met regularly and provided advice on implementation and progress.

17. Each of the four project countries has a National Project Manager recruited by FAO and acting as fulltime national technical advisor and SLM expert supporting the project implementation in country and collaboration on cross-border activities. Two of the NPMs are based in the capitals, Kigali, Rwanda and Bujumbura, Burundi, and two of the NPMs are based in districts that are within the Kagera basin but rather remote from the capitals which influences their tasks and relations with Government bodies and donors.

18. There is also an ad-hoc Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC) whose members were nominated by the 4 countries. Additional members can be called upon independently for review of project outputs and results, such as technical documents, and to provide specific technical support as required.

2. Purpose of the Evaluation

19. An independent final evaluation was foreseen in the contribution agreement and to take place and will focus on effectiveness of development results as stated in the logframe and the organizational efficiency in terms of implementation and partnership arrangements. In addition, the final evaluation will review project impact, analyse sustainability of results and whether the project has achieved its development and global environmental objectives. Provided that a comprehensive Mid-term evaluation been conducted in 2013 that covered activity/output level achievements, the scope of the final evaluation will focus on the project's contribution to outcome level results and the follow-up actions taken after the Mid-term evaluation.

20. The Terms of Reference for this Final Evaluation were prepared by FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) in close consultation with the Land and Water Division and the FAO GEF Coordination Unit in accordance with the evaluation policies and procedures of FAO and the GEF.

21. The evaluation will be guided by the key evaluation questions – further questions can be developed:

- To what extent has the project implemented the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation?
- To what extent are the coordination, information sharing and M&E mechanisms promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands?
- To what extent has the project created an enabling policy, planning and legislative environment that supports and facilitates a collaborative sustainable management and land restoration of the Kagera basin agro-ecosystems?
- To what extent has the project enhanced/improved the technical capacities of farmers and communities and has expanded the knowledge management for sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management amongst the farmer groups and communities?
- To what extent has the project facilitated the development and implementation of participatory land management plans by the farmer groups and communities? And to what extent has the implementation of sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management practices increased the benefits of the land users?

3. Evaluation Framework and Scope

3.1 Scope

22. The independent Final Evaluation will assess the full implementation period of the project i.e. April 2010 up to date. The evaluation will examine the project achievements on national and regional levels based on evidence from the field, In addition to assessing the project potential contributions to the:

- FAO Organizational outcome: 201 - Producers and natural resource managers adopt practices that increase and improve agricultural sector production in a sustainable manner.
- FAO Organizational output: 20101 - Innovative practices for sustainable agricultural production (including traditional practices that improve sustainability, such as those listed as Globally Important Agricultural Heritage Systems).

- GEF-4 Strategic Programs LD SP-1, Supporting Sustainable Agriculture and Rangeland Management, and LD SP-3, Investing in New and Innovative Approaches to Sustainable Land Management.

3.2 Evaluation criteria

23. The project will be critically assessed through the internationally accepted evaluation criteria, i.e. relevance, efficiency, effectiveness, impact, and sustainability. In line with the new FAO project cycle, the evaluation will assess compliance with the following UN Common Country Programming Principles: Human Rights Based Approaches (HRBA)/ Right to Food/ Decent Work; Gender equality, Environmental sustainability, Capacity Development and Results Based Management. In addition to cross-cutting themes such as: empowerment of non-state actors, South-South Cooperation and M&E.

3.3 Evaluation issues

I. Relevance of concept and design

a. Relevance of the initiative to:
- the GEF-4 land degradation focal area strategy under which the project was approved;
- Kagera TAMP countries development priorities and needs for to the sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems of the Kagera river basin;
- needs of the population;
- FAO Global Goals, Strategic Objective F "Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture" and Organizational Results FO1 and Core Functions;
- FAO Country Programming Frameworks;
- Other programmes implemented by our international partners.

b. Clarity, coherence and realism of the Logical Framework of the project and of its design, including:
   i) logic of causal relationship between inputs, activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impact (against specific and development objectives);
   ii) validity of indicators, assumptions and risks;
   iii) approach and methodology;
   iv) stakeholder and beneficiary identification and analysis;
   v) institutional set-up and management arrangements.

II. Effectiveness of outputs and outcomes

a. Overall effectiveness of the Kagera TAMP project, actual or potential, in attaining its results;
b. Description and analysis of the outputs produced, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness;
c. Description and analysis of the outcomes achieved, expected and unexpected, their robustness and expectations for further uptake and diffusion (see list of outcomes and outputs, Annex 3).
d. Use made by the project of FAO's normative and knowledge products and actual and potential contribution of the project to the normative and knowledge function of the Organization. In particular, the team will assess the use made by the Kagera project of specific normative tools and methods and technical documents developed by the

Natural Resources and Environment Department and other technical Divisions and if appropriate decentralized offices and wider TerrAfrica/SIP programme.

III. Efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation process

a. Assessment of project management:
- Quality, realism and focus of work plans;
- Effectiveness of internal monitoring and review processes; and feed-back loop into improved management and operations; this will also include information provided by the project through GEF Tracking Tools
- Efficiency and effectiveness of coordination and steering bodies, e.g. RPSC and NPSCs;
- Development and implementation of an exit strategy;

b. Institutional Setup:
- Administrative and technical support by FAO HQ and country office, as appropriate;
- Institutional set-up, internal review processes, coordination and steering bodies;
- Inputs and support by the Government/s and resource partner/s.

c. Assessment of financial resources management, including:
- Adequacy of budget allocations to achieve outputs and promote outcomes;

IV. Analysis of the application of the UN common country programming principles, cross-cutting themes, and of the Humanitarian Principles and Minimum Standards in the case of emergency projects

a. Analysis of gender mainstreaming for gender equality. This will include:
- extent to which gender equality considerations were reflected in project objectives and design to address the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men, and in the identification of beneficiaries;
- extent to which gender relations and equality have been or will be affected by the project.[5]

b. Analysis of the Capacity Development dimension in the design, implementation and results of the project, at individual, institutional and enabling environment levels.[6] This will include CD on both technical and soft-skills, i.e. planning, budgeting, partnering and negotiating. Including the training of staff and partners in land degradation assessment (LADA local) and SLM assessment using WOCAT tools (QT; QA; QM); the efficiency and effectiveness of the workshops organized.

c. Analysis of the adoption of the Human-Rights Based Approach, namely:
- the integration of the Right to Food dimension and principles, in the design, implementation and results of the project;
- the integration of decent rural employment concerns in the design and results of the project.

5 See: http://typo3.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/gender/docs/FAO_FinalGender_Policy_2012.pdf
6 See: http://www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/en/

d. Analysis of Partnerships and Alliances, namely:
   - how they were planned in the project design and developed through implementation;
   - their effect on project results and sustainability.[7]
   - effectiveness of partnerships with key institutions and organizations (MOUs with Nile Basin Initiative; Vi-Agroforestry, LVBC/LVEMP)

V. Impact

e. Overall impact of the project, actual or potential, positive and negative, produced directly or indirectly, intended or unintended; and
f. Overall contribution of the project to FAO Country Programming Frameworks, Organizational Result/s and Strategic Objectives.

VI. Sustainability

24. The prospects for sustaining the project's results by the beneficiaries and the host institutions after the termination of the project. The assessment of sustainability will include, as appropriate:

- Institutional, technical, social and economic sustainability of proposed technologies, innovations and/or processes;
- Expectation of institutional uptake and mainstreaming of the newly acquired capacities, or diffusion beyond the beneficiaries or the project; at national and regional level
- Environmental sustainability: the project's contribution to sustainable natural resource management, in terms of maintenance and/or regeneration of the natural resource base.
- Assessment of land and natural resources conflicts in transboundary agro-ecosystem management project Kagera basin and recommendations for addressing the conflicts
- The catalytic role of the programme in supporting the creation of an enabling environment with a view to achieve sustainable global environmental benefits.

25. Based on the above analysis, the evaluation will draw specific conclusions and formulate recommendations for FAO and/or other parties to ensure sustainable land and agroecosystem management and livelihoods, including any need for follow-up action. The evaluation will draw attention to specific good practices and lessons of interest to other similar activities.

4. Evaluation methodology

4.1 Approach and tools

26. The evaluation will adhere to the UNEG Norms & Standards[8]. It will adopt a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders throughout the evaluation process. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered will underpin its validation and analysis and will support conclusions and recommendations.

[7] See: http://www.fao.org/partnerships/partners-home/en/

[8] http://www.uneval.org/normsandstandards; both GEF and FAO evaluation units are members of UNEG

27. The evaluation will make use of the following methods and review of existing reports, semi-structured interviews with key informants, stakeholders and participants, supported by check lists and/or interview protocols; direct observation during field visits; surveys and questionnaires.

28. Particular attention will be devoted to ensure that women and other under-privileged groups will be consulted in adequate manner. Insofar as possible and appropriate, interaction will also take place with non-participants to canvass their opinions.

29. The evaluation team will make use of the mid-term evaluation for assessing the project relevance, design, efficiency, output level results and partnerships. The final evaluation will rather focus on the project contribution to the outcomes.

30. The evaluation team will visit Rwanda, Uganda and Tanzania which share the Kagera basin – Burundi can not be visited due to security concerns. In each of the three riparian countries of the Kagera river basin country, the evaluation team will visit:

- locations that hosts the national coordination units, namely in Bujumbura/Burundi, Kabale/Uganda, Bukoba/Tanzania and Kigali/Rwanda which is also the regional project coordinating unit
- up to 2 target districts to capture a broad range of field activities that will enable the team to capture the variability of the context in which the project operates as well as the specific challenges and progress. The selection criteria for locations and partners to visit will include the state of progress.
- At least two capitals (Location of Government authorities);
- Kigali/Rwanda which hosts the Regional Project Coordinating Unit.

31. The evaluation will include the following activities:

- A desk review of the project document, outputs, monitoring reports (e.g. project inception report, steering committee reports and reports from other relevant meetings; project implementation reports (PIR); quarterly and six-monthly progress reports), and other internal documents including consultant and financial reports;
- A review of specific products including the content of the project website, annual work plans, publications and other materials and reports;
- Interviews with staff and national institutions and national/regional counterparts involved in project implementation including the Regional Project Coordinator, the National Project Managers, the FAO Representations; the Lead Technical Unit and Budget Holder, task force members of other involved technical units of FAO and the GEF Unit;
- In the visited countries, the team will also meet other actors who are active working on the Kagera TAMP project, notably counterpart institutions and service providers and partner projects to assess actual and potential areas of collaboration and partnership, the evaluation team will participate in the final regional project review workshop and steering committee meeting.

32. The evaluation team will discuss in detail with the key stakeholders of the project and will take into account their perspectives and opinions. Key stakeholders will include:

- Government representatives from the executing partner institutions at national level;
- the partners and service providers involved in collaborative arrangements through MOUs and LOAs and other potential partners;

- Participants in communities, including farmers organizations and local leaders.
- FAO Representatives in the participating countries; and
- the Lead Technical and Operational Unit as well as the GEF Coordination Unit at FAO HQ.

33. The evaluation team will maintain close liaison with the FAO Office of Evaluation (OED), FAO offices at regional and country level and the RCU as appropriate, and all key stakeholders. Although the mission is free to discuss with the authorities concerned anything relevant to its assignment, it is not authorized to make any commitment on behalf of the Government, the donor or FAO.

5. Roles and responsibilities

34. FAO Budget Holder (BH), the Lead Technical Officer (LTO) and the Project Task Force (PTF) of the project to be evaluated are responsible for initiating the evaluation process, drafting the first version of the Terms of Reference, and supporting the evaluation team during its work. They are required to arrange the requested meetings with the stakeholders, make available information and documentation as necessary, and comment on the draft final terms of reference and report. Involvement of different members of the project Task Force will depend on respective roles and participation in the project.

35. The BH is also responsible for leading and coordinating the preparation of the FAO Management Response and the Follow-up Report to the evaluation following the OED guidelines, fully supported in this task by the LTO and PTF.

36. FAO Office of Evaluation drafts the ToR, identify of the consultants and in the organization of the team's work; it is responsible for the finalization of the ToR and of the team composition; it shall brief the evaluation team on the evaluation methodology and process and will review the final draft report for in terms of presentation, compliance with the ToR and timely delivery, quality, clarity and soundness of evidence provided and of the analysis supporting conclusions and recommendations.

37. The Office of Evaluation has also a responsibility in following up with the BH for the timely preparation of the Management Response and the Follow-up to the MR.

38. The Evaluation Team is responsible for conducting the evaluation, applying the methodology as appropriate and for producing the evaluation report. All team members, including the Team Leader, will participate in briefing and debriefing meetings, discussions, field visits, and will contribute to the evaluation with written inputs for the final report.

39. The Team Leader guides and coordinates the team members in their specific work, discusses their findings, conclusions and recommendations and prepares the final draft and the final report, consolidating the inputs from the team members with his/her own.

40. The team is fully responsible for its report which may not reflect the views of the Government or of FAO. An evaluation report is not subject to technical clearance by FAO although OED is responsible for Quality Assurance of all evaluation reports.

41. The Project Task Force (PTF) will coordinate with the beneficiaries and provide logistical support for the field missions in consultation with the evaluation manager.

42. As a contribution to the OED Knowledge Management System:

- the Team Leader will be responsible for completing the OED quantitative project performance questionnaire, to be delivered with the final evaluation report;
- OED will ask all team members to complete an anonymous and confidential questionnaire to get their feedback on the evaluation process.

6. Evaluation team

43. The team will include competence and skills in evaluation and relevant technical topics (see below); to the extent possible it will be balanced in terms of geographical and gender representation to ensure diversity and complementarity of perspectives.

44. Mission members will have had no previous direct involvement in the formulation, implementation or backstopping of the project. All will sign the Declaration of Interest form of the FAO Office of Evaluation.

45. The evaluation team will comprise the best available mix of skills that are required to assess the project, namely:

- Demonstrated experience in the evaluation of large/complex, regional technical assistance projects
- Familiarity with the objectives of the GEF Land degradation portfolio
- Understanding of governance, political, economic and institutional issues associated with transboundary land, water and agroecosystem management issues in the Eastern Africa region.
- Watershed management and participatory land use planning from local to national scales
- Gender equality and HRBA;
- Conduct of evaluations.

46. The evaluation team will be fluent in English with at least one member of the team fluent in French. Individual Terms of reference will be developed referring to this ToR.

7. Evaluation deliverables

47. The evaluation report will illustrate the evidence found that responds to the evaluation issues, questions and criteria listed in the ToR. It will include an executive summary. Supporting data and analysis should be annexed to the report when considered important to complement the main report.

48. The recommendations will be addressed to the different stakeholders and prioritized: they will be evidence-based, relevant, focused, clearly formulated and actionable.

49. The evaluation team will agree on the outline of the report early in the evaluation process, based on the template provided in Annex I of this ToR. The report will be prepared in English, with numbered paragraphs, following OED template for report writing.

50. The team leader bears responsibility for submitting the final draft report to OED within 4 weeks from the conclusion of the mission, which will provide comments within one week. The revised report will be circulated to other FAO stakeholders, who within two additional weeks will submit to the team comments and suggestions that the team will include as appropriate in the final report within one week.

51. Annexes to the evaluation report will include, though not limited to, the following as relevant:

- Terms of reference for the evaluation;
- Profile of team members;
- List of documents reviewed;
- List of institutions and stakeholders interviewed by the evaluation team;
- List of project outputs;
- Evaluation tools.
- Itinerary of the evaluation team mission;
- Data collection instruments (e.g. copies of questionnaires, surveys – if applicable)

8. Ratings

52. In order to facilitate comparison with routine reporting to GEF and contribute to the GEF programme leaning process (LD portfolio), the evaluation will rate the success of the project on the GEF six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

53. Each of the items listed below should be rated separately, with comments and then an overall rating given.

- Achievement of objectives
- Attainment of outputs and activities
- Progress towards meeting GEF-4 focal area priorities/objectives
- Cost-effectiveness
- Impact
- Risk and Risk management
- Sustainability9
- Stakeholder participation
- Country ownership
- Implementation approach
- Financial planning
- Replicability
- Monitoring and evaluation.

9. Evaluation timetable

54. The evaluation is expected to take place during May – July 2015. The country visit phase is expected to last approximately 2-3 weeks. The timetable in the box below shows a tentative programme of travel and work for the evaluation team. It will be finalised upon the recruitment of the evaluation team. Tentative timetable of the evaluation:

Task	Dates	Duration	Responsibility
ToR finalization			OED
Team identification and recruitment			OED
Mission organization			OED and NRL

- [9] Sustainability will be assessed in terms of Likelihood: Likely (L): There are no risks affecting this dimension of sustainability. Moderately Likely (ML). There are moderate risks that affect this dimension of sustainability. Moderately Unlikely (MU): There are significant risks that affect this dimension of sustainability Unlikely (U): There are severe risks that affect this dimension of sustainability

Reading background documentation			ET
Mission to Tanzania	17 – 26 May		ET
Mission to Rwanda	27 – 29 -May		ET (TL)
Mission to Uganda	30 May – 5 June		ET (TM)
Mission to Rome (?)			ET (TL)
Analysis and drafting			ET and OED
First draft			ET and OED
Circulation and comments			ET and OED
Final evaluation report			ET and OED
Total			

10. Annexes to the TOR

Annex 1, Annotated Report Outline
Annex 2, FAO Global Goals, Strategic Objectives and Organization results
Annex 3, Project key outputs and outcomes,
Annex 4; Project log-frame

Annex 2: Evaluation Methodology

Evaluation Tool

I. Development of Methodology by Consultants

Consultants had developed major questions and methodology together with FAO evaluation officer Natalia Acosta on Thursday, May 21st 2015. Out of this the Consultant developed a Master Evaluation matrix, which is presented in Table 1 (evaluation questions) and 2 (performance indicators) below.

Out of the Master Evaluation Matrix questions for the four countries were developed, which were tailored in more specific ways to the specific country issues as illustrated in semi-annual and quarterly reports.

II. 1. Labor division between the two consultants:

Consultants agreed upon lead issues to be discuss during the field missions and would address them alternately, which are covered by a checklist in Table IV.

II. 2. Communication with Mid-Term Reviewer.

The team communicated with the Mid-Term Reviewer to receive recommendations on the Final Evaluation, who was met on Thursday, 21st of May. He recommended to look on ownership issues and communication with other on-going GEF projects.

Table 1. Addressing evaluation Questions

• To what extent has the project implemented the recommendations of the mid-term evaluation?	• Questions and Field Observations with respect to all Recommendations, Compare Table 1 a)
• To what extent are the coordination, information sharing and M&E mechanisms promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands?	• Compare related question on effectiveness
• To what extent has the project created an enabling policy, planning and legislative environment that supports and facilitates a collaborative sustainable management and land restoration of the Kagera basin agro-ecosystems?	• Compare related question on effectiveness
• To what extent has the project enhanced/improved the technical capacities of farmers and communities and has expanded the knowledge management for sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management amongst the farmer groups and communities?	• Compare related question on effectiveness
• To what extent has the project facilitated the development and implementation of participatory land management plans by the farmer groups and communities? And to what extent has the implementation of sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management practices increased the benefits of the land users?	• Compare related question on effectiveness

Table 2. Evaluation Matrix

Objectives of Evaluation	Activities within Evaluation Process	Resources
Relevance		
The GEF-4 land degradation focal area strategy under which the project was approved;	Compare GEF-Land degradation strategy in Project document are in line with expected project outcomes and outputs,	Project document, project Reports
Kagera TAMP countries development priorities and needs for to the sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems of the Kagera river basin; needs of population	Compare if project outcomes are the congruent with objectives of County priorities outlined in PRSP reports, MDG reports and SDGs	Assess Country Priorities from PRSP reports, MDG reports and SDGs
FAO Global Goals, Strategic Objective F "Sustainable management of land, water and genetic resources and improved responses to environmental challenges affecting food and agriculture" and Organizational Results FO1 and Core Functions; and FAO Country Programming Frameworks	As above with relation to FAO global Goals and Result F01 and FAO Country Programming Frameworks	Result F01, FAO Country programming Framework
Other programmes implemented by our international partners.	The same with other GEF projects and other projects mentioned in the Project document	Project document
Coherence: Clarity, coherence and realism of the Logical Framework of the project and of its design:		
logic of causal relationship between inputs, activities, expected outputs, outcomes and impact (against specific and development objectives);	Compare procedure illustrated in Fig. 1	Log-frame
validity of indicators, assumptions and risks;	Discussion with stakeholders	Only stakeholders involved into monitoring
approach and methodology;	Review of Project document, discussion with stakeholders	Only stakeholders involved into monitoring
stakeholder and beneficiary identification and analysis;	Has to address question, if methodology is capable of addressing stakeholders' needs – open interviews	Only beneficiaries
institutional set-up and management arrangements.	Has to analyses, if institutional set up and management arrangements are suitable to achieve goals of project, FAO, country priorities, normally additionally UNCCD. Open Interviews, Project document analyses, reports	Review of institutional set-up as illustrated in Project document. Quarterly reports
Effectiveness of outputs and outcomes		

Objectives of Evaluation	Activities within Evaluation Process	Resources
Overall effectiveness of the Kagera TAMP project, actual or potential, in attaining its results;	It has to be done by an analysis how far outcomes have been reached, which needs to be preceded by an analysis, how far outputs have been reached	National progress reports
Description and analysis of the outputs produced, in terms of quantity, quality and timeliness;	Is incorporated in a). Timeliness relates to efficiency	
Description and analysis of the outcomes achieved, expected and unexpected, their robustness and expectations for further uptake and diffusion (see list of outcomes and outputs, Annex 3).	Expected and unexpected relates to impact. Robustness, uptake and diffusion has to be covered under a special topic, called "replication"	
Use made by the project of FAO's normative and knowledge products and actual and potential contribution of the project to the normative and knowledge function of the Organization. In particular, the team will assess the use made by the Kagera project of specific normative tools and methods and technical documents developed by the Natural Resources and Environment Department and other technical Divisions and if appropriate decentralized offices and wider TerrAfrica/SIP programme.	Relates to component Capacity building and will be addressed in analysis of the contents of those products and their use within the project, in particular LADA and WOCAT tools, GIS analyses and consultancy reports	
Efficiency and effectiveness of project implementation process		
Assessment of project management:		
Quality, realism and focus of work plans;	Check work plans, analyze if they could be achieved, report on reasons for revisions	Work plans, interviews with project staff on potential problems with work plan
Effectiveness of internal monitoring and review processes; and feed-back loop into improved management and operations; this will also include information provided by the project through GEF Tracking Tools	Interview on feasibility of indicators, eventual problems occurred with indicators and tracking tools, times needed to use them or fill questionnaires out	Interviews with project management
Efficiency and effectiveness of coordination and steering bodies, e.g. RPSC and NPSCs;	Analyze roles of –RPSC and NPSCs in achieving project results, check if they contributed to the targeted outputs and outcomes	Interviews with RPSC and NPSC members, triangulation with Project staff
Development and implementation of an exit strategy;	Cannot be measured under the aspect of efficiency, because not yet terminated, but the envisaged exit strategy will be assessed	Interviews with project staff, governmental representatives, partners and local stakeholders

Objectives of Evaluation	Activities within Evaluation Process	Resources
Institutional Setup:		
Administrative and technical support by FAO HQ and country office, as appropriate;	Analysis of organizational set-up as described in Project document, interview with project staff on FAO Support	Pro-Doc, project satff
Institutional set-up, internal review processes, coordination and steering bodies;	As above with reference to review and coordination	As above
Inputs and support by the Government/s and resource partner/s.	Interview with governmental representatives, Line Ministries and other partners mentioned in Project document on inputs and support. Triangulate with Project staff	Interviews with DEDs, PDF, Line Ministries, other partners such as TerrAfrica, check Investment Plans, triangulation by reviewing financial reports and interviews with project staff
Assessment of financial resources management:		
Adequacy of budget allocations to achieve outputs and promote outcomes;	Compare budget allocations versus outputs among countries and with other projects, compare with standard budget allocations as described in TerrAfrica Best Practices document, compare with budget allocations versus outputs in similar projects, calculate average budget allocations per ha SLM for the various interventions	Budget Plans and Financial Reports among countries, TerrAfrica Best Practices document, other project reports
Analysis of the application of the UN common country programming principles, cross-cutting themes, and of the Humanitarian Principles and Minimum Standards in the case of emergency projects	This does not apply, as this is not an emergency project	
Analysis of gender mainstreaming for gender equality:		
extent to which gender equality considerations were reflected in project objectives and design to address the needs, priorities and constraints of both women and men, and in the identification of beneficiaries;	Analysis of gender equality issues with respect to gender equal contributions to and benefits from the project, in particular gender related power relations and differences with respect to land use and SLM, special vulnerabilities of women and gender-disaggregated data as incorporated within Project document and log-frame	Project document and log-frame analysis

Objectives of Evaluation	Activities within Evaluation Process	Resources
extent to which gender relations and equality have been or will be affected by the project.10	Assess impact of project on women's rights, empowerment, work land and benefits as impacted by the project	Analysis of project reports, Gender assessment, community and project staff interviews
Capacity Development:		
Analysis of the Capacity Development dimension in the design, implementation and results of the project, at individual, institutional and enabling environment levels.11 This will include CD on both technical and soft-skills, i.e. planning, budgeting, partnering and negotiating. Including the training of staff and partners in land degradation assessment (LADA local) and SLM assessment using WOCAT tools; WOCAT tools (QT; QA; QM); the efficiency and effectiveness of the workshops organized.	Will answer questions, if design of capacity development strategy was matching the needs in capacity building, also if capacity building was effective, meaning translated into appropriate action with respect to the development of knowledge tools and products and work on the ground	Interviews with expert on LADA, WOCAT and GIS, Project staff, stakeholders, analysis of relevant consultancy reports
Analysis of the adoption of the Human-Rights Based Approach, namely: - the integration of the Right to Food dimension and principles, in the design, implementation and results of the project;	Assessment how Right to Food was relevant within respected countries, were right-based approaches implemented in the project with respect to food security	Interviews with Line Ministries and other governmental representatives, project staff, analysis of Project document and Logframe, analysis of by-laws
the integration of decent rural employment concerns in the design and results of the project.	Analysis of PRSP reports of the different countries with respect to rural employment,	Ministry of Agriculture and Ministry of Lands, FAO Rep
Analysis of Partnerships and Alliances:		
how they were planned in the project design and developed through implementation;	Interviews and report analysis	Project reports, interviews with project management
their effect on project results and sustainability.12	That is not only influenced by partnerships. Partnership analysis can only assess, if these were successful or not or why, and which capacities partners have or need to contribute to results	Interviews, Project reports

10 See: http://typo3.fao.org/fileadmin/templates/gender/docs/FAO_FinalGender_Policy_2012.pdf
11 See: http://www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/en/
12 See: http://www.fao.org/partnerships/partners-home/en/

Objectives of Evaluation	Activities within Evaluation Process	Resources
effectiveness of partnerships with key institutions and organizations (MOUs with Nile Basin Initiative; Vi-Agroforestry, LVBC/LVEMP)	Repetition of above question	
Impact:		
Overall impact of the project, actual or potential, positive and negative, produced directly or indirectly, intended or unintended; and	Open Interviews on intended and unintended impacts, use impact indicators for assessing if intended impacts have been achieved	All Stakeholders
Overall contribution of the project to FAO Country Programming Frameworks, Organizational Result/s and Strategic Objectives.	Analysis expected results of FAO country programming frameworks and strategic objective and compare in which way intended and unintended impacts identified above match with them	Interview with FAO Reps, Analysis of country programming framework, stakeholder interviews

Table 3: --Questions specific to Log-frame and Outcomes

1. Transboundary coordination, information sharing and monitoring and evaluation mechanisms operational and effective in promoting sustainable, productive agro-ecosystems and restoration of degraded lands.

- Has there been a basin-wide coordination mechanism established to facilitate trans-boundary dialogue, basin-level planning, policy harmonization and coordination of national/sub-national actions. How was, that mechanism developed, which were the partners, which were the obstacles, which issues were addressed, which policies needed to be harmonized, which issues were part of the dialogue, how was joint planning conducted, which joint actions were undertaken?
- Describe the efficient basin-wide knowledge management system, which has been established? Which information requirements and decision-making processes have been supported at which levels?
- Have indicators been changed since Mid-Term review and is the monitoring and evaluation system viable?
- Are Kagera TAMP project management structures operational and effective?

2 Enabling policy, planning and legislative conditions are in place to support and facilitate the sustainable management of agro-ecosystems and the restoration of degraded land.

- How has the project enabled policy, planning and legislation, that support SLM and restoration of degraded land?
- How are SLM technologies mainstreamed in national development policies and programmes?
- Which barriers to SLM had to be removed?
- Are synergies created among sectors to enhance synergies?
- Which is the coherent strategic and planning framework for SLM?
- Is there a coherent strategy of SLM implementation from river-basin to district/provincial and community levels?

3. Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin

- Which methods and approaches to promote adoption of SLM practices were promoted?
- How did FFS work? Which were the success stories?
- Which were the major best practices implemented, in which areas?
- How many technologies reported to WOCAT?
- How did technologies build upon local knowledge?

- How many sectors are involved in the technologies?
- How did project management and farmers perceive the quality and regularity of services provided?

4. Improved land and agro-ecosystem management practices are implemented and benefiting land users for the range of agro-ecosystems in the basin.

- What is the impact of improved land and agroecosystem management practices on agro-ecosystems?
- What is the impact of improved land and agroecosystem management practices on land users?
- How did participatory land management plans support improved land and agro-ecosystem management?
- How and to which extent were improved practices adopted by farmers and herders? Which were problems, which are opportunities?
- To which extent were these practices replicated, which factors increased replication, which factors hindered it?
- Have market opportunities and benefit-sharing mechanisms for ES been identified and developed, where identified, where developed, which were hindrances, which were opportunities?

Table 4: Checklist on Major Issues

Participation
FFS and Catchment committees – more into detail, how constituted, obstacles, perceptions of stakeholders, perceptions by stakeholders.

Institutionalization
Institutionalization FFS – Catchment Committees – to integrate into planning on landscape level – obstacles to overcome, enabling environment necessary.
Integration into national plans – opportunities and obstacles

To what extent has the project created an enabling policy, planning and legislative environment that supports and facilitates a collaborative sustainable
development

Capacity building and knowledge managements
Perception of tools used, like LADA and WOCAT …
Feasibility of project products / maps etc.
Handing over of maps and products

Satisfaction with service providers,
How are knowledge products used?

Transboundary issues:
Which transboundary issues have been solved / improved in which countries – as for instance fires, pastoralism, agrobiodiversity, soil erosion - harmonization of by-laws and national laws

SLM
Feasibility of SLM technologies and perceptions by different stakeholders
Perception of best practices in the view of different stakeholders

PES – support by governments, what works, what does not work

Monitoring and Evaluation
Were indicators useful, how were indicators used for monitoring and evaluation? Examples indicators for carbon sequestration, ExACT tools, problems of using them, problems of monitoring.

Financial allocation – problems observed

Environmental Goals and Development Goals – which are reached?

Co –funding - where are baseline projects, how did co-financing break down?

Analysis of Log-frame – Feasibility and Coherence of activities with expected outputs, outputs with outcomes

Performance Indicators

Efficiency --- timeliness of work plans, efficient use of financial resources

Relevance
To communities, national, FAO, human rights issues and Food of Right, CCD

Sustainability
Financial, ecological, economic, political sustainability,

I**mpacts**
Income generation, food security and nutrition – unexpected impacts

Indicators

- 10% reduction in soil erosion from 45,000 ha of land of pilot communities (PY5)
- 10% reduction in sediment loads from 4 target micro-catchments (PY5)
- 20% increase in soil carbon stores on farmer study plots and sample sites in target arable and pasture lands (PY5)
- 30% increase in vegetation cover (above and below ground biomass) on pilot 23,000 ha arable and 7,500 ha pasture lands (PY5)
- 120,000 farmers successfully implementing and benefiting from agro-ecosystem management practices and sustainable use of biodiversity in target communities (PY5)
- 10% increase in production (crop; livestock; fuelwood; biodiverse products) contributing to poverty reduction and food security, from SLaM activities in target communities (68 communities by PY3 and a further 200 by PY5)

Annex 3: Schedule of the Field Mission

TANZANIA

Saturday 23 May – Travel to Bukoba at 9am (7 hours, including the lake crossing)

Sunday 24 May
Stay: at Kolting hotel
Meeting with service providers: Kolting society
Bukoba district

Monday 25 May - Travel by car (3 hrs) to Kibongo site
Site not originally an implementation site – have been with the project for 2 years
Meeting with farmers, facilitators
Visit Kihanga Katera catchment
Sleep at Kayanga

Tuesday 26 May - Travel 1.5 hours to Ngara
Meeting with District Executive Director (DED) of Ngara, district project facilitator, and service provider
Visit Rusumo catchment. Sleep in Ngara

RWANDA

Dates	Sites / Agencies	People to meet
27th May	Rugando catchment, Kirehe district Kiyanja catchment, Kayonza district	District Project Facilitators; Service Providers; FFS groups
28th May	Karambo and Butare catchments, Rulindo district	District Project Facilitators; Service Providers; FFS groups
29th May	FAO Representative Ministry of Agriculture and animal resources Ministry of Natural Resources Rwanda Natural Resources Authority	Mr. Attaher Maiga, FAO Representative Rwanda Mr. Innocent Musabyimana, PS MINAGRI Mr. Innocent Musabyimana, MINIRENA M.r Tetero Francoir, Director IWRM, RNRA

UGANDA

Date	Place to visit	Activity	Comment
31/5/2015	Kabale	Travel and booked at White Horse Inn	
1/6/2015	Kabale	District Local Government, Service providers, District	

Date	Place to visit	Activity	Comment
	Kanyankwanzi and Kagarama watershed	Facilitators, visit the watersheds and meet FFS and see SLM activities	
2/6/2015	Mbarara Rubagano watershed	Visit Rubagano catchment, service provider, FFS SLM activities	
3/6/2015	Kiruhura (Sanga and Nyakigando watershed)	Visit the catchment, up to 2pm, meet service providers, and see SLM activities	MARTYERS DAY (public holiday) can see slm only no officials
3/6/2015	Kiruhura/Kampala	Travel to Kampala in the afternoon	MARTYERS DAY
4/6/2015	Kampala	Visit FAO, MAAIF, Terrafrica, NEMA /lands, water	
5/6/2015	Entebbe	Terrafrica in the morning and Mission completed	

Annex 4: List of Documents Reviewed

FAO-GEF Project: Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (KAGERA TAMP)

No.	Document Name	Year
	KAGERATAMP REGIONAL REPORTS	
1.	Project Document - (Kagera TAMP)	2009
2.	Project Logical Framework	2010
3.	Project Results Framework	2010
4.	Kagera Organizational Chart	2010
5.	Mid-Term Evaluation of the FAO-GEF Kagera-TAMP Project	2013
6.	Management response to the Mid-term evaluation report (Feb 2014)	2014
7.	FAO Evaluation QA_tools_final_version	2015
8.	Project Implementation Review (PIR) Report (July 2010 – June 2011)	2011
9.	Project Implementation Review (PIR) Report (July 2011 - June 2012)	2012
10.	Project Implementation Review (PIR) Report (July 2012 – June 2013)	2013
11.	Project Implementation Review (PIR) Report (July 2013 – June 2014)	2014
12.	GCP-RAF 424-GFF (Kagera –TAMP) GEF Tracking tool	2014
13.	Six-Monthly Report (Jul – Dec 2010)	2010
14.	Six-Monthly Report (Jan – Jun 2010)	2010
15.	Six-Monthly Report (Jul – Dec 2011)	2011
16.	Six-Monthly Report (Jan – Jun 2011)	2011
17.	Six-Monthly Report (Jul – Dec 2012)	2012
18.	Six-Monthly Report (Jan – Jun 2012)	2012
19.	Six-Monthly Report (Jul – Dec 2013)	2013
20.	Six-Monthly Report (Jan – Jun 2013)	2013
21.	Six-Monthly Report (Jul – Dec 2014)	2014
22.	Six-Monthly Report (Jan – Jun 2014)	2014
23.	Kagera-TAMP -Quarterly Progress Report (April – June 2010)	2010
24.	Kagera-TAMP -Quarterly Progress Report (Jan – Mar 2011)	2011
25.	Kagera-TAMP -Quarterly Progress Report (Jan – Mar 2012)	2012
26.	Kagera-TAMP -Quarterly Progress Report (Oct – Dec 2012)	2012
27.	Kagera-TAMP -Quarterly Progress Report (Jan – Mar 2013)	2013
28.	Kagera-TAMP -Quarterly Progress Report (Jan – Mar 2014)	2014
29.	Kagera TAMP Workplan with follow -up activities for 2013/14	2014
30.	Minutes of the 2nd Regional Project Steering Committee meeting held on 25th Oct. 2013	2013
31.	Recommendations of the 2nd Regional Project Steering Committee (25th Oct.2013)	2013
32.	Gender Assessment final Results Compiled K-TAMP project_09Feb2015	2015
	CONSULTANCY REPORTS	
33.	Kagera Basin Transboundary issues of land degradation and conflict related to livestock management and movements and identification of strategies and options for sustainable and equitable land and livestock management. (by J. B. Kizima, June 2013)	2013

No.	Document Name	Year
34.	The extent, impacts and best management practices of wildfires for Kagera river basin (Consultancy Report by Haji Mpya)	No date
35.	Kagera River Basin: Transboundary Issues of Land Degradation and Conflict Related to Livestock Management and Movements. (Report by *Jonas B. Kizima, Bunning S, Anania J.B and Rusharaza V.)*	No date
36.	Report for Development of Comprehensive Project SLM FFS program, Curriculum and Implementation of Training of Trainers courses in Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda	2012
37.	Action Plans for Sustainable Land Management Kagera River Basin Countries (Consultant report by Syprose Ogola)	No date
38.	Training Modules for Training of Trainers (TOTS) on Integrated Policies/ Laws/ Regulations/ Acts on Natural Resources and Land Use Conflict Resolution (Consultant report by Syprose Ogola, 15 Aug 2013)	2013
39.	Land and natural resources conflicts in transboundary agroecosystem management project Kagera Basin. (Consultant report by Syprose Ogola)	No date
40.	Report on Identification of Priority Transboundary Conflicts and Policy/Legal Issues (Consultant report by Ruzika N. Muheto, Oct. 2012)	2012
41.	GEF-4 Strategy on Land Degradation	2007
42.	Report for Development of Comprehensive Project SLM FFS program, Curriculum and Implementation of Training of Trainers courses in Uganda, Tanzania and Rwanda (by Julianus Thomas)	No date
43.	Interim Report of the Refresher Training Course and FFS Follow up and On-Field Trainings for Rwanda. Interim Report (By Julianus Thomas, Feb. 2013)	2013
44.	Etude d'identification des problèmes de gestion des agro écosystèmes transfrontaliers entre le Burundi et le Rwanda (Consultancy Report by Ruzima Salvator, October 2013)	2013
45.	Management of Wildfires and Intentional Burning in Different Land Uses in the Kagera Tamp Region (Consultancy Report by Mazimakwo. B. Kukundakwe, Oct. 2013)	2013
46.	Opportunities and challenges for trans-boundary ecosystem conservation in the Kagera Basin: the case of sub-catchments in Rwanda, Uganda and Tanzania (J. Perfect, 14 July2014)	2014
47.	Monitoring and evaluation	
	COUNTRY SPECIFIC REPORTS	
48.	Country Update – Burundi (Oct 2010-March 2013)	2013
49.	Country Update – Rwanda (Aug 2010-March 2013)	2013
50.	Country Update – Tanzania (Mar 2010-Feb 2013)	2013
51.	Country Update – Uganda (Jan2010-March 2013)	2013
52.	Stakeholder Mapping – Burundi	No date
53.	Stakeholder Mapping – Rwanda	No date
54.	Stakeholder Mapping – Tanzania	No date
55.	Stakeholder Mapping – Uganda	No date
56.	Activity timeline – Burundi (Aug 2010-March 2014)	2014
57.	Activity timeline – Rwanda (Aug 2010-March 2014)	2014
58.	Activity timeline – Tanzania (Aug 2010-March 2014)	2014
59.	Activity timeline – Uganda (Aug 2010-March 2014)	2014
60.	Project Brochure – Burundi	

No.	Document Name	Year
61.	Project Brochure – Rwanda	
62.	Project Brochure – Tanzania	
63.	Project Brochure – Uganda	
64.	Quarterly Report Burundi Jan – March -2011	2011
65.	Quarterly Report Burundi July – Sept 2011	2011
66.	Quarterly Report Burundi Oct. – Déc 2011	2011
67.	Quarterly Project Activity Report Burundi Oct – Dec. 2012	2012
68.	Rapport Du Quatrieme Trimestre, 2012 for Burundi	2013
69.	Quarterly Report Burundi Jan. – Apr 2013	2013
70.	Quarterly Report Burundi Apr. – Jun 2013	2013
71.	Quarterly Report Burundi Jul. – Sep 2013	2013
72.	Quarterly Report Burundi Oct. – Dec 2013	2014
73.	Quarterly Report Burundi Jan. – Mar 2014	2014
74.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda July - Oct 2010	2010
75.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda July - Oct 2010	2010
76.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Oct - Dec 2010	2011
77.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Jan – Mar 2011	2011
78.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Jul – Sep 2011	2011
79.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Oct – Dec 2011	2012
80.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Jan – Mar 2012	2012
81.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Jul – Sep 2012	2012
82.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Oct – Dec 2012	2013
83.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Jan – Mar 2013	2013
84.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Apr – Jul 2013	2013
85.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Jul – Sep 2013	2013
86.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Oct – Dec 2013	2014
87.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Jan – Mar 2014	2014
88.	Quarterly Report for Rwanda Apr – Jul 2014	2014
89.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Nov-Feb_2010	2010
90.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Jul – Sep 2011	2011
91.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Oct – Dec 2011	2012
92.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Jan – Mar 2012	2012
93.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Apr – Jun 2012	2012
94.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Jul – Sep 2012	2012
95.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Oct – Dec 2012	2013
96.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Jan – Mar 2013	2013
97.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Apr – Jun 2013	2013
98.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Jul – Sep 2013	2013
99.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Oct – Dec 2013	2014
100.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Jan – Mar 2013	2014
101.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania Apr – Jun 2013	2014
102.	Quarterly Report for Tanzania July –Dec 2014	2014
103.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Jan – Mar 2011	2011
104.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Apr – Jun 2011	2011
105.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Jul – Sep 2011	2012

No.	Document Name	Year
106.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Jan – Mar 2012	2012
107.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Apr – Jun 2012	2012
108.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Jul – Sep 2012	2012
109.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Oct – Dec 2012	2012
110.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Jan – Mar 2013	2013
111.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Apr – Jun 2013	2013
112.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Jul – Sep 2013	2013
113.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Oct – Dec 2013	2014
114.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Jan – Mar 2014	2014
115.	Quarterly Report for Uganda Apr – Jun 2014	2014
116.	Tanzania Co-funding for the period July 2012 to June 2013	2013
117.	Tanzania Co-funding for the period July 2013 to June 2014	2014
118.	Uganda Co-funding in Isingiro District - DLG	2014
119.	Uganda Co-funding in Kabale district	2014
120.	Uganda Co-funding in Kiruhura District- DLG	2014
121.	Uganda Co-funding Mbarara district	2014
122.	Uganda Co-funding Ntungamo District - DLG	2014
123.	Uganda Co-funding District: Rakai – DLG	2014
124.	Burundi-Summary sheet for monitoring of Letters of Agreements	2012
125.	Burundi - Summary sheet for monitoring of National Consultant contracts	2012
126.	Rwanda-SLM intervention area per micro-catchments	No date
127.	Uganda – Area under SLM as at 30th June 2014	2014
128.	Uganda Summary of TAMP Activities	2014
129.	GIS databases of Kagera basin on CDs for Burundi	2011
130.	GIS databases of Kagera basin on CDs for Rwanda	2012
131.	GIS databases of Kagera basin on CDs for Tanzania	2011
132.	Rapport Carte Systèmes d'utilisation du sol (LUS) du Burundi. Préparé dans un atelier national, Gitega – Burundi, 9-16 Nov 2010.	2010
133.	Land use map of Rwanda. Prepared during a workshop held in Butare, Rwanda at the CGIS centre, from 22nd Nov-3rd Dec 2010	2010
134.	Land use map of Tanzania. Prepared during a workshop held in Butare, Rwanda, at the CGIS centre, 22nd Nov. - 3rd Dec 2010.	2010
135.	Burundi - Questionnaire on Gender Equality by Ndabirorere Salvator	No date
136.	Tanzania - Questionnaire on Gender Equality by Fidelis Kaihura	No date
137.	Uganda - Questionnaire on Gender Equality by Wilson Bamwerinde	No date
138.	M & E data for Catchment FFS-SLM activities in Tanzania	2015
139.	SLM-FFS Evaluation Tanzania	No date
140.	Second Interim Report on Capacity Building for Sustainable Land Management in Rusumo and Kirushya Micro-Catchements, Ngara District, Tanzania (by TCRS, 20th Feb., 2015)	2015
	BROCHURES AND NEWSLETTERS	
141.	Kagera TAMP Newsletter (March 2011)	2011
142.	Kagera TAMP Brochure (March 2013)	2013
143.	Kagera Tamp – News Bulletin	

No.	Document Name	Year
	EVALUATION GUIDELINES	
144.	Step-by-step procedures for the separate evaluation of voluntary-funded initiatives (OED Guidelines)	2011
145.	Guidance Note for the Conduct of Country Evaluations (OED Guidelines)	2014
146.	Outline for project evaluation reports (OED Tools)	2013
147.	Terms of Reference template for the evaluation of projects and programmes funded through voluntary contributions by resource partners (OED Tools)	2015
148.	Summary of things to be looked by the evaluation mission	2015
	PROCEEDINGS OF KAGERA TAMP FINAL REGIONAL PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION REVIEW WORKSHOP, 19th – 22nd May, 2015, JB BELMONT HOTEL, MWANZA, TANZANIA	
149.	Kagera-TAMP Project Overview	2015
150.	Results of Regional Transboundary Workshop (Mbarara, Uganda 9-13 March, 2015) By Joseph Anania Bizima	2015
151.	A Synoptic View of Kagera Tamp During 5 Years of Project Implementation. Joseph Anania	2015
152.	Tanzania-Project Implementation Progress Kagera TAMP (2010-2015)	2015
153.	National Project Implementation Review	2015
154.	Présentation des réalisations au Burundi	2015
155.	Etude hydroMétéorologique des Bassins versants pilotes du projet TAMP Kagera au Burundi, by Aloys Rurantije, IGEBU	2015
156.	Policy Brief on PPP by Rusharaza	2015
157.	Implementation Status of LVEMP II in Burundi	2015
158.	Overview of Kagera River Basin Project- by Gertrude Ngabirano, NBI/NELSAP	2015
159.	Vi Agroforestry	2015
160.	PES – Incentives by Emmanuel Muligirwa	2015
161.	Burundi Etat d'avancement des activités (by Salvator Ndabirorere)	2015
162.	Kagera TAMP – 3rd Regional Project Steering Committee Meeting. Presentation by Stefan Schlingloff in Mwanza, Tanzania, 21 May 2015	2015
	OTHER DOCUMENTS	
163.	Terminal Evaluation of the UNEP/FAO/GEF Project "Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA)"; by K. Kellner, C. Risoli and M. Metz. (May 2011)	2011
164.	Greenhouse Gas Impacts of the Kagera TAMP Project. Case study of the Nyaikibari catchment in Burundi	

Annex 5: List of Stakeholders Met

FAO-GEF Project: Transboundary Agro-Ecosystem Management Programme for the Kagera River Basin (Kagera-TAMP)
Dates: 19th May to 5th June 2015

No	Dates	Country	Place	Name of respondent	Official status
			BUKOBA		
1.	19th May	Tanzania	Mwanza	Sally Bunning	Lead Technical Officer (LTO)
2.	21st May	Tanzania	Mwanza	Stefan Schlingloff	FAO Budget Holder/Project Operations
3.	21st May	Tanzania	Mwanza	William Critchley	Consultant for Kagera-TAMP Mid-Review
4.	22nd May	Tanzania	Mwanza	Salvator Ndabirorere	National Project Coordinator, Burundi
5.	22nd May	Tanzania	Mwanza	Fidelis Kahiura	National Project Coordinator, Tanzania
			TANZANIA		
6.	24th May	Tanzania	Bukoba	Shumbusho Eustad	Rural Dev Advisor Kolping Society, Tz
7.	24th May	Tanzania	Bukoba	Godfrey Baraba	District Project Facilitaror
8.	24th May	Tanzania	Bukoba	George Mbyazita	Researcher - Maruku Research Station
9.	25th May	Tanzania	Maruku	Innocent Ndietambura	Officer in Charge, Maruku Res. Center
10.	25th May	Tanzania	Kyerwa District	Pesha Wambura	District Project Facilitator
11.	25th May	Tanzania	Kyerwa District	Paul Bwarakumu	Chairman, Katera Pasture Improvement FFS
12.	25th May	Tanzania	Kyerwa District	Emilian Leonidas	Extension and Site Facilitator-Katera FFs
13.	25th May	Tanzania	Kibingo	Prosper Rwabukamba Richard Daudi	Tukwanise FFS
14.	25th May	Tanzania	Kihanga	Emmanuel Simon	Mazingira FFS
15.	25th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Philip Ileta	District Project Facilitator
16.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Peter Mwatege	Project Coordinator, TCRS
17.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	William Mnyanga	Field Officer, TCRS
18.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Samuel Kakilla	Site Facilitator, TCRS
19.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Kennedy Obed	Chairman, Tuinuane pasture FFS
20.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Methuselah Aggrey	Tuinuane FFS, Rusumo Village
21.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Chitegeze Daudi	Rusumo Magereza Pri. School
22.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Thobias Thomson	Chairman, Catchment Committee
23.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Williamson Dawson	Vikopa Chairperson - Village Community Banking

No	Dates	Country	Place	Name of respondent	Official status
24.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Lameck Aggrey	Village Council Member, Rusumo Vil.
25.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Salvatory Bayasabi	Fishpond owner
26.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Imani Ntabagi	Neema FFS
27.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	John Julius	Nuru FFS
28.	26th May	Tanzania	Ngara	Fabian Senkira	Mkombozi FFS
29.	27th May	Tanzania	Ngara, TCRS	Peter Mwatege	Project Coordinator, TCRS
30.	27th May	Tanzania	Ngara, TCRS	William Mnyanga	Field Officer, TCRS
31.	27th May	Tanzania	Ngara, Offices	Herman Hume	Acting DED, Ngara District
			RWANDA		
32.	27th-May	Rwanda	Border-border	Emmanuel Muligirwa	National Project Manager Rwanda
33.	27th May	Rwanda	Rugando, Kirehe district	Muhozabugingo Degard	Twiyubake Rugando FFS
34.	27th May	Rwanda	Kiyanja, Kayonza district	Sengayire Theoneste Mutesi Salome	FFS Facilitator, Ejoheza-Kiyanja FFS
35.	27th May	Rwanda	Kiyanja, Kayonza	Mutesi Salome	Duharanire Kwigira – Kiyanja FFS
36.	28th May	Rwanda	Karambo, Rulindo district	Gakindi Faustin	Umurava FFS
37.	28th May	Rwanda	Karambo Rulindo	Gakindi Faustin	Agapaki FFS
38.	28th May	Rwanda	Butare, Rulindo district	Mutuyumuremyi Jean Nepo	Ejoheza FFS
39.	28th May	Rwanda	Butare, Rulindo	Mutuyumuremyi Jean Nepo	Twisungane FFS
40.	28th May	Rwanda	Butare, Rulindo	Mutuyumuremyi Jean Nepo	Twitezimbere FFs
41.	29th May	Rwanda	Kigali	Attaher Maiga	FAO Country Rep
42.	29th May	Rwanda	Kigali	Theophile Uwiringiyimana	Head of M & E, Vi Agroforestry
43.	29th May	Rwanda	Kigali	Joseph Anania	Regional Project Coordinator
44.	29 th May	Rwanda	Kigali	Innocent Musabyimana	PS, MINAGRI
45.	30th May	Rwanda	Kigali	Desire Kagabo	Consultant for Kagera-TAMP
			UGANDA		
46.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale	Wilson Bamwerinde	National Project Coordinator, Uganda
47.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale	Patrick Besigye Keihwa	District Chairman, Kabale
48.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale	Twebaze Jeniffer	District Project Facilitator
49.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale-Kanyaukwanzi	Muhereza David	FFS Facilitator/Service Provider
50.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale-Kanyakwanzi	Tumuheirwe Honest	FFS facilitator/Service Provider

No	Dates	Country	Place	Name of respondent	Official status
51.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale-Kanyaukwanzi	Pross Twesigye	Farmer, Kanyakwanzi-Tukore FFS
52.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale-Kanyaukwanzi	David Muhereza	Kagugo Tree Nursery FFS
53.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale-Kanyakwanzi	Zaverio Zinorumuri	Bukoora FFS
54.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale - Kariko	Patrick Twebaze	Kariko Bahingi Tukore FFS
55.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale-Rwamate	Shallon Tumwiine	Kagarama bahingi Kweterana FFS
56.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale - Rwamate	Henry Turyatemba	Hamurambi Tukore FFS
57.	1st June	Uganda	Kabale - Kariko	Akankwatsa Kerren	Mukiraabo Tuvindebyobunga FFS
58.	2nd June	Uganda	Mbarara-Rubagano	Mpiirwe Emmy	Agric Officer, Mbarara
59.	2nd June	Uganda	Mbarara-Rubagano	Bizuri Johnson	FFS Facilitator Farmer
60.	2nd June	Uganda	Mbarara-Rubagano	Kyomuhendo Keti	Rubagano Tukore FFS
61.	2nd June	Uganda	Mbarara-Rubagano	Kashangirrwe V	Rubagano Tutungukye FFs
62.	2nd June	Uganda	Mbarara-Rubagano	Tibesigwa T	Abateganda FFS
63.	2nd June	Uganda	Mbarara-Rubagano	Scarlet Tumuhairwe	Kyeyare Tugumo Namaani FFS
64.	2nd June	Uganda	Mbarara-Nyakigando	Kashokye George	FFS Facilitator Nyakigando FFS
65.	3rd June	Uganda	Sanga	Karakire George	FFS Facilitator, Sanga FFs
66.	3rd June	Uganda	Sanga	Kacucu Sam	Farmer, Sanga FFS
67.	4th June	Uganda	Kampala	Alhaji Jallow	FAO Country Rep
68.	4th June	Uganda	Kampala	Steven Mugabi	As Commissioner, Min of Water & Env.
69.	4th June	Uganda	Entebbe	Steve Muwaya	Terrafrica Focal Point
70.	4th June	Uganda	Entebbe	Mutabazi Sunday	Commissioner, Farm Dev, & Chair, NPSC
71.	5th June	Uganda	Kampala	Catherine M. Musoke	Commissioner, Min of Lands & NSC
72.	5th June	Uganda	Kampala	Festus Bakoora	Member of NSC, formerly with NEMA

Annex 6: Co-financing

Overall Co-Financing Status 2014 (According to Stefan Schlingloff, presentation Mwanza May 2015)

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financer	Type of Co-financing	Amount confirmed at CEO approval	Actual amount reported by 30 June 2014 (USD)	
Government of Burundi	MINAGRIE	cash and in-kind cash in-kind	6,260,000	6,719,637 433,637 6,286,000	107%
Government of Rwanda	Provinces and the Gov. of Rw. community fund	cash and in-kind cash in-kind	6,293,760	532,800 532,800	8%
Government of Uganda	Districts	in-kind	3,707,800	3,115,910	84%
Government of Tanzania	Districts	in-kind	2,463,050	368,351	15%
FAO		in-kind	351,000	365,158	104%
Partner programs and donors		cash and in-kind	5,433,600	5,491,144	101%
		TOTAL (USD)	24,509,210	**16,593,193**	**68%**

Uganda (Co-Financing in USD)

District	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015	Total (USD)
Ntungamo DLG	22,800	116,500	153,200	116,700	125,00	-	573,200
Kabale	123,500	242,020	126,100	297,500	425,600	400,250	1,614,970
Mbarara	55,200	191,100	266,000	270,030	274,000	113,500	1,182,900
Kiruhura	47,400	174,020	229,500	177,500	193,000	47,676	869,120
Isingiro	22,800	116,500	153,200	116,700	94,300	99500	603,000
Rakia	56,200	164,140	209,350	180,000	259,000	57,700	926,390
Total							**5,769,580**

Status end of the Project: much more than 100% than Amount approved at CEO endorsement

The total of Kabale includes USD 2,500 cash from Africa fund. All other co-financing was in-kind.

Burundi

Partner	Co-Finance					Type	TOTAL
	2011	2012	2013	2014	2015		1000$
GBI	120,000	120,000	1,600,000	600,000	200,000	In	2,640
	50,000	117,500	100,000	150,000	16,137	cash	433,637
IFDC	95,000	-	-	0	0	In	95 000
APRN	40,000	-	-	0	0	In	40,000
FAO	11,000	120,000	450,000	250,000	250,000	In	1,081 000
FAO/HUP	-	250,000	250,000	0	0	In	500 000
PRODEMA	210,000	0	210,000	210,000	0	In	630,000
PAIRB/ADB		100,000	400,000	800,000	0	In	1,300,000
TOTAL	**526,000**	**707,500**	**3,010,000**	**2,010,000**	**466,137**		**6,719,637**

Status end of the Project: More than 100% of CEO approval

Rwanda

Implementation Partner	2010 (Oct - Dec) (US$)		2011 (Jan - Dec) US$)		2012 (Jan - June) (US$)		2012 Jul - 2013 June (US$)		2013 Jul - 2014 June (US$)		2014 Jul - 2015 June (US$)		Total (US$)
	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	
Staff Time - Sector Agronomists		**15,000**		**60,000**		**30,000**		**60,000**		**60,000**		**66,000**	**291,000**
Transport - Sector Agronomists		**3,600**		**14,400**		**7,200**		**14,400**		**14,400**		**15,840**	**69,840**
Per diem - Sector Agronomists		**2,400**		**9,600**		**4,800**		**9,600**		**9,600**		**10,560**	**46,560**
Staff Time- National Steering Committee (12 Members)		**10,800**		**43,200**		**21,600**		**43,200**		**43,200**		**43,200**	**205,200**
Office Space and equipment		**3,000**		**12,000**		**6,000**		**12,000**		**12,000**		**12,000**	**57,000**
FFS Plots		**0**		**0**		**60,000**		**60,000**		**60,000**		**66,000**	**246,000**
FSS Groups labour		**0**		**0**		**18,000**		**36,000**		**36,000**		**39,600**	**129,600**
Staff Time - FFS Facilitators						**3,000**		**6,000**		**6,000**		**6,600**	**21,600**
KWAMP - Rugando micro catchment		**20,0000**		**20,0000**		**15,0000**							**550,000**
KWAMP - Nyagasozi micro catchment		**250,000**		**210,000**		**180,000**							**640,000**
LVEMP - Gakindo & Nyirarubomboza micro catchment								**20,0000**		**15,0000**			**350,000**

Implementation Partner	2010 (Oct - Dec) (US$)		2011 (Jan - Dec) US$)		2012 (Jan - June) (US$)		2012 Jul - 2013 June (US$)		2013 Jul - 2014 June (US$)		2014 Jul - 2015 June (US$)		Total (US$)
	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	Cash	Kind	
Women for Women International - Kiyanja micro catchment		**80,000**											**80,000**
Vi Agroforestry Nyarurembo micro catchment				**80,000**		**60,000**		**50,000**		**35,000**			**225,000**
Vi Agroforestry Karambo micro catchment				**70,000**		**65,000**		**40,000**		**35,000**			**210,000**
LVEMP - Butare micro catchment, through RNRA project in Yanze catchment												**900000**	**900,000**
TOTAL	**0**	**34,800**	**0**	**139,200**	**0**	**147,600**	**0**	**235,200**					**4,021,800**

Status end of the Project: Only 64% of CEO Approval

Tanzania
Co-funding details July 2012 to June 2013

Co-funding sources	Stakeholder	Description	Estimates	Tshs	USD
District facilitation	Bukoba	Staff time	5 x 1,230,000	6,150,000	21,990
		Transport	5 x 288		1,440
		Office space	200 x 8		1,600
	Missenyi	Staff time	5 x 1,230,000	6,150,000	21,990
		Transport	5 x 288		1,440
		Office space	200 x 8		1,600
	Karagwe	Staff time	5 x 1,230,000	6,150,000	21,990
		Transport	5 x 288		1,440
		Office space	200 x 8		1,600
	Ngara	Staff time	5 x 1,230,000	6,150,000	21,990
		Transport	5 x 288		1,440
		Office space	200 x 8		1,600
Service Providers	Vi Agroforestry	Staff time	2 x 1,230,000	2,460,000	1,587
		Transport	2 x 288		576
		Office space	200 x 8		1,600
		SLM activities Kihanga,			10,000
		Carbon monitoring Kihanga			5,000
		SLM activities Missenyi			5,000
	TCRS-CEP Project	Staff time	2 x 1,230,000	2,460,000	1,587
		Transport	2 x 288		576
		Office space	200 x 8		1,600
		SLM activities Rusumo			5,000
	REDESO Project	Staff time	2 x 1,230,000	2,460,000	1,587
		Transport	2 x 288		576
		Office space	200 x 8		1,600

Co-funding sources	Stakeholder	Description	Estimates	Tshs	USD
		SLM activities Kirushya			5,000
	Hydro-electricity Power Project (district)	Staff time	2 x 2 x 500,000	2,000,000	1,290
Technical & Admin support	ARI Maruku	Staff time	2 x6 x 800,000	9,600,000	6,194
		Transport vehicles	2 x 2000 km x 8 months x 0.4 US$		12,800
		Support driver	1 x 12 x 250,000	3,000,000	1,935
		Office space	12 x 200 US$		2,400
		Project secretary	500 x 12		6,000
Support Bukoba district council	National FFS MT	Staff time Denis	1 x 1,230,000	1,230,000	794
	Communities	Land	4 x 4 x 1,630,000	26,080,000	16,825
		Increased ha in SLM-FFS (new FFS learning sites, technologies demonstration sites and farmer adoption sites) up to June 2013	(2.5 + 1.75 + 8.75)ha x 1,630,000	21,190,000	13,244
		Inputs	4 x 4 x 150,000	2,400,000	1,548
		Increased inputs due to additional 26 SLM – FFS activities (manure, labour, knowledge, etc) up to June 2013	26 x 150,000	3,900,000	24,375
		Micro-catchment committee time in-kind	10 x 10 x 12 x 10,000	12,000,000	7,500
Total in-kind co-funding					236,314
In-Cash co-funding					
North-South transborder project contribution (Rakai, Masaka and Missenyi)		Chaco dam construction in Bubale grazing land; Rangeland pastures improvement; and Kagera river banks protection			350,000
World Bank contribution to Ngara district development projects		Development of two additional village land use and management plans in Ngara district			30,000
Agriculture Green Revolution in Africa		Soil productivity improvement and improved seed multiplication and distribution to			120,000

Co-funding sources	Stakeholder	Description	Estimates	Tshs	USD
		communities in Bukoba and Missenyi districts			
Ngara district council contribution to TAMP		Inputs for nursery preparation and management for 2 groups			**625**
Total cash co-funding					**380,625**
Grand total co-funding 2012/13					**736,939**

Annex 7: Detailed Achievements per Output

Output 1.1: A Basin-Wide Coordination Mechanism is established to facilitate transboundary dialogue, basin level planning, policy harmonization and coordination of national/sub-national actions.

Output 1.1. was the most critical output under outcome #1 and the achievements under this output had an influence on other outputs under this same outcome. The original purpose of the output was to coordinate and harmonize policies and legal instruments for sustainable natural resource use in each of these countries into one overarching regional framework which would have allowed to implement basin wide SLaM programmes. Instruments foreseen were national-level workshops in each of the countries to propose such policy, institutional and legal mechanisms for enhanced regional cooperation to address priority transboundary issues and resolve conflicts and finally decide upon one basin SLaM approach and promote it through appropriate institutional mechanisms, including protocols, guidelines and a sustainable financing mechanism in collaboration with other basin-wide mechanisms such as LVEMP and NELSAP and regional political mechanisms such as EAC. Then, through regional workshops, project stakeholders would have finalized and agreed upon a proposed mechanism, raised awareness on the mechanism and finally implemented it.

At the end of the project not much of this "vision" was achieved, and among the whole project it can be said, that this is the output which achieved the least. In particular, the critical activity 1.1.2 - *"Institutional mechanisms developed (guidelines, protocols, funding) for dissemination/ use"* was not properly implemented. The achievements under this output consist mostly of workshops and identification of issues and awareness raising, which were not sufficient for the development of an institutional mechanism. It is the view of the evaluators - which is probably easier said than done - that this output should have integrated at least the following three activities to achieve the targeted results:

a) The establishment of an Inter-Ministerial Committee composed of relevant line ministries from each of the basin countries to promote such a mechanism. It seems as if the project had expected that the RPSC would act as such a transboundary committee itself. If that was the case, the ToR of the RPSC were too much focused on project supervision only and the time allocated was too little to establish something sustainable which would last over the end of the project. The establishment of such an Inter-Ministerial Committee would have probably faced many barriers, including lack of finances and capacities and insufficient cross-sectoral collaboration, but these are also the barriers the project tries to overcome.

b) The strengthening of a concerted action among all relevant stakeholders and institutions which collaborated with a project to put such a mechanism in place. This would have meant above all, seeking the support of FAO Representatives in all countries for advocacy work on the establishment of such a mechanism within the respective national Line Ministries. If the collaboration with EAC would not work out, a stronger collaboration with the political arm of the Nile Basin Initiative (NBI) rather than with its technical arm, even with IGAD, guiding the RPSC in a better way to establish such a mechanism, utilizing the valuable presence of TerrAfrica in the RPSC better to integrate the mechanism through NEPAD or TerrAfrica and not only for financing.

c) It would have probably been appropriate to hire an extra staff member under FAO to coordinate this task, as it went far beyond the mandate and the professional education of the hired project staff.

One positive result of this output was the initiative to register FFS officially as organizational entities, which facilitated financial arrangements and ensured sustainability.

Output 1.2: An efficient basin-wide knowledge management system is established to support information requirements and decision-making processes at all levels

This activity was planned to be implemented during the first two years of the project. The steps to reach this output were to put an environmental monitoring and information system (EMIS) in place, supported by GIS and RS tools, linked to the LVEMP and NELSAP systems for which a pilot district level GIS system was to be developed for each country. The underlying idea was to map the land use systems for the coordination of the transboundary system through the expert-knowledge based LADA methodologies, mapping major ecological parameters on national scales, and downscaling this information further to district and community scales by using biophysical measures and participatory appraisal tools to start from there the community actions within the other outcomes.

These targeted activities were comprehensively implemented in 21 districts and the expected output was fully reached. A GIS system/RS tools were used to establish or consolidate maps for all four countries. The major parameters of the initial maps such as soils, precipitation, livestock number, poverty rates and land degradation were integrated into a digital elevation model. Meanwhile, QM maps produced with the support of the project included various types of erosion and land use systems and many others variables[13]. In addition, complementary land use maps at the district level were compiled by governmental institutions. The resulting maps were used to identify project intervention zones. However, as the boundaries of project intervention were determined by the basin boundaries within each country, some of these parameters at the national level did not change within the whole boundary. Changes happened mainly in some areas where soil types and land degradation types showed further subunits within the basin area in each country. It gave sufficient targeted information to prioritize larger areas of degraded land.

Output 1.3: Project Monitoring and Evaluation systems supporting TAMP implementation and decision making

Regarding the Monitoring and Evaluation system established within the project, it is not clear why it was an integral part of the project and not part of the project's M&E system to monitor processes, progress and impacts of the project itself. The review indicates that the reasons for this might be that an M&E system was to be established to monitor a transboundary mechanism outside the project itself. However, it turns out that the M&E framework developed by the project is indeed related to the monitoring of the project itself, and therefore should not have been a project expected output.

A consultancy assigned to the M&E system described the various indicators used for monitoring the performance of the project; including the measurement of progress toward

[13] https://www.wocat.net/fileadmin/user_upload/documents/QM/MapQuest_V1.pdf
https://www.wocat.net/en/methods/spatial-assessment-qm/questionnaires.html

outcomes, outputs, Impact, using progress indicators and their respective targets. The consultancy also established a table for stakeholder involvement into monitoring activities. As described in the table below, it includes 7 parties to be involved into monitoring activities.

M&E Stakeholders and Responsibilities

Stakeholders	M&E Responsabilities
LTU-FAO	Review the progress and result reports and propose adjustments Send progress reports and budget to GEF/TCI
RPC	Prepare the progress report (6 months, and annual) Submit workplan and budget on time Share minutes meetings of RPSC
M&E consultant (when needed)	Review/update the M&E plan, develop the M&E forms Provide support in participatory M&E and for the design of impact assessments
NPM	Prepare annual work plan and targets Prepare the progress report and send it to RPC Share minutes meetings of NPSC
DPF- district project facilitator	Provide information to NPM on activities carried out, problems encountered, etc at district level
Extension officer, NGO, service provider	Provide information to DPF and NPM on activities carried out, problems encountered, etc at catchment/community level
FFS facilitator	Provide information to DPF and NPM on activities carried out, problems encountered, etc at FFS level

The review conducted for this final evaluation indicates that much of the content of the M&E system developed through a consultancy was already covered in the project document and that overall, this system was very complex. This remark was already noted during the MTR and a recommendation was made to reduce the number of indicators. The end-result was an M&E system that did not meet the goal of monitoring a transboundary mechanism and furthermore, a system that was not realistically implementable in its entirety.

One possible reason explaining the difficulties in implementing this M&E system might lie in the fact, that the project did not support any applied research to accompany the implementation of project activities and provide more quantitative information to the M&E system. Overall, the limited use of the M&E system and the absence of an applied research component have let to the general lack of impact data throughout the project, particularly data on global benefits such as carbon sequestration, nutrient and hydrological cycling, but also on local benefits like yields and incomes, etc. This limitation has affected the project throughout its cycle.

The final outputs of the M&E mechanism resulted in the following products:

- Quarterly Reports (52) National
- Quarterly Reports (6) Regional
- Six-monthly Reports (10) Regional
- Project Implementation Review (PIR) Reports (4)
- Mid-term evaluation Report

<u>Output 1.4</u>: Kagera TAMP project management structures are operational and effective

The output was fully met without further challenges. Project management structures, including Regional and National Project Steering Committees and a regional Technical Advisory Committee were established and effectively functioning. However, the presence of this expected output within the project strategy is problematic. It seems to imply that the project management structure would be identical to the management structure of the expected transboundary mechanism to be developed under outcome 1. It was not clear why it was added under this outcome when in fact, there is the outcome #5 which is to provide an effective project management structure to manage the project.

Output 2.1: Sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems (SLaM) mainstreamed in national development policies and programmes, enhancing synergy among sector strategies and across the river basin

Mainstreaming SLaM into national policies and programs was viewed as mostly dialoguing with the respective institutions to consider SLaM as an appropriate technology within their plans. This was achieved in all four countries; however, only in planning, but not in budgeting due mostly to the lack of budget resources. The review indicates that too much emphasis was given to this issue and that when considering the scope of this output, it should have been simply an activity part of another output and not an output in itself. Moreover, the various achievements made under this output did not seem to be targeted nor coordinated, such as the translation and distribution of NRM policy and legislation documents, the organization of conflict resolution seminars, etc.

Output 2.2: Regulatory actions developed and used to promote - or remove existing barriers to - sustainable land and agro-ecosystem management.

Various institutions have been created to guide SLM planning at the catchment level like the catchment committees, to guide the preparation of land use plans and the establishment of by-laws to promote and sustain SLM practices and environmental protection activities (river bank protection, woodlot protection, pasture management and fire control, etc.). However, although the project had developed TORs for catchment committees, these were, in most cases, not functional, or even non-existent. Where catchment committees existed before the intervention of the project, such as in Rwanda, these committees were not ready to work according to the project supported TOR, since their traditional role had been a different one. On the other hand, other committees established by the project, particularly the saving groups, worked very well and achieved a lot in a short time.

Training activities on land and natural resources conflicts were based on a former consultancy report on these issues and were rather based on schoolbook methods rather than addressing real practically existing problems that the communities faced.

The project drafted various policy recommendations, particularly in Tanzania (on land use planning and management, and transboundary issues) and in Burundi, However, these policy recommendations reached visibility by governmental authorities only in Burundi.

With respect to land tenure issues, activities supported by the project were mostly limited to awareness raising on these issues. Despite that a study was conducted on land tenure issues and that training activities on managing land conflicts were implemented, these activities did not make sufficient reference to ongoing conflicts and that land tenure issues are often dependent

on existing policies within each country. For instance, in Rwanda, the cadastral service to ensure land tenure security is fully in place. However, in Uganda, it is still in its infancy. Thus, the project was limited in being able to address these issues since its focus was on SLM and not on land tenure. It would have required additional resources to make a change and improve the policy framework related to land tenure in place in each country. Nevertheless, one member of the RPSC, the representative of the Ministry of Lands in Uganda, is promoting actively the issue as an important precondition for SLaM implementation in her institution.

Output 2.3: A coherent strategic planning framework developed and implemented (from river basin to district/provincial and community levels) to support SLM efforts by rural communities.

The major achievements under this expected output can be seen in the development of land use plans, and the application of land use policies through participatory strategies for SLaM.

It also involved assessments of status and trends of NRM parameters and their costed options, as well as the drafting of community and district implementation action plans for improved wetland management, which were enabled by training activities conducted under the previous output. The activities were all executed, except the assessment of cost-options, which was reported by a national consultant hired in Rwanda who mentioned that there was a gap in the assessment of costing options. According to the plan, activities conducted under this output achieved indeed synergies among various measures such as the energy targets, and the land management and biodiversity targets. The energy target relieved partly the burden of collecting wood for cooking on women.

The training activities received by policy makers were of excellent quality; they were partly given by the FAO project manager herself. The contents are mainly equivalent to the field courses of a 3rd semester curricula of a master program in landscape or NRM studies or agriculture and soil sciences. The Evaluation Team found that if these efforts would have been linked with some applied research efforts, results would have been available for applying adaptive management.

However, not all indicators to measure progress under this output were fulfilled. For instance, action plans for transboundary movements were not met; due mostly to the fact that this issue was already poorly addressed under outcome #1.

Output 3.1: Methods and approaches to promote the adoption of SLM practices and agro-ecosystems (pastoral and cropping) are identified, developed and validated through participatory processes.

The establishment of community management plans and all preparation activities for component #4 took place under this output; including the participatory diagnosis of resources, the preparation of training and awareness raising materials, the development of income generation and saving strategies and the first farm demonstrations.

Under this output, the following achievements were made:

- community action plans (68)
- micro-catchments (46)
- pasture/ range areas (15)
- target wetlands (10)

- riverbanks stabilized (1,000 km)

Additionally, 135 community groups were mobilized, their capacities developed and each one developed a community action Plan.

Output 3.2: The quality of services provided to rural communities enhanced, particularly through inter-sectoral approaches that build on local knowledge and innovations for improved agro-ecosystems management.

This output is the extension of the former one, where the materials prepared under output 3.1. were applied in various training activities and courses. Activities conducted under this output initiated the high vibrancy observed on the project by the Evaluation Team. These activities were well implemented and well received by communities who particularly appreciated the materials distributed as well as the important technological innovations which were put into place by the project through the alignment of traditional technologies with the best practices disseminated by WOCAT.

FFS are the main instrument to promote and moderate the adoption of new SLM technologies. The implementation of the FFS approach turned out to be the highlight of the project. This approach was considered as revolutionary in contrast to various blanket technologies promoted by governmental extension agencies or to the conservation agriculture approach. It also enhanced the social cohesion among farmers' groups and the dynamics of their interactions.

Community Catchment Groups: Community catchment groups are the overarching units to FFS groups and received their own specific ToRs. The major tasks of these groups were to make decisions on how to integrate SLM technologies into the overall catchment, basin or agroecosystem. However, the Evaluation Team found that these groups are less active, and in some cases, not even functional. It was observed that there are differences among countries; these groups worked best in Burundi, however, in other countries they often do not exist.

Demonstration sites started under this output. Those visited by the Evaluation Team were, in most cases, excellent performing sites. However, many of them were established on former grassland, which are not appropriate places to demonstrate rehabilitation of degraded land. This type of land re-accumulated a lot of organic matter, and the mineralization process during its transformation process releases a lot of nutrients, which distorts the real picture of the impact the technology might have on degraded lands.

Technically, demonstration sites for restoration of degraded land should be located on real degraded land, which was degraded from overuse and over-exploitation. It would demonstrate the real impacts of land improvement through new SLM technologies.

Another element implemented under this output was the Agro-Ecological Assessment (AEOA). It included field assessments which enabled farmers to identify site characteristics, plant diseases and production functions. While the finger test method used for soil classification are typical methods to identify soil types and to establish or verify district soil maps, the AEOA also claimed to be able to assess nutrient deficiencies using a finger test. This claim can hardly be valid; at least as long as there was no reference to standard data on nutrient availability and demands for different soil types and crops for which no evidence was found. With respect to the identification of plant diseases one would have wished that these would have included traditional indicators, which are also abundantly available and merged into a

modern knowledge system.

The purpose of AEOAs were not clear, and findings from the Evaluation Team deviated from information reported in project reports.

It was reported that an AEOA was mostly a refinement to describe a site. However, according to various informants met during this evaluation, farmers collected large amount of data to describe production functions in three stages and yields and this information was transcribed in exercise books. If these data would have been evaluated, the AEOAs could have provided a baseline, which could have been used to assess how SLM technologies would work, provide feedback to Farmer Field School participants to adapt the technologies selected and to assess how these technologies would impact farmers' yields. However, this feedback did not happen, and the data collected and assessed by farmers were never used for further purposes. This collected data was never integrated as parameters into the overall monitoring system.

Furthermore, the project did not support any research activities to assess quantitatively the impacts of the WOCAT tools. This is a significant limitation since agricultural technologies and ecosystem assessments do not only imply, what to do, but also how much to do of what. Therefore, an important element of this component, that is the collection of lessons learnt, could not take place and used for adaptive management.

<u>Output 4.1</u>: Participatory land management plans are developed and implemented in targeted communities, micro-catchments and wider land units.

A lot of activities took place under this output following the MTR, so that it could meet its revised targets of putting about 43,000 ha under SLaM. As a result, this target was almost achieved. 135 community groups were mobilized, their capacities developed and each group developed a community action plan. A total of 174 water ponds were constructed exceeding the target, and 95km of riverbanks were protected, meaning this target was not met.

Various SLM Practices had been applied by communities including those below:

- Stabilization of river banks with bamboo
- Improvement of natural pastures/rangelands
- Restoration of vegetation cover (Planting of trees, agroforestry, woodlots, fodder, enclosure for protection of natural vegetation, by-laws established against bush fires)
- Soil erosion control structures (progressive and bench terraces)
- Gully healing
- Soil moisture conservation
- Integrated soil fertility management
- Crop and Livestock integrated (goats, pigs) for manure and income generation

It has been mainly the enhanced productivity through these SLM technologies that created the commitments of communities to the FFS approach. These commitments were observed by the fact that most members remained in FFS groups, even when funds were delayed over long periods, as it happened in Tanzania.

<u>Output 4.2:</u> Improved land use and agro-ecosystem management practices are successfully adopted by farmers and herders in targeted communities and replicated in other areas.

The introduction of SLM technologies into long-established farming systems, like banana systems, banana coffee systems, etc. was obviously a long-lasting process. The higher yielding crops or the un-infested banana plant materials were welcomed rapidly, however, the adoption of more labor-intensive technologies, such as ditches and trenches and all kind of protection activities against erosion, were adopted at a slower rate.

Exchange and dissemination of SLM technologies were conducted with great enthusiasm. There was a particular high vibrancy where SLM activities achieved the highest results and the greatest support from governments. The reported multiplication factors ranged between 2 to 10, with some cases at 20. In one of the countries even the President requested to have access to these new SLM technologies for applying them on his farm. Greatest successes were achieved, where SLM technologies were unknown, such as composting, using manure, green manure, sound plant material against banana bacterial wilt, cassava mosaic virus, certain value chain, etc. The factors of success were also dependent on the overarching production factors at each farm level, such as farm size, soil quality, climate etc.

135 community groups implemented SLaM, including soil fertility management, erosion control, tree planting and biodiversity conservation. Manure application, agroforestry, water retention ditches/trenches and mulching were the main SLM practices adopted by households. This is probably because of their high effectiveness in replenishing soil fertility to meet short term needs.

A total of 7,401 farmers and other stakeholders were trained on improved SLM systems, albeit the number of herders was much lower. Nevertheless, all targets for this output were met.

<u>Output 4.3</u>: Market opportunities and other cost-benefit sharing mechanisms for the Payment of Ecosystem Services identified, demonstrated and promoted among land users.

The review indicated that the planned activities under this output were not comprehensive enough to ensure the delivery of PES. It would have required an effective monitoring system of environmental stocks and flows to be in place, including the related training and other capacity development needs. Instead the project supported several consultancies and one internship on the topic, which ended as not supplying all the necessary data and connections for implementing a PES, except in Burundi where it was accepted for supporting hydroelectricity through the protection of community forests. The payments were covered by the government.

There were also options for PES in hydroelectricity in Tanzania and Uganda, which were not implemented due to the absence of a buyer and also because of a lack of support from the government. In Rwanda, potential buyers were identified, which were producers of Stevia and the national water services. Furthermore, the MTR, recommended to stop any new PES activities, which might have been a loss of opportunities. In the meantime, the project mimicked payments for watershed conservation in the upper catchment. What can be concluded from this experience is, that the project has been quite unrealistic, when expecting PES to contribute to the co-financing of the project.

The highest economic gains were achieved through the conversion of low-intensity farming systems towards high intensity farming systems where land availability allowed extensive land use systems. Such examples were found in Uganda where former cattle herders were able to

convert their lands towards banana farming, fruit and vegetable production, and managed even to create synergies between gully restoration and cash crop production such as sugar cane. However, the project did not assess, if and how far these success stories could be up-scaled, given that the closer we get to urban centers, the higher the land scarcity per capita is. The Evaluation Team also found that there was a high potential for economic gain in the future through pasture improvement. Seed production for fodder grasses has high economic returns. However, it would be useful to compare the biophysical and economic productivity of fodder grasses versus fodder trees. Highest economic returns were also achieved in fruit and vegetable farming, and the project had also found appropriate markets for these products.

The project put also some efforts in enhancing the number of livestock within the farming systems and agro-ecosystems for manure production and income generation. Regarding manure production, livestock concentrates nutrients from larger places into smaller places, but does not produce nutrients. Therefore, the carrying capacities for livestock on ecosystems and farming systems should be carefully assessed. For instance, "highly productive pigs", which were the standard varieties distributed by Vi-Agroforestry in Rwanda, were partly immediately sold again by individuals and exchanged for local pigs. Income generation from livestock was mostly achieved through cascade systems. Additionally, the question of preference between keeping the livestock in group farms or as individual farms to generate incomes was also controversial. In some areas, it was considered as preferable to us the group farm systems, recognizing that on individual farms too many animals would die, or that farmers would try to avoid giving away their lambs. The project should have provided calculations of the carrying capacities of watersheds for ruminants and assessed the quantity of wastes on farms which could be fed to pigs, to assess how much of this approach could be scaled up.

Annex 8: List of Activities Implemented by the Project

Capacity Building/Training Activities in each Country

Outcome #3 of the Kagera –TAMP project Log-Frame states "*Capacity and knowledge are enhanced at all levels for the promotion of – and technical support for – sustainable management of land and agro-ecosystems in the basin".* In this respect, the training/capacity building activities implemented in each country are presented here.

BURUNDI

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
9-16/11/ 2010	Gitega	Atelier sur l'élaboration de la carte nationale des systèmes d'utilisation du sol	GIS experts	8	GIS experts on LUS, QM
17 – 21/01/ 2011	King'sConference Center, à Bujumbura	Un atelier sur l'évaluation géographique de la Dégradation des terres et gestion durable des terres au Burundi	Multidisciplinary team (Govstuff)	34	QM approches, Land use systems, WOCAT/LADA
21.03 au 08.04.2011	Centre BeneTerezia-Gitega	FFS - TOT	Extension workers	25	la formation et le soutien des groupes d'agriculteurs (CEP, éleveurs, associations d'utilisateurs des terres et des eaux, etc.) à des fins de mise à l'essai et d'adaptation locales de techniques améliorées (conservation des sols et des eaux, **collecte et retenue collinaire de l'eau pluviale,** amélioration des pâturages, cultures fourragères, agroforesterie, agriculture de conservation à l'aide des outils adaptés, et ainsi de suite) et en reliant la gestion des ressources à la création de revenus
24.05.2011	Muramvya	Atelier provincial pour la validation des cartes sur la dégradation des terres à l'intention des cadres de Mwaro, Muramvya et Gitega	Govstuff, Policy makers	50	Types, causes, impacts de dégradation des terres,
25.05.2011	Karusi	Atelier provincial pour la validation des cartes sur la dégradation des terres à l'intention des cadres de Karusi et Kirundo	Govstuff, Policy makers,	50	Types, causes, impacts de dégradation des terres,

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
27-29/06/2011	Kayanza	Formation des experts pour évaluer les meilleures pratiques de GDTA à l'aide du QT et QA	Multidisciplinary experts	26	Pratiques agronomiques, végétales, structures physiques et mode de gestion. Compréhension du contenu des questionnaires QT et QA
20.7.2011	Centre AMAHORO Kirundo	Atelier de validation d'un plan d'action pour la protection des paysages aquatiques de Bugesera	Extension workers and policy makers	91	Importance socio-économique et écologique des zones tampons, menaces, stratégies pour la protection des zones humides
08.12. 2011	Kayokwe Mwaro	Atelier de sensibilisation de l'importance du bambou dans le cadre de la stabilisation des berges des rivières, l'atténuation et adaptation aux changements climatiques et la sécurité alimentaire	Extension workers and policy makers	60	Conservation des eaux et sols, river bank protection with bamboo, different use of bamboo products, importance of bamboo on CCA.
13 – 19. 02. 2012	Gashora, Rwanda	Une session de formation des experts multidisciplinaires sur l'évaluation de la dégradation des terres et gestion durable des terres à l'aide de la méthode LADA	Multidisciplinary experts	9	LADA, analyse socio-économique, analyse végétale, sol, etc.
27 – 29.02. 2012	Kigali, Rwanda	Une réunion de planification stratégique du projet	NPM, RPC, LTU, ME consultant	5	Collaboration transfrontalière, indicateurs de suivi-évaluation du projet
02-04 Avril 2012	King's Conference	Un atelier de correction et de validation des cartes LUS et celles de la dégradation des terres (LUS et Qmmaps)	GIS experts, multidisciplinaires experts	34	
16-19.04. 2012	Accolade Hotel, Gitega	Recyclage des Animateurs des CEP et des facilitateurs provinciaux du Projet TAMP Kagera	Extension workers	30	Rappel étapes du processus de mise en œuvre des CEP, mesures de conservation des eaux et sols, protocoles d'expérimentation, collecte et valorisation des eaux pluviales
Avril 2012	Nyakirwa, Mwaro	La restauration et l'amélioration des pâturages en province de Mwaro », l'activité de *Formation sur les techniques d'installation et des meilleures espèces fourragères*	Farmers	90	Démonstrations d'installation d'une association de graminées et légumineuses fourragères (*Panicum maximum*/*Stylosanthesguianensis et Desmodiumintortum/Brachiariamulato*) au niveau des CEP

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
12 – 13.06. 2012	Kirundo et Karusi	Formation des formateurs sur les techniques de fabrication et d'utilisation des foyers améliorés	FFS group	90	Réduction de la déforestation, gain du temps , amélioration de la santé des enfants et des femmes, économie monétaire
28-29.11. 2012	Commune Buhinga , Province de Karusi	un atelier de sensibilisation pour la gestion des étangs piscicoles de Buhiga à l'intention des pisciculteurs	FFS group	43	la qualité des eaux dans l'augmentation de la productivité piscicole,technique d'installation des happaspour alevinage et démonstration, technique de capture du frais et des alevins en étangs à l'aide des épuisettes et démonstration, préparation d'aliment pour poisson et distribution d'aliments pré préparés
2011, 2012, 2013	Mwaro, Gitega, Karusi, Kirundo , Muramvya	Renforcement des capacités institutionnelles, techniques et organisationnelles des CEP/FFS	FFS group members	1215/ an	les techniques d'élevage des chèvres et porcs, les techniques de confection de foyers améliorés à bois de feu, le maraîchage, les maladies des bananiers et leurs moyens de lutte. Certains ont fait des essais d'expérimentation sur la culture de pomme de terre, de haricot et de maïs
Juin, Juillet-Août 2013	Mwaro, Gitega, Karusi, Kirundo , Muramvya	Formation sur les techniques de compostage en vue d'améliorer la fertilité des sols	FFS group members	1215	Compost en fosse et compost sur le tas, activateurs de la décomposition
22 – 25.10. 2013	Club du Lac Tanganyika	Atelier technique régional et réunion du Comité de Pilotage Régional du projet	Policy makers	40	État d'avancement des activités dans les 4 pays, suivi de recommandations des réunions régionales antérieures
Janvier – Avril 2014	Mwaro et Gitega	Formation sur les techniques de multiplication de semences maraîchères (Nyakibari, Gishubi, Ruvubu (Gitega)	FFS groups	340	Semences d'amarante et d'aubergines
Janvier – Avril 2014	Mwaro, Gitega, Karusi et kirundo	Formation sur les techniques de confection des Kicthen-garden et des foyers améliorés pour garantir l'économie du bois énergie	FFS groups	1045	Techniques de confection des KG, types de semences maraîchères, techniques d'arrosage,

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
Janvier – déc 2014	Mwaro, Gitega, Karusi et kirundo	Formation sur l'intégration agro-sylvo-zootechnique	FFS groups	1215	Conservation des eaux et sols, installation des cultures fourragères sur les courbes de niveau, agroforesterie, introduction des animaux
13–17. 04. 2015		Formation des membres des CEP des communes de Gishibi et de Gitega (province Gitega) ainsi que ceux de la Commune de Busoni (Kirundo sur les techniques apicoles à Giheta (Nyakibari, Gishubi, Ruvubu (Gitega)	FFS groups	40	Maladies des abeilles, plantes méllifères, hygiène des abeilles et équipement requis.
15-18.07 2014	Accolade Hotel Gitega	Recyclage des Animateurs des CEP et des facilitateurs provinciaux du Projet TAMP Kagera (phase II)	Extension workers	30	1.Agri-business (identification et sélection d'une activité génératrice de revenus, analyse de la rentabilité et Planification des affaires, 2. réseautage des CEP, 3. Processus de montage des coopératives, gestion intégrée de la fertilité des sols et le maraîchage
31.03 au 5.04.2015		Formation des Représentants des CEP sur les mécanismes de constitution des coopératives agricoles	Extension workers, policy makers, FFS representative members	135	Statuts et règlement intérieur des coopératives, enregistrement des statuts, la gestion et comptabilité d'une coopérative.
08-09. 04.2015	Mwaro	Des Représentants des enseignants des Ecoles Fondamentales formés sur les techniques de confection et de conduite des Kitchen gardens. Ceux derniers sont appelés à transférer ces connaissances aux écoliers	Secondary school Teachers	137	Outillage nécessaire, mélange du fumier et d'une bonne terre, techniques d'arrosage, semis ou repiquage.
14-15.04.15	Muyinga, Karusi et Gitega	Des représentants des CEP de Kirundo ont effectué une visite d'échange d'expérience dans les provinces de Muyinga, Karusi et Gitega	FFS groups	35	Transfert du savoir-faire sur les techniques de conduites des exploitations de bananiers, gestion durable des terres, pisciculture, le maraîchage

RWANDA

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
17th – 21st Feb 2014	Ngoma District	Refresher Training Course for Kagera TAMP SLM FFS core Farmer Facilitators, Agronomists and Service Providers	FFS facilitators, Local government and NGO staff	30	SLM implementation and monitoring. Agro-ecosystem assessment.
17th – 21st Dec 2012	Ear/Kibungo Diocese-Training Center	SLMFFS training of trainers refresher course.	FFS facilitators, Local government and NGO staff	30	SLM implementation and monitoring. Agro-ecosystem assessment.
31st Mar – 1st Apr 2015	Faraja Hotel, Musanze District	Operationalization and Training of District Committees for Hydrographic Basins in the Yanze River Catchment	District and Sector officials, water users' representatives; civil society and local NGOs representatives.	77	Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) – policies, legislation and practices; Kagera TAMP SLM technologies and approaches.
23rd – 25th June 2015	DEREVA Hotel, Rwamagana District	Operationalization and Training of District Committees for HydrographicBasins in the Upper Kagera River Catchment	District and Sector officials, water users' representatives; civil society and local NGOs representatives.	75	Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM) – policies, legislation and practices; Kagera TAMP SLM technologies and approaches.
20th – 24th April 2015	Hotel Beausejour, Kigali	Kagera Transboundary Agro ecosystem Management Project: Training on the Ex-Ante Carbon-balance Tool (EX-ACT)	Kagera TAMP NPMs and Service Provider staff	12	EXACT Tool
5th – 9th 2013	Four Steps Hotel, Huye District	land and natural resources conflict resolution	District staff in charge of land and natural resources management	29	Conflict resolution
25th – 29th Oct. 2010	Rwamagana district	training of Field Farmer School Facilitators	FFS facilitators	16	SLM implementation and monitoring. Agro-ecosystem assessment.
18th – 22ndJul 2011	Rwamagana district	SLM Technology Assessment in Rwanda (LADA-WOCAT TOOLS).	Central and local government. SLM experts and Q_T& Q_A enumerators	20	LADA-WOCAT tools
22nd Nov – 3rd Dec 2010	National University of Rwanda (NUR)	Training on generating Maps of Land Use system classes	GIS practitioners from Rwanda,	12	GIS tools and applications

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
	Centre for Geographical Information System (GIS), Huye district		Tanzania and Uganda		
13th-17th December 2010	Huye district	for Land degradation and Sustainable Land Management assessment using LADA/WOCAT QM methodology	Central and local government and NGO	33	LADA/WOCAT QM methodology

TANZANIA

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
Nov. 2010	Kigali (Rwanda)	LUS maps development in Kigali Rwanda (Nov. 2010)	GIS Professionals	4	Development of Land use and degradation maps (regional)
Jan 2011	Masaka (Uganda)	Expert assessment and mapping of LD and SLM practices in Tanzania	Districts NR subject Matter Specialists	13	Confirmation of land use and degradation types in the selected project implementation districts and proposals for activities to implement
Nov. 2011	Missenyi (Bukoba)	SLM-FFS training November 2011	Selected District and Sites project facilitators	20	Understanding & addressing LD/SLM using the FFS/PLAR methodologies; Improve facilitators knowledge and skills in facilitating implementation
May-August 2011		Village land use planning and mapping	District Subject Matter Specialists, village leaders, councillors	30 DSMS 90 village leaders and councillors	Training experts and community leaders in developing village land use plans & maps. 5 VLUP developed by project and 13 VLUP developed by districts using own sourced resources.
March 2012	Kigali (Rwanda)	Technologies (T) and approaches (A) documentation using QT & QA questionnaires	Selected District Subject Matter Specialists and National Project Managers	3	assessment and documentation of successful SLM technologies using QT & QA forms. Trainees later trained 20 (5 from each district) who conducted the documentation.
February 2012		LD/SLM assessment training	District & Field implementing staff	13	The training was used in project

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
		using LADA/WOCAT tools/methodology			implementation sites characterization and development of community action plans
April and May 2012	Masaka Uganda	Watershed Management and Planning training, Masaka, April and May 2012.	District land use planning experts	4	To strengthen land use planning experts knowledge in adopting the catchment approach in LD/SLM.
June 2012	Missenyi, Bukoba	SLM-FFS training phase two	Selected District and Sites project facilitators	20	Sharing experiences of FFS sites establishment, development of the FFS curriculum and conducting Agro-ecosystems analysis (AESA), learning by doing approach.
July 2012	Kyazi and Bujuruga catchments in Bukoba and Karagwe districts	Use of the LADA local level SLM assessment tools	University students specialized in environment management	4	Field practice's training of application of the Land Degradation Assessment (LADA) tools in land management related PRAs
April 2013	Kayanga, Karagwe district	SLM training for gap filling	Recruited service providers, district and sites facilitators	20	Recruited Service Providers exposure to LD/SLM and its components i.e. agronomy with emphasis to: SWC, Agroforestry; farm management as well as aspects of data collection, processing, cost/benefit analysis and reporting.
April 2013	Kirushya Clinic (Farmers Training Centre)	Training of farmer animators is specific topics to be able to facilitate other farmers	Innovative SLM farmers selected and trained as farmer animators	13	To improve effectiveness in project implementation especially with inadequate extension staff to cover divers SLM activities at field implementation level. Activities included: Nursery establishment & management, compost making and application, contours construction, Farmyard manure management.
July 2013	Bunazi Missenyi district	Training on policy, laws and conflicts resolution on land	Village chairmen, ward executive officer and	44	To train on natural resources and land use conflict resolution;

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
		uses and other natural resources in the micro catchment areas of Kagera river basin	counsellors; Legal officers and experts from different disciplines such as environments, forest, agriculture and natural resources among others from the 4 implementing districts.		Familiarization on how conflicts are resolved; Overview of natural resources, what policies, laws, regulations exist; Overview of participatory approaches and tools; and Create awareness to the participants on the integrated policies, regulations, laws and acts on natural resources and land use.
Mar 2014	Kirushya Clinic, Ngara district	Management of Savings and Credit Schemes	FFS-SLM Groups	50	Familiarization of community members with establishment and management of on-going savings and credit associations
May 2014	Kabirizi Farmer Extension Centre, Bukoba	Conflict management and resolution	FFS-SLM Groups	75	
June 2014	Kayanga, Karagwe district	Value chain analysis	FFS-SLM Groups	75	District facilitators and Community members familiarization to production and marketing systems of farm products
June 2014	Magereza PS, Ngara district	Vegetative propagation	FFS-SLM Groups	75	Project and non-project community members exposure to horticultural crops production and marketing for established income generating group through hort. Crops production
Nov 2014	Kayanga, Karagwe district	Agriculture products processing	FFS-SLM Groups	35	Selected community members (bananas, cassava and horticulture crop producers) in processing and marketing of agricultural products.
Nov 2014	Kayanga Karagwe district	Entrepreneurship	FFS-SLM Groups	50	Community members training agriculture enterprises selection and farming as a business

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
Feb 2015	Rusumo catchment	Hay and animal health care	Selected livestock keepers	20	Training in sustainable and effective use of pastures after successful rehabilitation of degraded pastures in most sites
Feb 2015	Kibingo catchment	Contours construction	Selected farmer animators for contours construction for SWC	25	Strengthening farmer animators' confidence in construction of physical contours for erosion control following unexpected transfers of extension staff
April 2015	Kayanga Karagwe	Networks formation and their management	Selected group representatives of successful income generating activities	24	Establishing FFS-SLM network for Kagera TAMP farmers with successful income generating activities and registering their FFS groups in order to establish a group bargaining power of their produce

UGANDA

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
December 2010	Kigali	QM (TOT)	Research Institutions. Initial training of experts in GIS to map LD in countries	2	QM mapping degradation and practices, GIS. Maps are available
February 2011	Masaka	WOCAT QM Workshop	Staff from GOVT, NGO, CBO and districts were selected and trained	36	QM techniques, Ground assessment, LD Mapping and coding, Data available
November 2011	Mbarara	TOT of FFS Methodology in district watersheds by regional consultant	NGO, CBO, GOV staff were trained	40	Group dynamics, AESA and Concept of FFS, M and E by farmers and facilitators. FFS for crops and livestock. Report available
February 2012	Bukoba	LD Assessment and watershed planning	Selected staff from GOVT, CBO, NGO to come and cary out the activity	12	LD assessment, PRA, Field assessment, livelihood assessment

Dates	Venue	Title of Training Event	Cadre of trainees	No. of Trainees	Main Topics covered/ Comment
April 2012	Masaka	Watershed planning and land degradation assessment	Selected staff from GOVT, CBO, NGO to come were trained to plan and make assessment	36	Participatory planning, objective and problem tree, catchment planning, watershed mapping for current and future. Report available
2012	Kabale	Training of district staff on PES in Uganda by international consultant	selected GOVT, CBO staff trained in PES	14	Market opportunities in PES, cost benefit analysis, tools for assessment, challenges. BTO reports
June 2013	Training in WOCAT methodology for UNDP cattle corridor project	Selected Project and District staff of Nakasongora, Kiboga and Mubende	Project staff district staff for 3 districts	10 (P) 30 (D)	WOCAT, SLM. Land degradation, QT and QA, Principles of WOCAT,
July 2013	Mbarara	Watershed Facilitators training	Selected Watershed based CBO, Govt FARMERS were trained in FFS methodology and AESA	32	Fieldwork on AESA, FFS dynamics, monitoring and evaluation. Report available
July 2013	Kabale	Questionnaire of Approaches and Questionnaire of Technologies	Selected GOV, CBO staff were trained in filling the forms and uploading in WOCAT website	24	Approaches, Technology assessment. GPS reading, sketches. The technology
October 2013	Kabale	Natural resource conflict management	Selected GOVT, CBO and service providers trained	30	Conflict resolution, natural resources, SLM. Policies,
December 2014	Kabale	Monitoring and Evaluation of SLM by farmer field schools	Selected GOVT, CBO and service providers trained		M and E, reporting
April 2015	Kigali	Carbon measurement and assessment	Selected staff from Research Institutions, CBO	2	Carbon assessment, Watershed Questionnaire

List of Workshops and Meetings held in each Country

BURUNDI

Dates	Venue	Title of Workshop/ meeting	Cadre of participants	No. of participants	Output (Minutes, Proceedings)
20th and 21st October' 10		project inception/ launching workshop	Policy makers, project coordinators, NGO	60	Project presentation to partners, official gov, FAO representative
22th October' 10	Celexon ex-Orphan's AID in Bujumbura	First National Project steering committee meeting	NPSC members	17	Project presentation to partners, NPSC TOR,
08.04.2011	Bujumbura	Second national steering committee meeting	NPSC members	17	Annual work plan and budget adoption
03.11. 2011		La troisième réunion du Comité de pilotage National du Projet Kagera TAMP au Burundi	NPSC members	17	Etat d'avancement des activités, prévisions des activités pour Nov et décembre 2011
26 Avril 2012	Bujumbura, Burundi	Quatrième réunion du Comité de Pilotage National du Projet	NPSC members	17	Analyse du Bilan des réalisations de l'Année 2011, Présentation du Programme d'activités et budget annuel 2012
7-11.05. 2012	FAO HQ, Rome	Participer à la semaine dédiée aux Terres et l'Eau	NPM	1	Ndabiroreresalvator et FidelisKaihura
24-26.5.2012	Mwaro, Gitega, Karusi, Kirundo et Muramvya	Visite des réalisations du projet dans les 5 provinces		17	Etat d'aménagement des bassins versants, conservation des eaux et sols, protection des zones tampons, agroforesterie, reboisement, activités génératrices de revenu
09-21/9/2012	Rio de Janeiro, Brésil	une visite d'échange d'expérience au Brésil en matière d'aménagement des bassins versants, gestion des ressources forestières et le paiement des services environnementaux	Projects coordinators	12	2 burundais : NPM et Un haut cadre du MINAGRIE

Dates	Venue	Title of Workshop/ meeting	Cadre of participants	No. of participants	Output (Minutes, Proceedings)
06.05.2014	Pearl Residence, Hotel, Bujumbura	Sixième réunion du Comité de Pilotage National du Projet TAMP Kagera	NPSC members	17	1.Adoption du Programme de Travail et Budget annuel 2014, 2.Validation du rapport annuel 2013, 3.Echange sur les recommandations du 2ième Réunion du Comité de Pilotage Régional du Projet
05 Mars 2015	l'Orphan's Residence, Bujumbura	Septième réunion ordinaire du Comité de Pilotage national du projet TAMP Kagera	NPSC members	17	Adoption du Programme d'activités pour la période restante au projet càd jusqu'au 30 Juin 2015, Validation du rapport annuel 2014, Divers.

RWANDA

Dates	Venue	Title of Workshop/ meeting	Cadre of participants	No. of participants	Output (Minutes, Proceedings)
17th – 18th March 2011	Hotel Milles Collines, Kigali	First Regional Project Steering Committee	Central and local government staff; NGOs and civil society representatives, from the four riparian countries	12	Minutes.
5th Oct 2010	Club house La palice Gashora	Project launching workshop	Central and local government staff; NGOs and civil society representatives	10	Minutes
6th Oct 2010	Club house La palice Gashora	First National Policy Steering Committee meeting	Central and local government staff; NGOs and civil society representatives	10	Minutes
16th – 18th Feb 2012	Rwamagana	Evaluation on SLM Practices conducted on 16-18 February	Land management technicians from central and local government entities.	8	Minutes
13th – 17th 2010	Dereva hotel Rwamagana	The Assessment of Land degradation and Sustainable Land Management Workshop	Land management technicians from central and local government entities.	15	Minutes
31st May 2013	Musanze District	Kagera Transboundary Agro-ecosystem Management Project	Central and local government staff;	12	Minutes

Dates	Venue	Title of Workshop/ meeting	Cadre of participants	No. of participants	Output (Minutes, Proceedings)
		(TAMP). National Project Steering Committee meeting.	NGOs and civil society representatives		
14th May 2015	Kigali	National Project Steering Committee meeting.	Central and local government staff; NGOs and civil society representatives	13	Minutes
3rd – 7th Nov 2014	Musanze, La Palme Hotel	Kagera TAMP writeshop	Consultants on SLM from the four riparian countries	27	SLM Book

TANZANIA

Dates	Venue	Title of Workshop/ meeting	Cadre of participants	No. of participants	Output (Minutes, Proceedings etc.)
Jan-Mar 2011	Districts respective Hqs	Project introduction to stakeholders and sensitization on LD/ SLM meetings	District Commissioners (DCs); District Executive Directors (DEDs), District Subject Matter Specialists (DSMS).	15-20 varying from district to district	Confirmation of project implementation sites; Identification of District and site Project Facilitators
Feb 2011	Bukoba	Project launching	National, district and community LD/SLM stakeholders	60	Introduction to project objectives, strategies outputs and budgeting, establishment of members and TORs for National Project Steering Committee (NPSC), Regional Project Steering Committee (RPSC) and Regional Technical Advisory Committee (RTAC). Stakeholder strategies to make Kagera TAMP successful.
Feb 2011	Bukoba	First NPSC meeting	Members	14	Review of Project implementation plan; Review TORs for NPSC, RPSC. NPM and DPF; Election of NPSC Chair and Assist. Chair; Election of members to the RPSC and RTAC; Development of project co-funding strategies; Approval of budget 2011/12.
July 2011	Bukoba	2nd NPSC meeting	members	14	Review of project implementation progress and stakeholder involvement; Follow up progress with project co-funding.

Dates	Venue	Title of Workshop/ meeting	Cadre of participants	No. of participants	Output (Minutes, Proceedings etc.)
Jan 2013	Kayanga Karagwe district	3rd NPSC meeting	Members and some contracted consultants	16	Members field visit of Kihanga/Katera micro-catchment activities; review implementation progress; discuss consultants' reports/recommendations; FAOR reminder to national and district stakeholders on project co-funding requirements
May 2015	Mwanza	4th and final NPSC meeting	Members and some contracted consultants	18	Review project performance and outputs for 2011-2015; handing over of project developed database and maps to national institutions; review project policy and technical recommendations for mainstreaming into national development programs; develop recommendations for Kagera TAMP Project scaling up.
	Rotational bases from one district to another.	Quarterly review and planning meetings, 2011 to 2015	National Project Manager; Service Providers; District Project Facilitators; Site facilitators and invited farmer facilitators and consultants. facilitators;	15-20 depending on meeting agenda	Quarterly review of micro-catchments/sites implementation progress, challenges and learning from each other through visiting implementation sites. Making sure all implementers contribute to the lessons learned from each site as most sites are visited by the team and interactions by farmers conducted.
Feb 2012	Kitale, Kenya	Carbon monitoring workshop	Soil Scientist and one expert in Carbon monitoring	2	To learn from Kenya VI-Agroforestry project on carbon monitoring
May 2012	Rome, Italy	Participation in the Land and Water Week at FAO HQ.	NPM Tanzania	1	Experience sharing opportunity with other Land and Water Projects within FAO worldwide. Also, a learning opportunity from successful projects, an opportunity to discuss strategies of improving implementation Kagera TAMP with NRL experts at HQs
May 2012	Bunazi, Missenyi district	LUS and QM Maps validation	Key stakeholders especially those who participated in the expert judgement training in Masaka	25	After the reconnaissance tour in the basin (19-23, March, 2011), to assess the quality of developed maps, two consultants were recruited to review field work and improve on the maps. This was done in March 2012 and

Dates	Venue	Title of Workshop/ meeting	Cadre of participants	No. of participants	Output (Minutes, Proceedings etc.)
					a stakeholder workshop called in May 2012, to discuss the results
March 2015	Bukoba	Sharing experiences and handing over documented successful SLM technologies	Key stakeholders from each implementing district as well as research and training institutions in Kagera region of Tanzania	34	Discussed successful SLM technologies documented during project implementation; Grouped the technologies into categories for farmer adoption i.e. resource poor, medium and rich technologies using C/B analysis and other social economic and environmental criteria; Handed over the technologies to respective stakeholders for adoption and/or mainstreaming into national and district development plans; Established a pilot Kagera region SLM team.
May 2015	Mwanza	Review and submission of project developed policy and technical recommendations to policy and decision makers.	NPSC members, technical consultants, policy makers at ministry and district levels, higher learning institutions	25	20 Technical and 3 policy recommendations prepared for discussion with high level policy and decision makers at national level a process to be pioneered by the project national focal point within the department of environment in the Vice President's Office.

UGANDA

Dates	Venue	Title of Workshop/ meeting	Cadre of participants	No. of pax	Output (Minutes, Proceedings etc)
November 2010	Kabale	Project Launch	Govt, CBO and NGO, Research instititutions	36	Project approaches, collaborators workplans and cofounding institutions.
2010	Hotel Africana	NPSC meeting	NPSC members	10	Minutes, workplan endorsement, recommendations for follow up actions
December 2010	Kigali	QM (TOT)	Research Institutions	2	QM maps on degradation, best practices and report
February 2011	Masaka	WOCAT QM Workshop	GOVT, NGO, CBO	36	Gap filling for LD Maps, Ground truthing and assessment, draft report
August 2011	Kabale	Land use planning, land tenure and PES	GOVT, NGO	14	Reports, and recommendations on Participatory Land use planning, PES and tenure systems

Dates	Venue	Title of Workshop/ meeting	Cadre of participants	No. of pax	Output (Minutes, Proceedings etc)
November 2011	Mbarara	FFS Methodology	NGO, CBO, GOV	40	Reports, FFS facilitators trained in Group dynamics, AESA and Concept of FFS, M and E reporting tool
February 2012	Bukoba	LD Assessment	GOVT, CBO, NGO	12	LD assessment, PRA, Field assessment and report
	Kabale	NPSC	NPSC members	10	Recommendations for priority areas, Worplan, budget review and clearance
2012	Kabale	PES	GOVT, CBO	14	Cost benefit mechanism, PES priority areas, identified.
July 2013	Mbarara	Watershed Facilitators training	CBO, GOVT, FARMERS	32	Fieldwork on AESA, FFS dynamics, monitoring and evaluation
July 2013	Kabale	QA and QT	GOV, CBO	24	Uploaded QAs, QT
December 2014	Kabale	NPSC	NPSC members	12	Recommendations for project extension, Worplan, budget review and clearance, exit strategy
April 2015	Mbarara	Regional workshop on exit strategies for continued transboundary cooperation sustainable Land management in the Kagera basin	GOVT, NGOS, Regional bodies	36	Transboundary Issues, livestock movement, pest and diseases, agrobiodiversity and report
April 2015	Kigali	Carbon measurement/assessment in selected watersheds in Uganda	Research Institutions/CBO	2	Carbon assessment. Ex ante analysis
May 2015	Mbarara	National Project steering Committee meeting	Member institutions	10	Recommendations for Regional meetings and exit strategy

Reports, Publications and Bulletins released by each Country

BURUNDI

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
Mai 2011	Etat des lieux des agroécosystèmes et systèmes d'utilisation des terres dans la zone projet TAMP Kagera	FAO LTU, Kagera TAMP Project	Etat actuels et système de gestion des agroécosystèmes, degré de dégradation des terres, aspects socio-économiques des populations de la zone : situation de base	Outil d'orientation dans le choix des sites d'interventions du projet
Août 201	Planification et tenure foncière au Burundi	FAO, Kagera TAMP Project	Aperçu de la problématique foncière au Burundi, problème de dégradation des terres, piste de solution	Utilisation planifiée des terres, dans le contexte de rareté des

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
			pour la gestion durable des terres au Burundi	terres et de multiples conflits liés à l'accès aux ressources naturelles.
Juillet 2012	Monographie de 7 micro-bassins versants aménagés par le projet TAMP Kagera au Burundi	FAO, Kagera TAMP Project	Etat des lieux des ressources naturelles dans les micro-bassns versants, aspects socio-économiques, problèmes prioritaires pour de développement socio-économique et écologiques des communautés, vision des communautés, plan d'action pluriannuel	Application de bonnes pratiques de gestion durable des terres et amélioration de moyens d'existence des communautés.
Avril 2013	Analyse biophysique des micro-bassins versants de Magamba, Nyakibari, Gihehe, Rusi, Rwikikara et Kibogoye au Burundi	FAO, Kagera TAMP Project	Etat de fertilité des sols dans chaque site (pH, N, C, P, bases échangeables, CEC, H^+ et Al échangeables), Etat de couverture végétale, de la biodiversité dans les sous-sols, proposition des formules d'application des fertilisant dans chaque site.	Situation de référence des zones d'interventions du projet
Octobre 2014	Suivi hydrométéorologique des micro – bassins versants du projet TAMP Kagera	FAO, Kagera TAMP Project	Mesures de pH, turbidité, sédimentation, Débits, pluviométrie,	Paiement des services environnementaux
Mai 2015	Evaluation des effets et impacts socio-économiques et écologiques du projet au Burundi	FAO, Kagera TAMP Project	Mis en évidence des résultats, effets et impacts du projet	Monitoring and Evaluation
Mai 2012	Contribution à l'intégration agro-sylvo-zootechnique à l'amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire et la préservation des ressources naturelles (Poster)	FAO, Kagera TAMP Project	Conservation des eaux et sols par les courbes de niveau, la plantation des herbes fixatrices sur les courbes de niveau, introduction des semences améliorés dans les exploitations aménagées, compost pour améliorer la fertilité des sols, introduction des animaux en stabulation permanente pour augmentation de la fertilité des sols, foyers améliorés, etc.	Application de bonnes pratiques de gestion intégrée et durable des terres
Avril 2013	Amélioration de pratiques de cultures fourragères diversifieés (poster)	FAO, Kagera TAMP Project	Introduction des cultures fourragères constituées de graminées et de légumineuses (mucuna, desmodium, pennissetumsp), techniques d'ensilage pour la conservation du fourrage	Amélioration des paturages

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
Avril 2013	Promotion des techniques de fabrication des blocs à lécher (poster)	FAO, Kagera TAMP Project	Techniques de mélanges des intrants pour améliorer la productivité des animaux en lait	Amélioration de l'alimentation des animaux

Fiches techniques: Le projet a produit des fiches techniques pour la fabrication des blocs à lécher, foyers améliorés, cultures maraîchères, techniques de compostage,
Newsletters: Le projet a publié des articles dans le 3 newsletters du projet et 4 articles dans la newsletter de la FAO Burundi

RWANDA

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
31st July 2013	Farmer Fields Schools approach to sustainable land management: a case of Karambo micro catchment, Rwanda.	Partners	FFS approach	Kagera TAMP newsletter March 2014 issue # 3
21st Oct 2014	Promoting family farming through adopting sustainable land management practices in Rwanda	Public	SLM	Newspaper article for the world food day celebrations
18th Oct 2013	The Kagera TAMP	Public	Project objectives and activities	Newspaper article for the world food day celebrations
June 2014	Ecosystem restoration (rehabilitation) in Gatebe II micro catchment, Rwimiyaga sector in Nyagatare district	Partners	Ecosystem rehabilitation	FAO Rwanda Newsletter. Volume 1 issue 1, June 2014

TANZANIA

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
Sept. 2014	Development of Mwisa subcatchment management plan	NELSAP-NBI proposal for funding circulated to NRM stakeholder ministries and district councils and Lake Victoria River basin Office in Mwanza for sourcing implementation funds.	Mwisa sub-catchment description; Baseline and socioeconomic data; Watershed characterization using GIS; Pilot subcatchments characterization; Selection of LD hotspots and development of catchment management plans; Stakeholder analysis; Monitoring & Evaluation	Project proposal for funding under NBI Kagera Project. Project developed by the NPM using Kagera TAMP catchment approach knowledge and experiences.
March 2015	Developed national policy (3) and technical recommendations (18) for mainstreaming into national	Reviewed by NPSC and forwarded for action by high level policy makers.	Technical recommendations in relation to: livestock management and movements; water sources management; conservation of protected areas;	Recommendations to be discussed in a meeting of high level policy and decision makers. The meeting is to be jointly cobvened by the country FAOR and the project

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
	development plans and inclusion into national policies		Biodiversity conservation; pests and disease control; soil productivity improvement; farmers and herders knowledge in DL/SLM; promotion of energy saving technologies; land grabbing. Policy recommendations cover: land use and tenure for SLM; cattle trasboundary movements control and awareness creation and benefits from adopting UN conventions.	National Focal Point and chair of the NPSC.
March 2012	Soil Ecosystem Analysis Guide	Jointly developed by the national soil scientist and NPM, the FFS regional and national master trainers and circulated for use by Service Providers and sites facilitators in FFS-SLM assessment.	Assessment of the surrounding areas to the point of SLM techn application (vegetation, slope, erosion, etc), Land management practices and timing; soil ecosystem analysis parameters: colour, moisture, OM content, living organisms, root density, compaction, structure; plant performance (stem width, colour and number of leaves, presence of organisms, disease deficiency signs, number/size of fruits)	Used as a decision-making tool by the FFS-SLM groups as they continue learning by doing and comparing soil and/or plant responses to applied technologies.
July to Dec 2011	Developed Village Land Use and management Plans for Butulage, Businde, Nyakashenyi, Rusumo and Kasharazi villages/subcatchments	Jointly developed by the Kagera TAMP team, the national land use Planning Commission, district subject matter specialists and community leaders and innovators	Background to village land use and management planning; Village land and community characteristics; Current land and other resources use; problems related to current land and other resources use and current community action plans; Development of the land use and management plan; monitoring and evaluation; and bylaws for enforcement of developed VLUMPs.	Village land use plans usually developed in 6 steps. 4 of the steps are related to project objectives and the last 2 (establishment of the village registry and issuing of certificates of occupancy are responsibilities of district councils. For the indicated 5 villages work was completed to the 4th step and the rest left to the districts to finalize and produce final stamped documents. It is not clear if all districts finalized the draft VLUMP after finalizing the process.
May 2013	Kagera FFS-SLM implementation	Produced by the project implementation team and shared between	Planning and implementing SLM activities following the FFS approach; Demonstrating successful	Video provided to districts for community and technicians

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
	video documentation	districts for publicity and community sensitization on LD/SLM and community participation	SLM technologies at farmer Extension Centres; Implementing community activities in control of LD following the catchment approach; Selecting and implementing income generating activities e,g, tree nurseries establishment & management.	sensitization and training in LD/SLM
March 2015	Video documentation of Kagera TAMP success stories	Produced jointly by service providers, districts facilitators and project implementing communities	Part I: FFS-SLM following the ecosystems approach; Part II: FFS-SLM in coffee-banana cropping systems; Part III: FFS-SLM in rangelands/pasture lands; Part IV: FFS-SLM in water sources management.	Video shared with districts, key stakeholder ministries and training institutions for sensitization and training of different stakeholders as well as sensitization during agriculture and other NR related exhibitions of LD/SLM.
June 2015	Video documentation for the International Soils day	Jointly documented by FAO information unit in Rome, the NPM Tanzania and project implementing community members	Testing and demonstrating successful SLM technologies in soil productivity improvement; demonstrating climate change resilient technologies including soil and water conservation, adoption of drought tolerant and short term crop varieties; promotion of woodlots establishment and use of energy saving technologies; rehabilitation and protection of drying water sources, establishment and management of wildfires and community and facilitators testimonies of the project in contributing to climate change mitigation and adaptation.	Video documentary designed to be focused on CCMA. Planned to be used in sensitization on LD/SLM and CCMA during the international Soils day. The Video can now be accessed at: http://www.fao.org/news/audio-video/detail-video/en/?uid=11233 Also YouTube at: (http://www.youtube.co/watch?u=Pape4732uE
May 2013	Land use Systems database	Developed jointly by FAO and National consultants	Land use systems database and maps; Land degradation types, extent, trend and impact as well as existing management technologies and practices; Expert recommendations for LD control or SLM technologies for each of the identified land use system	Database and maps handed over to national institutions capable of storing, retrieving and improvement of the database.
Feb 2012	Sites characterization reports for the selected 10 LD	Shared with respective district authorities for reference and guide	Micro-catchment location, climate, geology and physiography, characteristics, LD	A total of 9 out of 10 implementation sites have sites characterization data.

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
	degradation hotspots for project implementation	to SLM activities implementation	constraints of identified land use types; micro-catchment participatory action plans and activities.	Kibingo was established two years ago at special request to the RPC and the NPM. Information of site characteristics is however similar to that of Murongo.
Aug. 2011	Land use planning and land tenure in Tanzania	Presented at the project organized workshop on land use Systems and land tenure in the Kagera basin (Kabale Uganda)	Land and its management objectives; Development of land use planning in Tanzania; Development of participatory land use planning and management approach; Levels of land use planning and natural resources management; Land tenure systems in Tanzania; Land Use Systems in the Kagera TAMP project implemented area (Bukoba); Conclusions.	In this workshop participants from all project implementing countries evaluated current situations of land use and land tenure systems and how these influence SLM. Also what suggestions can be made to countries to improve where improvement is needed.
Nov 2013	Kagera TAMP implementation experiences during the period 2011-2013	Presented to the Ministry of Agriculture Lake Zone Research and Training Institutions Internal Programme Review (IPR) meeting, including Agriculture, Livestock, Water resources management and representative NGOs.	Project development and environment objectives; Project implementation approach/methodology; Tested and/or demonstrated Technology categories; Activity categories; Realized SLM benefits; Challenges; Lessons learned and recommendations	The Ministry of Agriculture zonal Internal Programme Review meetings of respective Research and Training Institutions is a platform for exchanging information in relation to on-going projects. This was an opportunity for the project NPM to share project activities and benefits to NRM stakeholders also for inputs and for adoption of some of the technologies and/or approaches. Through such meetings the institutions decided to adopt the catchment approach in targeting research and developed research technologies.
May 2012	Transboundary Agroecosystem management Project experiences in Tanzania	Presented during the FAO Land and Water Week at FAO HQs Rome	Project objectives; Implementing districts in Tanzania; Challenges with working across sectors and boundaries; FFS in supporting adoption of SLM technologies; Lessons learned; Sustainability, up-scaling and co-funding.	L&W Week attended by NPMs for Burundi & Tanzania. The Land and Water Week was an exposure for Kagera TAMP to share implementation experiences with other FAO project implementers worldwide, an opportunity to exchange knowledge and

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
				experiences with the FAO Land and Water Department staff, all of which improved on project performance
Feb 2013	Sustainable land management for banana production in Kagera region of Tanzania	Presented at the fact finding and project design mission for developing a banana production improvement project in East Africa, funded by Bill & Melinda Gates in Bukoba	Key production constraints in Kagera; Specific land related banana production constraints; Efforts by different stakeholders to improve soil productivity in Kagera; Kagera TAMP Project approaches, tested technologies and findings; Other potential SLM technologies to be considered for improved banana production; Recommendations for SLM adoption for improved banana production.	The paper was an input to information gathering and experiences sharing with the mission responsible for developing a project on improving banana production. The thrust by the mission was on multiplication and distribution of improved banana varieties. The SLM experiences by TAMP and other stakeholders brought about the second thinking of including SLM in project implementation. The project is still under development.
2012&2013	Contributions to Project Newsletters	Circulated to all stakeholders in the project sites and other stakeholders reading project information at the project website	Improvement of degraded pasturelands in Tanzania; Smallholder access to reliable and clean water through rehabilitation of drying water sources in Tanzania	Participating farmers in the works that were published pleased with seeing their work recognized and published.
May 2015	Diagnostic assessment of the incentives and disincentives to adoption of sustainable land management technologies in Kagera river basin of Tanzania	Draft publication (still under review) for publication on project website and other possible coming NRM related forums	Some SLM technologies were widely adopted than others. Incentives to adoption of SLM technologies in Tanzania included: frequency of farmer training sessions, land tenure and area owned, access to technical information, type of crops and crop prices. Disincentives to adoption were land tenure and other resources ownership and access e.g. labour, inequitable sharing of benefits, availability and cost of inputs,	The results of the study will help stakeholders in SLM to design technologies with the background for possible adoption or non-adoption.
Feb 2015	SLM benefits for rural communities through adoption of the catchment approach	Draft paper for publication on project website and other possible forums	Description of the catchment approach; Procedures used to identify, prioritize and develop community action plans and activities; Description of the set up and	A documentary of the project implementation approach in Tanzania to guide interested stakeholders adopt the two in one approaches.

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
			operationalization of the FFS-SLM groups; Field evidence of farmer empowerment as a result of adoption of the catchment and FFS-SLM approaches; Establishment and empowerment of catchment committees; Description and analysis of realized SLM benefits; challenges and recommendations	
May 2015	Impact of SLM technologies on soil quality and carbon sequestration	Draft paper under review for publication in NRM forums and project website	Soil analysis results of soils collected from points with and without SLM technologies; Description of the tested/demonstrated and analyzed technologies; Analysis of different aspects of soil quality changes with and without SLM; potential of tested technologies in sequestering carbon; Challenges with the analysis for the kind of establishment of the sites and technologies; Recommendations	Study conducted to evaluate the impact of SLM on soil quality improvement with a focus on carbon sequestration and with an objective of comparing soil analysis results with the EX-ACT model of FAO for carbon sequestration assessment.
Nov 2014	Documentation of SLM technologies and Approaches	Tested and demonstrated SLM technologies and approaches evaluated by trained district staff for a wider application and publicity on WOCAT website	Out of 30 tested SLM technologies throughout project implementation, 14 proved very successful and were adopted widely. Another 7 technologies were identified as being successful but were indigenous and unpublished. Two approaches were also documented. Documentation followed the WOCAT procedures using QT & QA questionnaires.	Powerful local SLM technologies were identified in this process and documented for the first time. Analysis of the technologies using the WOCAT assessment procedures went beyond the general cost/benefit analysis to include other parameters important for the environment and the community including: Ecological, social, environment, agronomic, cultural and other parameters. Finally these technologies were categorized to fit the 3 farmer categories of resource rich resource medium and resource poor and handed over to stakeholders for mainstreaming into their programs.
May 2015	Leaflets and Posters on SLM	Leaflets and posters developed and printed for	Leaflets: Compost making and management; Improved agroforestry; Farmyard	Materials to be used by government extension staff, farmer facilitators,

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
		dissemination after multiplying them.	manure management and application; Mineral fertilizer use and management; Conservation agriculture; Banana Xanthomonas Wilt diseases control. Posters: Contour farming; Participatory land use planning and LD/SLM sensitization.	training and research institutions as well as being placed at Farmer Extension Centres as reference materials.

UGANDA

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
Quarterly (every three months)	Main activity reports from service providers and watershed activities	FAO, Kagera TAMP	Report on SLM activities, approaches, trainings carried out during the quarter by FFS and service providers,	Helped to assess progress and adjust/complement activities
2011	Constraints and opportunities in S W Uganda for the adoption of SLM practices using multi-level stakeholder analysis.	University, MAAIF, FAO, Districts	SLM challenges, SLM technologies, dissemination approach, recommendations	Master's Thesis
February 2012	Using trees and sugarcane to reclaim eroded hills	Nationwide and beyond	Deep gullies, gully healing, agroforersty trees, increased income and livelihood improvement	Published in Monitor website, newspaper, National paper
Quarterly July September 2012	FAO Quarterly newsletter Riding on Kagera TAMP to restore agricultural production	FAO, partners	Farmer Field Schools, fruits farming, compost making	Newsletter
August 2012	Land tenure land use status in the project districts	Makerere, MAAIF, Lands	Land tenure, land use planning status, policy	Collaboration with Ministry of Lands
July 2013	6 Uploaded Technologies on WOCAT website including one on zero grazing, Calliandra for contour hedges, fodder banks for rangelands, stonelines for minimising run off, Ficus natalensis agroforestry system and conservation trough for bananas	Global WOCAT, Partners, MAAIF, FAO	Technology attributes, environment, Economics, agroforestry,	The uploaded technologies are highly regarded by farmers
May 2013	Bad farming threatens river Kagera	Nationwide and beyond	Degradation of crop and rangeland, farmers' bad	Published in Monitor website, newspaper, National paper

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
			practices, Farmer field schools, Aesa	
June 2013	Fire management in districts of cattle corridor in Kagera project	Kagera TAMP	Fire management, opportunities, policies and byelaws, dangers, causes and ways to overcome the challenge	transboundary report
June 2013	Using stones and trees to restore environment	Nationwide and beyond	Rakai-Katongero watershed, stonelines, coffee planting	Published in Monitor website, newspaper, National paper
January 14, 2014	Changing mindsets for better farming methods	Nationwide and beyond	Cattle keepers, manure production, SLM and crop improvement and income diversification	Published in Monitor website, newspaper, National paper
30 April 2014	Reclaiming land	Nationwide and beyond	SLM, tree planting, improved use of goat and animal manure,	Published in Monitor website, newspaper, National paper,
November 2014	Opportunities and challenges for transformation of farmer field school groups into cooperatives in the Kagera TAMP SW Uganda	FAO, Kagera TAMP	Cooperatives, farming enterprises selection, FFS groups, value addition,	In press
November 2014	2.1 Evaluate the biophysical and social economic factors influencing SLM adoption,	FAO, Kagera TAMP	Physical and economic factors, steep slopes, biological degradation, SLM, FFS, watershed planning	In press
Quarterly July September 2014	FAO Quarterly newsletter	FAO, partners	Improved livelihood, project impacts on landscapes, food security, zero grazing for goats	Newsletter
July 2014	Photo gallery	FAO	SLM potential, impact of SLM, FFS	Gallery
January 2015	Kagera TAMP brochure	MAAIF, FAO Minishare at Munyonyo Ministry of lands, Districts	Project goal and objectives, main activities, main results and lessons learnt,	Distributed by MAAIF, TERRAFRICA and other partners for main lessons and results achieved
March 2015	Sustainable Land Management using the WOCAT/LADA methods	FAO Uganda, FAO TAMP, MAAIF	SLM, degraded types Percentage Extent of SLM practice, Conservation practices against biological degradation, Values of WOCAT approach	Poster presented at Mini share FAO meeting in Munyonyo
March 2015	Goat Zero grazing for manure production	FAO, partners	Zero grazing, manure production, improved yields,	Poster
March 2015	Calliandra calothyrsus for contour hedges	FAO, partners	Stabilize bunds, fodder trees, nitrogen fixing,	Poster

Dates	Title of publication	Circulated to	Main Topics	Outcome/ Comment
			stakes, soil erosion control	
January-December 2015	Kagera TAMP Project Calendar	FAO Partners, service providers	Tree planting, fanya chini	calendar

Other Initiatives Supported through the Project in each Country

BURUNDI

Dates	Initiative/ Activity	Target Group/ Beneficiaries	Partner(s)	Outputs/Impacts
Juin 2011 – Juin 2015	Démarrage des FFS en gestion durable des terres et leur renforcement des capacités organisationnelles, institutionnelles et techniques	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services	Augmentation de la production agricole, recherche et apprentissage par action gestion raisonnée des ressources naturelles, cohésion sociale et entraide mutuelle, accès aux marchés, évolution des FFS en coopératives.
Juin 2011	Vision à long terme des communautés de leur développement durable de leurs paysages	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services	Eviter la communauté à vivre au jour le jour et accroissement d'une prise de conscience des communautés de la prise en compte de la préservation des ressources naturelles dans le développement.
Juin 2011 – Juin 2015	Intégration agro-sylvo-zootechniques	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services, projet de développement	Optimisation de la production par unité de surface et par unité zootechnique.
Février 2012	Chaîne de solidarité communautaire dans le repeuplement des animaux *(l'Approche consiste à ce que le premier bénéficiaire d'un animal (animaux), doit céder à son voisin un animal femelle et vice versa).*	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services, projet de développement	Augmentation du taux d'accès des communautés vulnérables aux animaux
2011- 2015	Liaison Bassin versant – FFS et Comité bassin versant : approche innovatrice introduite par TAMP Kagera	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services, projet de développement	Gestion durable des terres, pérennisation des interventions du projet
Depuisfévrier 2012	Introduction des haches paille et des techniques d'ensilage en fosse et en sachets	Communautés	FAO, ISABU	Diminution du gaspillage du fourrage

Dates	Initiative/ Activity	Target Group/ Beneficiaries	Partner(s)	Outputs/Impacts
Juin 2011 – Juin 2015	Gestion communautaire des plantations forestières	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services	Réduction de la déforestion et des feux de brousse, partage équitable des coûts et bénéfices liés à la gestion d'une plantation forestière
Mai 2013	Aménagement et gestion d'un étang piscicole associé aux porcs	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services	Amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire et nutrition
Mai 2013	Construction d'un tank de collecte des eaux pluviales à l'Ecole Primaire de Munzenze pour assurer l'aménagement du jardin scolaire de cette dernière.	Jeunes Ecoliers	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services	Amélioration de la sécurité alimentaire et nutritionnelle des écoliers à travers la Cantine scolaire, implication des jeunes écoliers dans la protection des ressources naturelles.
Juin 2012	Promotion des activités de production des bambous en pépinière et stabilisation des berges des rivières	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services	Amélioration de la qualité des eaux, stabilité des berges des rivières, augmentation du taux de séquestration du carbone et de revenu par la valorisation des produits de bambous.
Avril 2011	Conservation des eaux et sols à travers la mise en place des courbes de niveau associées à leur végétalisation et agroforesterie	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services	Diminution du taux de pertes en terres et des inondations dans les bas-fonds.
Avril 2011- Juin 2015	Multiplication et diffusion des semences vivrières et maraîchères améliorées dans les communautés, techniques de greffage, production des espèces végétales indigènes et à usages multiples	FFS group et communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services	Amélioration de l'agrobiodiversité
2012 - 2015	Activités non agricoles et génératrices de revenus pour atténuer la pression sur le foncier (apiculture, moulins)	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services, projet de développement	Augmentation des revenus des communautés, diminution de la pression sur les terres
2013 - 2015	Usages des motopompes et pompes à pédale pour irrigation collinaire	Communautés	FAO, ONG, Gouvernement à travers extension services, projet de développement	Adaptation aux changements climatiques, valorisation des eaux et augmentation de la production agricole

RWANDA

Dates	Initiative/ Activity	Target Group/ Beneficiaries	Partner(s)	Outputs/Impacts
Sep 2010 – June 2015	Construction of infiltration ditches along the contours	Local communities in all the six districts the project operates.	District and sector officials; local NGOs; and local communities	196 Ha; and 75.55 Km in total.
Sep 2010 – June 2015	Buffer zone on lakes and streams	Local communities in the Bugesera and Rulindo district sites.	District and sector officials; local NGOs; and local communities	27 Km
Sep 2010 – June 2015	Afforestation	Local communities in all the six districts the project operates.	District and sector officials; local NGOs; and local communities	450,356 trees of various species planted
Sep 2010 – June 2015	Construction of water trapping pits	Local communities in all the six districts the project operates.	District and sector officials; local NGOs; and local communities	3,367m^3, combined capacity
Sep 2010 – June 2015	Bench terraces	Local communities in the Kayonza, Rulindo and Kamonyi district.	District and sector officials; local NGOs; and local communities	20 Ha
Sep 2010 – June 2015	Energy conserving stoves	Local communities in all the six districts the project operates.	District and sector officials; local NGOs; and local communities	520 constructed and distributed.
Sep 2010 – June 2015	Rain water harvesting dam sheets	Local communities in all the six districts the project operates, except Rulindo and Kamonyi district sites.	District and sector officials; local NGOs; and local communities	1,440 m^3 combined capacity

TANZANIA

Dates	Initiative/ Activity	Target Group/ Beneficiaries	Partner(s)	Outputs/ Impacts
April 2015	Development of a revised Catchment Participatory Action Plan for all sites	Districts; Service Providers; NGOs; Sites facilitators; Incoming projects.		At the end of the project, stakeholders in the implementation sites were called to review the extent of achievement of established action plans and activities at the beginning of the project. A new action plan was then developed indicating short, medium and long term activities considered as priority by the stakeholders. Corresponding land use /land degradation and planned SLM maps are being finalized. The document will be available for District Executive Directors, Service Providers, NGOs and other interested partners.

UGANDA

Date	Initiative/ Activity	Target Group/ Beneficiaries	Partner(s)	Outputs/ Impacts
2014-2015	Formation of FFS-based cooperatives	FFS and community	Service Providers, Districts	3 FFS cooperatives formed
2012, 2013, 2014, 2015	Local governments supplying vegetable seeds and fruit-tree seedlings to Farmer Field Schools	Farmers, Farmer Field Schools and communities	National Agricultural Advisory Services (NAADS)/ Local governments	10% more fruit trees planted in the catchments

Date	Initiative/ Activity	Target Group/ Beneficiaries	Partner(s)	Outputs/ Impacts
2014	Involvement of Kagera TAMP facilitators and service providers as consultants on private initiatives on SLM	Communities outside Kagera TAMP micro-catchments	USAID, Kigezi Diocese, Kiruhura district	Increased up-scaling of SLM outside the catchments
2012, 2013, 2014, 2015	Farmer-to-farmer exchange visits among FFS and districts	Farmer Field Schools, communities, farm households	Service providers, District local governments	Increased adoption of SLM in the catchments by farmers
September 2014	Collaboration with NBI on SLM project development for Maziba	Communities within the Maziba catchment, Kabale district local government	NBI, Kabale District local government	Characterization/ Planning report
2013	Collaboration with NARO through Farmer Field School training to eliminate banana bacterial wilt (BBW)	FFS, farmers, farm households, communities, local governments	NARO, District local governments, Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries (MAAIF)	50 facilitators trained; decrease of incidence of banana bacterial wilt (BBW)
2014	Initiation of Apple-village farmer field schools to upscale the growing of apples	Farmers, Farm households, communities	Kabale District local government	1000 apple plantlets distributed to farmers; 2 FFS formed
2012, 2013, 2014, 2015	Attachment of students from Kabale and Nkozi Universities	Students, universities, communities	Nkozi University, Kabale University	6 students trained in practical aspects of SLM and Farmer Field School methodology
2014	Collaboration with Kiruhura district on road construction to support improved delivery of SLM services	Farmers, farm households, community, district local government	Kiruhura District local government	15km of rural feeder road constructed
2014	Collaboration with Kigezi Good Samaritan in the provision of solar energy to farm households	Farm households, FFS	Kigezi Good Samaritan (NGO)	30 farm households equipped with solar energy panels for lighting
2012, 2013, 2014	Radio and TV broadcasts on SLM	Farmers, communities	Voice of Kigezi	About 3,000,000 people reached with SLM messages

Uganda-Tree seedling multiplication and eventual planting by members was a key activity implemented in all the micro-catchments. Varieties planted included multi-purpose trees such as eucalyptus and pine, fruit trees such as mangoes and jack fruit and leguminous fodder trees (*bruverria spp* and *calliandra spp*).

SLaM Practices Implemented by each Country

No	SLaM Technology	Units	Burundi	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Total
1	No. of provinces covered by TAMP	number	5	6	4	6	**21**
2	Total Catchment areas (ha)	ha	4,604	2,161	64,947	30,000	**101,712**
3	Catchment area conserved by TAMP activities	ha	4,604	1,700	3,428	7,365	**17,097**

No	SLaM Technology	Units	Burundi	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Total
4	Total area under SLM (ha)	ha	4,604	1,200	300	7,365	**13,469**
5	No. of FFSs facilitated by TAMP	number	40	24	30	41	**135**
6	Total number of active farmers under TAMP	number	12,322	7,240	7,272	9,137	**23,649**
7	Area covered by food crops introduced by TAMP	ha	100		120	O	**220**
8	Area covered by pastures improved by TAMP	ha	4633,4		2,400	427	**2,827**
9	Terraces (progressive)	ha	4,604	1,200	-	0	**5,804**
10	Ditches/trenches excavated	km	1,015	98	1,015	545	**2,673**
11	Micro-basin/ infiltration pits excavated for water retention in the soil	number	1,015	4,489	120	4,500	**10,124**
12	Micro-basins/infiltration pits excavated (volume)	m^3		6,734	NA	60,480	**67,214**
13	Water harvesting ponds/dams for drinking water, livestock and/or irrigation	number	1	120	23	30	**174**
14	Water harvesting ponds/dams storage (volume)	cu. m	20	1,440	10	21,504	**22,974**
15	Vegetative strips/grass strips (for agroforestry/soil conservation)	km	1,015		-	480	**1,495**
16	Tree planting/afforestation (area)	ha	120		50	775	**945**
17	Tree planting/afforestation (trees planted)	number	133,320	450,356	31,000	700,000	**1,314,676**
18	Agroforestry trees/ shrubs planted	number	4,800,000	450,356	85,300	20,000	**5,355,656**
19	Agroforestry trees/shrubs (area covered)	ha	4,320		343	100	**4,763**
20	Nursery bed establishment	number	108	12	12	24	**156**
21	Riverbank protection /buffer zones planted	km	37	27	15	16	**95**
22	Stone lines or trash lines for soil conservation	km			3	5	**8**
23	Mulching (area)	ha	112	800	320	1,153	**2,385**
24	Soil fertility improvements area covered	ha	1,151	600	400	300	**2,451**
25	Organic manure (compost/FYM) application	ha	100	600	180	300	**1,180**
26	Pasture improvement/grass reseeding	ha	29		1,200	7	**1,236**
27	Improved bananas planted	number	32 500	400	1,250	0	**1,650**
28	Energy conserving cook stoves distributed/built	number	1,145	520	40	1,240	**2,945**
29	Kitchen/Backyard gardens	number	1,615		-	3,000	**4,615**
30	Bananas planted	number	32 500	1,200	130,200	10,000	**141,400**
31	Vegetable gardens	ha	70	10	3	150	**233**
32	Goats distributed	number	1,451	290	80	2,145	**3,966**
33	Cows distributed	number	35		5	10	**50**
34	Pigs distributed	number	45	71	5	0	**121**

No	SLaM Technology	Units	Burundi	Rwanda	Tanzania	Uganda	Total
35	Bee keeping (beehives)	number	120		85		**205**
36	Motor pumps for irrigation	number	6				**6**
37	Mills	number	4				**4**
38	Fish ponds	number	2				**2**
39	Buffer zones protection	km	100				**100**
40	Gully erosion control (check dams)	m				25	**25**

SLM interventions Introduced by the Kagera-TAMP Project in each Country

(Summarized from the PPT presented at Mwanza Workshop, reports and field visit observations)

SLM Interventions	Impacts	Challenges
BURUNDI		
• Main enterprises are banana, maize and beans • Use of the A-frame to set out contour lines • Soil fertility improvement – using farmyard manure • Erosion control structures (water retention ditches, terraces) • Agronomic soil and water conservation esp. mulching • Crop improvement – introducing high yielding banana varieties • Digging of terraces • Improving fodders by combining napier grass with calliandra, desmodium, sesbania • Riverbank protection using bamboo (also income generating) • Distribution of livestock (pigs) • Agroforestry • Water harvesting ponds • Use of pumps for small scale irrigation • Establishing Tree seedlings of introduced (exotic) and indigenous trees were established • Restoration/conservation of water sources • Natural forest conservation by using beehives (Honey building up in 7 planted beehives and Trees and grass biomass building up and wildfire incidences decreased.) • Establishment of a tree nursery of indigenous trees for planting in different parts of the catchment	• Increase in yields, beans sweat potatoes maize -got 20% increase • They grow vegetables in valley bottoms • Development a markets value chain	• Funds were not enough had 1 million USD in 5 provinces was not enough. • Problem of facilitation of staff e.g. they needed motorcycle but no funds. • Sustainability, planted trees but 3 years too short to see impact • FFs was new, and farmers were used to handouts, some farmers gave up e.g. 2% attrition • Small land holding 0.5 ha. • Drought affected some crops in the dry area near Rwanda border
RWANDA		
• Soil fertility improvement – use of farmyard manure • Tree planting to rehabilitate catchment areas • Agronomic soil and water conservation e.g. mulching • Erosion control using infiltration ditches, water trapping pits, bench terraces • Crop diversification e.g. intercropping • Crop improvement –new banana varieties • Use of improved cooked stoves for conservation of trees • Rain water harvesting with plastic-lined ponds • River buffer planting (using bamboo) • Pest and disease control, especially cassava mossaic		

SLM Interventions	Impacts	Challenges
• Distribution of livestock (goats and pigs) • Gully rehabilitation – use of check dams		
TANZANIA		
• Main enterprises are banana, maize, cassava and pasture. • Agoforestry, hedges • Crop diversification (pineapple, climbing beans, canjanus cajun), • Grass reseeding, re-afforestation, • Soil conservation contour bunds, trenches • Soil moisture conservation – e.g. grass mulching for banana • Soil fertility management - farmyard manure, fertilizer application in maize • Agroforestry – *Sesbania sesban, calliandra, indigenous trees* • Pest and disease management in crops (BXW in banana and cassava mosaic) • Pasture improvement, closure and grass reseeding (e.g Rhodes grass0) • Improving range condition with legumes (stylozathus, desmodium, mukuna) • Livestock (goats) distribution • Water source protection – by closing area to grazing • Bush-fire control and prevention – fire guard • Bee keeping for income generating	• Improved banana production e.g. bigger banana bunches from 30 kg to 80 kg for Fiah variety and from 10 to 30 kg for indigenous bananas • Income generated from enterprises e.g. pineapple, banana • Reducing forest fires	• Illegal grazing of pasture conservation areas • FFS (e.g.) losing members when project activities declined due to funding hitches. • The Carbon Sequestration tool ExACT was introduced in March 2015 when training was conducted in Kigali in 2015. • Thus it was not possible to apply the ExACT tool in the project in Tz. • Delayed replenishment of service providers leading to less equipment to use during SLM scaling up such as seeds and pick axes • Lack of titles hinders efficient use of land by farmers
UGANDA		
• Main enterprises are banana, maize, cassava, coffee and beans • Soil fertility improvement – using farmyard manure • Erosion control structures (water retention ditches, terraces) • Agronomic soil and water conservation esp. mulching • Crop improvement – introducing high yielding banana varieties • Pest and disease management in crops (BXW in banana and cassava mosaic) • Gully healing and control • Pasture conservation – closure and reseeding • Pasture improvement - removing invasive species • Tree planting on degraded hills • Tree nursery		

Annex 9: List of MTR Recommendations

Recommendation 1: Three reviews should be conducted before the end of the project: • Investigate the effectiveness of the LADA-WOCAT methodologies; • Document the innovative and successful FFS approach used by the project; • Document the full extent of the area covered by SLM/SLaM under the project.
Recommendation 2: More focus needs to be given to developing the capacity of related organizations and of an enabling environment to provide the adequate policy, legislation and governance frameworks.
Recommendation 3: A planning exercise should be conducted, including the development/ refinement of: • A replication/scaling-up strategy where entry points and specified activities are identified; • A work plan for the entire remaining implementation period with the associated budget; • A project exit strategy; particularly for disengagement of support in demonstration sites.
Recommendation 4: Specific project activities should be managed as follows: • No new PES activities be established; • The LUS and QM maps be handed over through a three step process; • The potential for an informal GEF partnership be investigated in Uganda
Recommendation 5: The project period should be extended, if the budget permits.
Recommendation 6: FAO should decentralize decision-making, including financial approval, in countries and provide accurate and timely financial information by outcome to project managers.
Recommendation 7: Backstopping from FAO HQ should focus more on general progress and support, and less on technical training sessions at this stage of the project.
Recommendation 8: The engagement of stakeholders should be urgently improved through more cross visits for intra-national and regional learning at all levels and through more frequent RPSC and NPSCs meetings, starting with a RPSC to review the MTR findings and its recommendations
Recommendation 9: The set of performance indicators needs to be revised; including the identification of a few specific capacity indicators and all related targets used to measure the progress of the project.