Sustainable Land Management in Timor-Leste, Capacity Building and Mainstreaming Project

Terminal Evaluation Report

James Hardman, April 2011

Implemented by UNDP Timor-Leste and the Government of Timor-Leste, Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries, National Directorate of Forestry

Funded by the Global Environment Facility and UNDP

Table of Contents

Glossary

ALGIS	Agriculture and Livestock Geographic Information System unit
CO	Country Office
DOE	Division of Environment
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GoTL	Government of Timor-Leste
LDC	Least Developed Country
MAF	Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries
MED	Ministry of Economy and Development
MOJ	Ministry of Justice
MPF	Ministry of Planning and Finance
MPW	Ministry of Public Works
MSP	Medium-Size Project
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NAP	National Action Programme to Combat Land Degradation
NAPA	National Adaptation Programme of Action
NCSA	National Capacity Self-Assessment
NDAL	National Directorate of Agriculture and Livestock
NDF	National Directorate of Forestry
NDFA	National Directorate of Fisheries and Aquaculture
NDP	National Development Plan
NDLP	National Directorate of Land Property
NDSACD	National Directorate for Support to Agriculture Community Development
NFP	National Forest Policy
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
NRM	Natural Resources Management
NUTL	National University of Timor-Leste
OP-15	Operational Programme 15
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PIU	Project Implementation Unit
PM	Project Manager
PO	Programme Officer
PRE Unit	Poverty Reduction and Environment Unit – UNDP-TL
Prodoc	Project Document – as submitted to GEF and approved for funding
PSC	Project Steering Committee
PWC	Project Working Committee
SIDS	Small Island Developing States
SIP	Sector Investment Plan
SLM	Sustainable Land Management
SoS	Secretary of State (Junior Minister)
Suco	Administrative division equivalent to extended village
TE	Terminal Evaluation
TL	Timor-Leste
TOR	Terms of Reference
TRAC	Target for Resource Assignment from the Core – UNDP funding
UNCCD	United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification
UNCBD	United Nations Convention on Biodiversity
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
USD	United States Dollar

Photo on front page: training participants learning permaculture techniques - credit: Joao do Rosario

Executive Summary

Introduction and project design

1. This report documents the Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project implemented by UNDP and the National Directorate of Forestry in Timor-Leste. The project implemented from 2007 to 2010 and was funded through a contribution from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) of USD 475,000 and a UNDP contribution of USD 31,000. The Government of Timor-Leste (GoTL) provided in-kind support, primarily through staff time of personnel from NDF and other Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF) directorates.

2. The TE was conducted in March 2011, following the end of project activities in August 2010, and reviewed all relevant project documentation and outputs as well as interviewing key informants. A list of informant questions was developed based on the areas of inquiry mapped out in the terms of reference for the TE. The questions were put to the key informants from government, UNDP, the former Project Implementation Unit (PIU), as well as project consultants. A short field visit to the easternmost district of Lautem was conducted to view SLM issues and sites of interest.

3. The SLM Project was designed to promote the integration of SLM objectives and approaches across a broad range of government planning and practice. The stated goal of the project was that, "the agricultural, forest and other terrestrial land uses of TL are sustainable, productive systems that maintain ecosystem productivity and ecological functions while contributing directly to the environmental, economic and social well-being of the country." Given that Timor-Leste's topography, soils and climate make it extremely vulnerable to in-appropriate land use, and that some 80% of the population is reliant on agriculture for the majority of their livelihood, the overall goal of the project is extremely relevant.

4. The objective of the project involved "strengthen(ing) the enabling environment for sustainable land management…," through achieving the outcomes of: 1) mainstreaming SLM into national policies, plans and legislation, including the National Action Programme (NAP); 2) building up the required human resources and institutional capacities; and 3) improving knowledge management as it relates to SLM.

5. Two main difficulties were found with the overall project design. Firstly, it was based on limited appreciation of the context in Timor-Leste (TL), which led to over estimation of the capacities of relevant institutions and under estimation of the risks of focusing primarily on the "enabling environment". Secondly, the intervention logic was flawed, lacking linkages between production of outputs and achievement of outcomes. Many of the indicators were not well constructed, and unfortunately the project did not review this situation until the Mid-Term Evaluation (MTE), by which time it was too late to enact a full re-design. As a result of these and other issues, such as limited timeframe and a low-skill environment, the project was very output focused. In addition, little attention was given to what actual land use practices needed to change and how that should happen.

Project implementation

6. Overall, the conduct of project activities by the PIU was found to be well managed, with 11 of 14 outputs being achieved and two of the missing three being assessed as beyond the control of the project. Support from UNDP TL to the project was well regarded by the PIU and others, although more technical assistance during the first 18 months of implementation would have improved the prospects of achieving results at the outcome level.

7. Systems for monitoring and evaluation (M&E) and risk management of the project were assessed as being poorly designed and thinly implemented. With very limited reporting requirements and tracking of indicators, the project was not able to demonstrate achievement of higher level results. Although many of the major risks were correctly identified in the project design, there is no evidence of measures having been implemented to mitigate those risks, and UNDP tools for risk management, such as provisions in the ATLAS project management system, were not utilised by the project team or support staff.

8. The PIU was able to achieve satisfactory levels of engagement from the key counterpart agency, the NDF, but this fell away in the second half of the project. Lack of project activities for NDF to implement (under UNDP's direct execution model), was reported as a significant factor in reduction of interest. Engagement from the other main counterpart institution, the Division of Environment, was more problematic, with personnel having less involvement in activities. Other ministries, such as Planning and Finance, Justice, Infrastructure and others, were never engaged in the project in a meaningful way, notwithstanding the ongoing efforts of the PIU and NDF to involve them. Existing barriers to inter-ministerial collaboration proved very difficult to overcome.

9. Arrangements for project oversight could have benefitted from a more streamlined approach to membership of oversight committees (the Project Steering Committee in particular was too large and broad), as well as more emphasis on educating members as to the nature and objectives of their roles. This resulted in little value added from these committees.

10. Financial management was assessed to have been conducted competently, with final spending coming in just one percent over the budgeted total. Management costs increased over the course of project implementation, from 25% in the initial budget to 33% by project end. This was due primarily to higher than expected costs for purchasing a project vehicle and unbudgeted costs for communications. Both the MTE and the TE had issue with the inclusion of a vehicle and driver in the original budget, due to limited transport requirements of the PIU. Funds would have been better directed towards increased technical support for the PIU. In addition, more active financial management is recommended for future actions.

Project results and ratings

Table 1: Summary of GEF ratings

Assessment area	GEF rating
Overall project rating	Moderately satisfactory
Overall project outputs and results	Satisfactory
Outcome 1	Moderately satisfactory
Outcome 4*	Moderately satisfactory
Outcome 2	Satisfactory
Outcome 3	Moderately satisfactory
Sustainability	Moderately likely
M&E	Moderately unsatisfactory

*Outcome 4 is considered by the TE as an element of Outcome 1

11. Outcome 1, regarding mainstreaming of SLM into policies, plans and legislation, was an ambitious target for a relatively modest project in a very low capacity environment. Major activities included the development of SLM Mainstreaming guidelines and the drafting of the NAP. Although the relevant activities were implemented as planned, by project end the TE was not able to find evidence of the project having met its indicators for this outcome. The reasons for this included the lack of priority given to the area by the government, limited collaboration and coordination between the relevant ministries, difficulties for counterparts to engage with long documents in English, and a lack project attention to practical examples of integrated planning. Key informants at the directorate level indicated that they had an increased understanding of the need to focus planning and resources towards combating land degradation, and how to go about it, but lacked direction and support from above to follow through. Outcome 4 was considered by the TE to be an element of Outcome 1, as it dealt purely with the production of the NAP.

12. The project achieved significantly better results for Outcome 2, "Human resources and institutional capacities needed for SLM are developed." The indicators for training activities were achieved while other indicators were partially achieved. The TE encountered consistent praise for the national and sub-national train-the-trainers courses that were conducted, and for the standard of the training manual. Good adaptive management was demonstrated by the PIU when SLM training for farmers and communities which was re-directed to train rural agricultural extension workers, increasing the scope of training benefits.

13. The third outcome, which involved the production of a number of knowledge products related to SLM, consumed the largest share of the project budget and staff time. Due to the diligence and efficiency of the PIU, all but one of the knowledge products was produced and socialised to the key personnel in government. These included a GIS database that categorised land-use across Timor-Leste in order to assist policy makers and practitioners, a status report on land degradation, and research studies into the effects of upland agriculture and of firewood collection. While the activities under this outcome were not able to achieve the expected results in terms of changes to policy or practice, they did contribute significantly to the base of knowledge and tools available to practitioners and policy makers. Further advancement in terms of policy development and implementation, stronger interest in SLM from key decision makers and evidence of increased operational activity, will be difficult to achieve until political will increases. The TE found, notwithstanding the positive attitudes of practitioners and strong rhetoric from senior policy makers, that there was little evidence of the agencies responsible for SLM governance being adequately supported to promote sustainable land use practices.

Conclusions and recommendations

14. The SLM Project performed satisfactorily in implementing the planned activities and outputs, and coordinating the work across multiple government directorates; particularly when consideration is given to the difficult working environment, government focus on more politically driven priorities, low capacities of counterpart agencies, and ambitious work-plan.

15. The project did not achieve significant progress at the outcome or objective level. Factors that influenced this, in addition to those in the previous paragraph, included: unrealistic design which assumed key risks would not eventuate, lack of capacity within ministries to coordinate, lack of focus on practical SLM measures for the project to promote and the overly technical nature of some of the project outputs.

16.   The TE found that while the various activities were not able to contribute significantly to an improved enabling environment as they were intended, the diverse range of project actions appear to have provided a much needed increased level of exposure for MAF staff. The efforts put into implementing the project have highlighted issues around integrated approaches to SLM so they are more accessible to key personnel in line ministries, as well as demonstrating the need for continued attention by development partners to a sector that becomes increasingly crucial to achieving broader national development outcomes.

17.   **Summary of Terminal Evaluation Recommendations:**
The following are the recommendations that arose through the TE process. They have been summarised and categorised, with the reference number referring to the order in the body of the report.

Design considerations:
TER 1: Future SLM actions should include a "design review and M&E system development process"

TER 8: Project location within one particular directorate should be avoided if possible, as this significantly reduces the potential for other directorates to engage meaningfully

TER 9: Future collaborations should carefully consider the sustainability of high technology inputs – until capacity exists to utilise and manage the outputs

TER 11: Include a significant implementation role for the relevant directorates, even if UNDP retains a direct implementation modality

UNDP management considerations:
TER 2: UNDP TL should consider establishing a position for a Senior National Advisor to support environment related actions and dialogue with government

TER 3: Future SLM related interventions be provided with more direction and support to develop and manage M&E and risk management systems

TER 7: That UNDP TL tracks and reports on relevant project level spending across the environment sector, including activities outside of UNDP

Project management considerations:
TER 4: Projects to use Tetum rather than English during the development of written outputs; and reduce the emphasis on counterpart feedback to long and complex documents

TER 6: Annual budget reporting against outputs be a minimum requirement

TER 10: Local institutions and government personnel should be prioritised for the conduct of research studies and other technical inputs

TER 12: Include missing basic reference data in those project outputs that are lacking it, in order to better enable the material to be well managed and accessible

Governance considerations:
TER 5: The criteria for membership of the PSC be reviewed, with aim of improving focus and avoiding unwieldy grouping or PSC becoming a proxy for other coordination forums

Introduction

Background

18. This report documents the independent Terminal Evaluation (TE) for the "Sustainable Land Management in Timor-Leste, Capacity Building and Mainstreaming Project". The field work for the evaluation was conducted during March 2011.

19. In 2004 the United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) and the Global Environment Facility (GEF) developed a programme to enable each of the Least Developed Countries & Small Island Developing States (LDC-SIDS) to prepare a solid foundation for sustainable land management (SLM) in the country. The design included writing a SLM National Action Programme (NAP) for mainstreaming SLM into national development and conservation agendas, plus facilitating initial capacity development among key stakeholders.

20. The SLM Project for Timor-Leste was designed in October-November 2005 by an international consultant commissioned by UNDP under a GEF Project Development Facility grant of USD 25,000. The UNDP TL Country Office and GoTL applied for funding to GEF in April 2006 and were granted an LDC-SIDS Portfolio Project for Timor-Leste, titled "Capacity Building for and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management in East Timor", commonly referred to as the "SLM Project". The project document was approved in February 2007 and implemented for just over three years, from July 2007 to August 2010. The project implementation unit (PIU) was based within the National Directorate for Forestry (NDF) of the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries (MAF).

21. Funding for the project comprised USD 475,000 from the GEF, USD 31,000 of UNDP core (TRAC) funds, and a USD 43,350 "in-kind" government contribution.

Objectives and scope of the Terminal Evaluation

22. All GEF projects implemented by UNDP require a terminal evaluation to be conducted to address four general aims: 1) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; 2) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvements; 3) to promote accountability for resource use; and 4) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

23. The Terms of Reference (TOR) for this terminal evaluation (Annex 1) call for consideration of aspects of relevance, ownership, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, management, monitoring and evaluation and cross cutting issues. The TOR also asks the TE to provide forward looking recommendations for UNDP TL that would be applicable generally to this type of project and to the GEF's overall portfolio.

Methodology

24. The methodology for this TE followed closely that advised in the TOR (Annex 1). It involved initially conducting a desk review of key relevant documents, such as the project document, project reports and PSC/PWC minutes, as well as all final documentation related to the project outputs (see Annex 4).

25. The TE held a series of semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders to gather information and views (Annex 3 is a list of stakeholders interviewed for the evaluation). A set of questions

based on the evaluation criteria was prepared to ensure that appropriate information was sought from relevant informants (see Annex 5).

26.   A short field trip was conducted in Lautem District to observe SLM issues and sites of interest to the project (see Annex 6 for a brief trip report). The field visit was also useful to enable the TE to better understand the ways of working of the NDF, the key counterpart directorate.

Constraints

27.   The M&E Plan outlined in the Prodoc indicates that the TE would take place at least two months before the end of the project. It eventuated that the TE took place in March 2011, six months after the project had ceased implementation. This situation was not ideal as the Project Implementation Unit had long since been disbanded and it could be expected that informants had less recollection of specific activities. However, it was fortunate that the TE still had access to the former Project Assistant, Carsiliano Oliviera, who now works in the UNDP TL Poverty Reduction and Environment (PRE) Unit and was readily able to facilitate access to informants, documents and provide historical background. The TE was also able to conduct a face-to-face interview with the former Project Manager, Paula Lopes da Cruz, which was extremely useful. Other key former support personnel from the PRE Unit were able to provide some input via email or telephone.

28.   The methodology called for by the TOR was focused on the relevant documentation and the views of key informants within ministries and UNDP. If the timeframe had been longer it would have been interesting to include collection of data and views from communities and farmers.

Structure of the Terminal Evaluation Report

29.   The structure of the TE report follows the suggested layout provided in the TOR. An Executive Summary captures the main points of the report and provides an overview of key points, while the main body of the report has seven sections: Introduction, Project Concept and Design, Project Implementation, Project Results and Sustainability, Conclusions, Lessons and Summary of Recommendations. Recommendations are introduced in the relevant sections, and then summarised in the final section. A number of annexes are also provided, including the TOR, project logical framework and names of informants.

30.   Ratings for each outcome, for sustainability, and for monitoring and evaluation, as per the GEF Guidelines for Terminal Evaluations, are provided in the Project Results and Sustainability section.

Project Concept and Design

31. As established, this project is part of the UNDP/GEF LDC and SIDS Targeted Portfolio Approach for Capacity Development and Mainstreaming of Sustainable Land Management. The project document indicates that the action will address all three outcomes under OP-15 of the umbrella project:

    ▪ Cost-effective and timely delivery of GEF resources to target countries
    ▪ Individual and institutional capacities for SLM will be enhanced – "a large part of this project is directed towards these types of capacity building."
    ▪ Systemic capacity building and mainstreaming of SLM principles – "this project also addresses policy development and mainstreaming of SLM."

32. The project document provides a solid review of the context and issues relating to SLM in Timor-Leste. The problems of land degradation, including structural impediments, are articulated in detail and indicate that the project concept is highly relevant. The following table, Table 2 (reproduced from Mid-Term Evaluation), is a useful summary of the main causes and consequences of land degradation in the country.

Photos 1 & 2 : Examples of land degradation in Timor-Leste
Credit: Paula Lopes da Cruz

Table 2: Causes and consequences of land degradation in Timor-Leste[1]

Important intrinsic factors:
1. Nearly half of all land is steeply sloping (>40%).
2. Soils are generally shallow, low in organic matter and fragile.
3. Rainfall is sparse and variable; different parts of the country are subjected to long dry seasons, periodic droughts (affected by the El Niño Southern Oscillation), short periods of heavy rainfall, flash flooding (exemplified in 2010 by La Niña influenced events).

Five main causes of land degradation in Timor-Leste:
1. Deforestation
• "Widespread deforestation during the Indonesian occupation".
• "Unsustainable harvesting of the country's most valuable tree species, notably sandalwood, ebony and redwood."
• Intensive cutting of trees for firewood.
2. Inappropriate agricultural practices
• "Primarily a problem in dry land farming where vegetables are grown on steep slopes... without any soil conservation measures."
• Shifting cultivation; slash & burn techniques; in upland areas.
3. Forest fires
• "Recurring wildfires on grass-covered mountain slopes."
• Many fires deliberately lit to stimulate grass growth for grazing; some lit to aid hunting.
4. Over-grazing
• Grazing animals, especially goats, roam freely through public "rangelands" rather than being "stall fed" on collected fodder.
• Introduction and spread of invasive weed species.
• Destruction of vegetation, compaction of soils, loss of soil moisture and organic matter, soil erosion from wind and water run-off.
5. Demographic pressures

Major consequences of land degradation:
1. Deforestation destroys forest habitat, biodiversity and forest productivity; leads to severe soil erosion.
2. Poor farming practices lead to decreased soil fertility and soil erosion; land degradation impacts the livelihoods, food security and income of rural populations in many ways: loss of soil fertility, silting of waterways and irrigation infrastructure; flooding of agricultural lands; reduced agricultural productivity and livestock production.
3. Forest fires result in loss of habitat, loss of organic matter, reduction in soil fertility, and soil erosion; leading to sedimentation of rivers; and air pollution which in turn leads to health problems in nearby populations.
4. Downstream impacts extend to flooding of settlements and destruction of infrastructure; torrential river flows causing severe siltation and destruction of coastal vegetation, beaches, mangrove forests and coral reefs; leading to loss of fisheries and of potential recreational and tourism activities.

33. The project document identifies a set of barriers to sustainable land management in Timor-Leste: (a) sustainable land management is not adequately incorporated into national development policies, strategies, legislation and regulations, i.e. sustainable land management is not mainstreamed (b) TL has relatively low human and institutional capacities for integrated and sustainable land management, (c) there is lack of awareness among stakeholders on the seriousness of land degradation and need for sustainable land management, (d) the country does not have adequate funds to implement effective sustainable land management programmes, (e) there is also lack of reliable, comprehensive and up-to-date information on

---

[1] SLM Project Mid-Term Evaluation (2009) and Project Document (2006)

the cause, extent, trends and economic and social implications of land degradation,[2] and (f) lack of clarity about land tenure presents a constraint to assessing land degradation problems and implementing sustainable land management practices, there is no proper land registry, no recording or verification of land transactions or no framework to determine competing claims to land.[3]

34. The project design is apparently derived from a global template used for the portfolio projects that provided a starting point of a common set of goals, objectives and outcomes. The design for the specific Timor-Leste Prodoc was conducted by an external consultant and involved a process of approximately one month in-country. From the consultant's trip report it appears the process consisted of a relatively small number of consultations and field visits and the writing of the proposal. Although the author was assisted by a national consultant, the level of contextual understanding that could be gained by the author during that time and with that level of engagement is severely limited. One result is that the project design is extremely ambitious for a country such as Timor-Leste that does not have established institutions.

Table 3: SLM Project Goal, Objective and Outcomes

Goal	The agricultural, forest and other terrestrial land uses of TL are sustainable, productive systems that maintain ecosystem productivity and ecological functions while contributing directly to the environmental, economic and social well-being of the country.
Project Objective	To strengthen the enabling environment for sustainable land management (SLM) while ensuring broad-based political and participatory support for the process.
Outcome 1	SLM mainstreamed into national policies, plans and legislation.
Outcome 2	Human resources and institutional capacities needed for SLM are developed.
Outcome 3	Capacities for knowledge management for SLM are developed.
Outcome 4	National Action Programme (NAP) is completed.

35. The SLM Project is intended to contribute to the overall goal of solving land degradation issues and risks, which are significant and widespread across Timor-Leste, as summarised in Table 2. The strategy chosen for the project to work towards this goal is to remove the barriers that are considered to be hindering the practice of sustainable land management. These barriers are identified as, first, the lack of attention to sustainable land management in the main sectors of the country's economic and social development activities; and second, as a general lack of capacity – knowledge, resources, mechanisms – to introduce SLM across the country.

36. The project is intended to contribute towards the global and national benefits noted in Table 4 below.

---

[2] Project Document paragraph 39

[3] Project Document paragraph 19

Table 4:   Global and national benefits expected from the SLM Project

Direct global benefit	Enhanced capacity for ecologically sustainable land management in Timor Leste.
Indirect global benefits	Cross-sectoral integration of sustainable land management into plans, policies, strategies, programmes, funding mechanisms and multi-sectoral stakeholder groups.
	Maintenance of the structure and functions of ecological systems.
	Enhanced biodiversity conservation due to reduced deforestation and reduced sedimentation in mangrove ecosystems and improved health of coral reefs.
	Enhanced carbon sequestration through improved capacities for sustainable agriculture and reduced deforestation.
Direct national benefits	Enhanced capacities for economic and financial sustainability of the agricultural, and forest use systems of the country
Indirect national benefits	Enhanced crop production through improved soil fertility maintenance.
	Identification of new commercial uses of forest plantations.
	SLM contributes to the health of mangrove ecosystems and coral reefs that are in turn critical for the tourism industry, for fishing and, in the mid to long-term, for avoiding catastrophic beach erosion.
	Greater empowerment and self-sufficiency of resource users and stakeholders to participate directly in the conception, monitoring and adaptive management of lands and resources.
	Reduced impact of natural disasters.

37. The stated objective of the project is to improve the enabling environment for SLM policy and practice, with desired outcomes that would appear to be relevant in relation to the situational background. However, the achievement of such objectives and outcomes is typically well beyond the control of such a project, even one that is much more significantly resourced and with a longer timeframe. A more modest and specific objective, while still contributing towards the global goal, would perhaps have provided clearer direction for the project to follow.

38. The design lays out a very comprehensive set of project outcomes (4) and corresponding outputs (16). The TE found that this approach, i.e. a focus on a wide range of connected but disparate outputs, was not particularly well suited to the implementation context. Given the very low capacity context it would have been preferable to see a smaller number of outcomes and outputs, with scope built-in for the project to adjust those outcomes to build a distinctive and focused approach to supporting SLM policy and practice.

39. The TE found a number of issues with the logical framework of the project design. For one, there was duplication of two of the outputs (1.3 and 3.6 are the same output, with identical wording; and 4.1 and 4.2[4] are effectively the one ouput – involving the drafting of the NAP).

40. More importantly, the TE found that the project design did not have a practical or appropriate set of indicators and targets for measuring achievement at the outcome level. For example, under Outcome 1, an indicator of success was dependent on the actions of the Ministry of Finance and others in mainstreaming SLM, with the relevant target calling for SLM to be

---

[4] In the GEF submission there was also an output 4.3 which was repetitive and was later cut from documents.

recognised in macro-economic policies and planning by the end of Year 1. The TE considers this to be unrealistic setting of targets.

41. Most of the other outcome indicator targets are actually output targets, for example, "..workshop and guidelines completed by Y1", and, "NAP completed by Y1". The targets should have been more reflective of higher level results, even if more modest results than those in the logical framework. For example, "workshop participants more able to plan relevant SLM activities," or "NAP is being utilised by MAF to help frame annual budget."

42. There is also confusion between the Outcome level and the higher Objective level. Of three indicator targets at the Objective level, one involves the writing of the NAP, which as mentioned is an Output level indicator, and the other two represent completion of activities. In addition, the overall results framework is too dependent upon government actions following the approval of the NAP (i.e., actions undertaken to begin to implement the NAP). The NAP is still yet to be considered by the government[5], although it was approved by MAF and other stakeholders in 2008. While it is not reasonable to expect that the design could have foreseen that the government would not have even got to the point of considering the NAP by project end, a significant timeframe should have been planned for.

43. The deficiencies in the logical framework make it somewhat difficult to judge exactly what level of achievement was expected to constitute a satisfactory project implementation. If judged against achievement of stated outcome indicators[6] then the project is clearly not successful. However, this would not be reasonable given that the indicators were very unrealistic, and the TE will therefore focus more on the output indicators. Given the above issues with project design it is somewhat understandable that the PIU gravitated to an output based approach. The TE is of a view that the project design could have done better to establish a more useable Strategic Results Framework, and better setup the Project Implementation Unit (PIU), and UNDP TL, to be able to monitor progress against the outcomes. However, an improved design would still have required the PIU and UNDP TL to put considerably more attention towards results-based monitoring. Monitoring will be discussed more specifically in the next section.

44. When questioned about the approach that was taken towards the original project design, the International Program Officer in the PRE Unit said that they had felt that their hands were tied. She indicated that there was an understanding within the unit that the basic project design was fixed and that the only flexibility lay in tweaking the outputs to match the perceived reality. Only upon the MTE input and recommendations were they aware they could make relatively significant changes.

45. The MTE had concerns about the strategy presented in the project design and was of the opinion that the project's direction should not have been aimed at reducing "perceived" barriers to SLM: "The approach used supposes that if policies, information, awareness, capacities and funding are improved, then "SLM" will result. However, this is not realistic; it is also important to work out exactly how land use, farming and forestry practices on the ground

---

[5] Under TL's centralised system the Council of Ministers reviews and approves all policies and draft laws, resulting in large delays for policy documents that aren't among government priorities.

[6] There are no outcome indicators in the project agreement so the TE is using those from the GEF submission.

need to change and can be changed; what forms of SLM are required to address the real land degradation issues; and then to specify these details in the strengthened policies, capacity development and funding."[7] The underlying causes of land degradation were not being addressed by this project design.

46. **TE Recommendation 1:** Future SLM actions supported by UNDP TL should allow sufficient resources to enable a "design review and M&E system development process" to take place at, or very soon after, project inception. This would allow more scope for the PIU and UNDP to match the project design to any contextual changes or improved understandings. It is suggested that resources for design and M&E support would be better invested here than in a MTE, as by the time a MTE is conducted it is typically too far into implementation to make more than minor changes. Alternatively, although less preferable, an MTE could be conducted towards the end of the first year, allowing the findings to be well incorporated into a revised approach and M&E strategy.

---

[7] Mid-term Evaluation paragraph 50

Project Implementation

Efficiency of Project Management and implementation, including M&E

47. The SLM project had a large body of work to get through, with a high number of outputs that each had a complex series of further design, procurement, logistics, consultation with counterparts and technical support inherent in their implementation. The PIU was modest, consisting of the Project Manager (PM) a Project Assistant (PA) and a driver. The PM provided significant technical input to several of the outputs, including the NAP and SLM Mainstreaming Guidelines, as well as managing the relationship building with counterparts and linking with other stakeholders, management of the PA and the various consultants and sub-contractors, among other project management tasks and responsibilities.

48. The level of resources available from the counterpart agencies in Forestry and Environment was extremely modest. No government funding was involved in implementing the project activities, or related activities, with the initially expected co-financing contribution of the Trust Fund for Timor-Leste not eventuating.

49. The PM was of the view that the PRE Unit of UNDP TL provided strong support to the SLM project, primarily via the assigned Program Officer (International), a Junior Professional Officer. In the final year of implementation the opportunity for support increased when the PRE Unit employed a Senior Technical Advisor[8] for the environment program. UNDP TL support sections were involved as required in supporting procurement (including recruitment of consultants), travel and finance.

50. The Program Officer, who has since left UNDP but provided input via email, felt that she was not able to provide sufficient support due to the large number of projects she was supporting. Nevertheless, the point was made by several informants that the Program Officer's contribution was extremely valuable, and vital to keeping the project moving ahead.

51. Interviews with national consultants engaged to produce various outputs for the project indicate that the level of technical support available increased dramatically once the international advisor came on board within PRE. The consultant who conducted both the fuel-wood survey and the survey into upland farming opined that her research methodology was improved dramatically following input from the international advisor. She was very thankful for the input but felt that it was unfortunate it came several months into her research, necessitating much re-working.

52. **TE Recommendation 2:** To enable quality implementation of environment related activities, the PRE Unit should consider establishing an ongoing position for a Senior National Advisor. Such a position would require a Timorese national with reasonable experience in implementation of environmental actions, as well as suitable qualifications. While the pool of suitable personnel is very limited in Timor, such a role may well attract qualified individuals currently working out of

---

[8] An international role which went for approximately one year.

their field (eg with bi-laterals or multi-laterals). Or, this position could be potentially be seconded from MAF or another ministry[9].

53. The TE assessed that the **logical framework** of the project was not used as an ongoing management tool. As discussed, the "Strategic Results Framework" was not particularly well designed to track more than the implementation of outputs. This factor may have become apparent if a system of utilizing the logical framework for project management and M&E had been in place. The MTE had noted similar deficiencies in the logical framework, although by that stage of project implementation the country office felt there was little point in amending it.

54. In general, the TE found limited resources devoted to **project monitoring**. The reporting system in place for the portfolio projects also did not encourage monitoring against outputs or outcomes, and was quite limited. Quarterly progress reports required a half-page of general comments, while annual Project Implementation Review (PIR) documents did not require progress against the results framework to be addressed. Also, it is unfortunate that the Terminal Report did not refer to the indicators and targets in explaining achievements and challenges. The MTE aside, monitoring was largely confined to very basic reporting, liaison with consultants, review of their products and observation of training.

55. The TE formed the view that the project activities themselves were reasonably well managed in a difficult implementation environment. The project achieved a number of good quality outputs, such as the SLM Training Manual, trained personnel, and numerous reports. However, the general lack of monitoring information makes it difficult to relate the outputs to any improvements in the policy and practice landscape of SLM in Timor-Leste. For example, the SLM Mainstreaming Guidelines were considered by a number of stakeholders to be a useful tool, although no efforts were made to measure how such products are being used, or if they are influencing stakeholder practice. An example of how monitoring data could have been collected to demonstrate results is the conduct of before and after surveys of key personnel with regard to their views on mainstreaming and how it can be achieved. The training-of-trainers was very well regarded by all who attended and by MAF directors, yet there is no direct evidence that it improved knowledge related to SLM or training skills of the participants. While anecdotal evidence of effectiveness exists, in that some participants went on to conduct training themselves, which was also well received, direct evidence (such as pre and post-tests of knowledge and attitude) is preferable and would allow for continuous improvement of the curriculum and training techniques.

56. As previously noted, the MTE was conducted too late in the project cycle for its more far-reaching recommendations to be implemented. However, various recommendations relating to technical implementation were acted upon. For example, the production of the Catalogue of Good Practice in SLM was driven by the recommendation of the MTE. This demonstrated that the project had the capacity for adaptive management once appropriate feedback was provided.

---

[9] The TE was informed by one senior national advisor that his capacity to work productively was severely limited due to lack of operational budget and issues of structure within the directorates

57. The TE found that the risk management systems could have been better utilised. The project logical framework identified a number of key external risks (see Annex 2); unfortunately, they indeed proved to be the key external limiting factors, but apparently the project had no clear strategy to mitigate them. The Atlas based system was not used by the project to address delivery or planning in a meaningful way, and did not connect to the programmatic reporting as far as could be observed. In the absence of a risk management plan, or reporting against the logical framework, any risk management is most likely going to be limited primarily to financial accountability.

58. **TE Recommendation 3:** Future SLM related interventions in Timor-Leste should be provided with clear direction and support to develop and manage M&E and risk management systems. As PIUs are typically not adequately skilled or resourced to put such systems in place, UNDP TL needs to deliver appropriate support. In addition, project managers are not necessarily aware of the M&E guidance material available (POPP and other sources) and may need clear direction from the CO or regional office as appropriate. Once M&E expectations have been clarified, the establishment of results-based monitoring and robust risk management strategies would normally still require guidance and support from the UNDP TL country office, given the relative inexperience of national project managers and other PIU personnel. Costs for regular M&E activities (apart from the MTE and TE) need to be built specifically into project budgets.

59. The project worked across two ministries in particular, MAF and MED, and was intended to interact with various others (including Infrastructure, Justice and Territorial Administration). The PIU put considerable efforts into consultation for the major outputs, an example being the SLM Mainstreaming Guidelines. The level of participation by the key counterpart, Forestry, was reported to be strong in the first year of the project. However, this dropped away in subsequent years, frustrating the conduct of many activities. The TE can only speculate on the actual reasons for this trend. The level of engagement by personnel from the DOE was not particularly strong throughout. Apparently they saw the project as being for the PIU/MAF to conduct, with their role being more consultative. It should be noted here that implementing actions across ministries in Timor-Leste is notoriously difficult. There is no existing culture of cooperation and collaboration across government, and an environment of rivalry and disinterest is common.

60. Some senior NDF staff indicated that they felt there was too much emphasis on the production of documents, while others, including the director, felt the focus was justified. During discussions for the TE the director indicated that the formulation of guidelines and production of useful information was a necessary step given the paucity of such material within the ministry. Notwithstanding this, the SLM project was apparently unable to elicit input or feedback from ministry stakeholders on key documents. The reasons for this are most likely complex, but probably include a lack of comfort in reviewing and providing feedback on long and complex documents, particularly those in English. Almost all project outputs were drafted in English and only translated upon final approval.

61. As noted above, the PIU conducted numerous consultations across the key directorates in MAF (NDF, NDAL, NDSACD) and other ministries during development of major outputs. The purpose of these consultations was to garner input and support from a range of invited stakeholders

(primarily key counterparts, but including other ministries, agencies and NGOs) and agree on appropriate content and approaches. The PIU reported that these consultations were not successful in eliciting any significant input, although they did get strong interest and attendance and it provided the opportunity for stakeholders to keep in touch with the progress of the project. The reasons for the lack of input and critical comment are most likely complex. Combined with issues such as lack of expertise, a significant factor appears to be the hierarchical nature of discussions and engagements (for example, the high level of deference paid to higher ranking personnel, which typically discourages genuine discussion). In this context it is probably more productive to work with smaller groups where there are not large disparities in the level of authority.

62. **TE Recommendation 4:** Future SLM interventions should work to use Tetum rather than English during the development of written outputs, to better allow engagement and input from key stakeholders. The mechanisms of engagement should also more specifically take into account local customs and capacities, thus reducing the emphasis on feedback to long and complex documents, and avoiding consultations with large disparate groups.

63. The SLM Project invested considerable time and effort in preparing and conducting **Project Steering Committee (PSC) and Project Working Committee (PWC) meetings**. These were usually held every six months. Most stakeholders interviewed for the TE noted that these meetings did not work particularly well. It appears that despite the best efforts of the PIU the participants were generally not cognizant of their roles in these meetings, and they were therefore generally not able to add value to the project. Difficulties that were mentioned to the TE included lack of attendance by ministries apart from MAF and MED, lack of regular representation from directorates – leading to frequent re-visiting of topics, lack of willingness to address matters cooperatively across ministry lines, and lack of understanding of the role expected of participants.

64. The Minister of Agriculture chaired the PSC meetings. While it was admirable that he took the time to engage at this level (and he continues to voice strong support for the need to advance SLM policy and practice) it was not an ideal arrangement as he was very far removed from the level of project implementation.

65. The PWC had more technical and practical issues to deal with, and was therefore more able to stay closer to its mandate. However, it also suffered from inconsistent attendance and attempted to cover too many aspects of the project. The MTE recommended that the PWC be combined with the PSC for the remainder of the project and meet annually to consider only the broadest issues, and that a very limited joint executive meet regularly to deal with key issues in a timely manner. The first part of the recommendation was implemented partially, with combined 6 monthly meetings, but the regular smaller executive PSC/PWC meetings did not take place.

66. **TE Recommendation 5**: Similar interventions should carefully consider the criteria for membership of the PSC, and avoid large and disparate membership. Guidance for establishing PSCs is contained in the UNDP POPP and should be taken into account. Membership should be kept to a much smaller and more manageable number of participants with close links to the activities. In the context of future SLM projects in Timor-Leste, membership could potentially

be restricted to two key directors from the most relevant directorates, the most relevant Director General or Secretary of State, and key personnel from UNDP (such as the PM and PRE Unit Head). Six monthly meetings should be tightly focused and concentrate on results and obstacles, that is, more focus on relative achievements and less concern for reporting on activities. PWC membership could be broader, but should also be focused on personnel who can add value to the process. Future SLM interventions should be cognizant of demonstrating good practice to committee members regarding their roles and that that of the committee, but should avoid trying to cover perceived gaps in broader coordination in the sector, as such an approach lacks sustainability.

Project Performance, including financial management

67. The SLM project was able to implement 11 of 14 outputs. The TE assesses this to be a satisfactory level of achievement considering that two of remaining three outputs[10] (investment plan, donor commitment) were out of the control of the PIU and UNDP TL. Given the range of activities, and the inherent difficulties involved with coordinating across various ministries, the SLM project performed well in regard to rolling-out its activities.

68. The sequencing of some inputs could have been better timed. As previously noted, a number of studies were only completed in the final year of the project and thus could not inform policy development or influence related outputs. Partly this was due to deficiencies in the original workplan, and partly due to the high number of recruitments and contracts involved (which incurred various delays and pushed out most timeframes for consultant inputs).

69. The PIU and UNDP support staff worked diligently to involve the relevant stakeholders in the numerous outputs. Unfortunately there seems to have been limited return on that investment of time and energy. The various barriers to collaboration within ministries, and low levels of capacity, resulted in relatively low levels of engagement (see TE Recommendation 4).

70. There were obstacles outside the control of the project. For example, even with the Minister of Agriculture chairing the PSC and being supportive, the promotion of a key project output and advocacy tool, the NAP, was bogged down at Ministerial level for the second half of the project while it waited to be considered by the Council of Ministers.

71. The project finances appear to have been managed satisfactorily by the PIU and UNDP TL. Budget execution per outcome is summarised in Table 5, and demonstrates that final expenditure is estimated to be within 1% of the revised budgeted total (once the confirmed TRAC contribution was included).

---

[10] The "Land-use study" was the other output not achieved, due to being contracted late and the local NGO not delivering.

Table 5:   Budget and expenditure by outcome

	Original Budget		Revised Forecast		Expenditure	
	GEF	%	GEF+TRAC	%	GEF+TRAC	%
Outcome 1	30,364	6	26,024	5	16,555	3
Outcome 2	134,500	28	140,030	28	123,144	24
Outcome 3	191,587	40	183,121	36	155,816	31
Outcome 4	0	0	1,934	0	14,445	3
Management costs	118,549	25	154,891	31	167,664	33
Tree planting					32,240	6
Totals	$ 475,000	100	$ 506,000	100	$ 509,864	100

Table 6:   Financial overview: budget and expenditure by output.

Outputs		Budget		Expenditure			Balance	
		TRAC	GEF	TRAC	GEF	TOTAL	TRAC	GEF
1.1	...macro-economic policies...	1,206	11,500	1,206	11,228	12,434	0	272
1.2	...Forestry Agriculture Livestock Policies	1,625	5,500	1,625	2,496	4,121	0	3,004
1.3	SLM investment plan	-	10,864	-	-	0	-	10,864
1.4	Donors commitment to SLM	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
	Sub-total Outcome 1					**16,555**		
2.1	Trained officers...	7,969	70,000	10,011	32,044	42,055	-2,042	37,956
2.2	Trained farmers etc (extension workers)	-	39,000	-	71,104	71,104	-	-32,104
2.3	Gender sensitization	-	17,000	-	-	0	-	17,000
2.4	Mandates of NDAL and NDCF	-	21,500	-	9,985	9,985	-	11,515
	Sub-total Outcome 2					**123,144**		
3.1	Status report on land	-	18,500	-	10,485	10,485	-	8,015
3.2	Computerized land information system	17,244	104,587	14,817	74,414	89,231	2,427	30,173
3.3	Assessment of land ownership...	-	25,000	-	12,493	12,493	-	12,507
3.4	Evaluation of fuel wood harvesting	-	22,000	-	12,117	12,117	-	9,883
3.5	Evaluation of upland/ dryland farming	-	16,000	-	31,490	31,490	-	-15,490
3.6	SLM investment plan	-	7,000	-	-	0	-	7,000
	Sub-total Outcome 3					**155,816**		
4.1	Draft NAP document	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
4.2	Final NAP document approved	1,934	0	1,934	12,511	14,445	0	-12,511
	Sub-total Outcome 4					**14,445**		
Gen. Management Costs		1,022	106,549	1,407	166,257	167,664	-385	-59,708
Support to tree planting		-	0	-	32,240	32,240		-32,240
Totals (USD)		**31,000**	**475,000**	**31,000**	**478,864**	**509,864**	**0**	**-3,864**

72. Table 6 gives an overview of the spending broken down by output. Expenditure figures in tables 5 and 6 are not based on final approved figures but a best estimate based on available data. The TE combined the figures from the Project Terminal Report with known expenditure from the latest ATLAS[11] data, together with known commitments. There are some differences between the budget column in the Terminal Report and the original budget (they also don't match with the revised budget figures of 2008), although the TE was not able to clarify the reasons for the differences. It is possible that the PM was using figures from an earlier budget revision, but the CO should attempt to clarify the figures by examining the available documentation.

73. The most notable variation in spending to note from table 5 is that management costs continued to exceed budget, beyond the significant increase in the revised forecast. Reasons for the original increase in management costs include the project vehicle costing some USD 8,000 more than budgeted, and not enough allowance being made for internet and telephone costs.[12] It had been noted in the MTE that the purchase of a vehicle and appointment of a driver was not the most effective use of the funds. The TE is in agreement that for a Dili based project with limited field travel such an arrangement was not warranted.

74. Tables 5 and 6 show that an additional budget line is presented under final expenditure, USD 32,240 for tree planting. The minutes of the final PSC meeting show that the project indicated it would be underspent by approximately USD 30,000. The PSC then agreed to re-allocate funds towards practical SLM activities, in this case tree seedlings for MAF's five district nurseries.

75. While overall financial management appears to have been sound, the SLM project could have benefitted from more active budget control. The TE finds that the lack of reporting requirements was a factor. It is understood that the PIU did monitor the project spending against budget, however, this information was not required to be acted upon through monitoring frameworks or reports.

76. **TE Recommendation 6:** For future SLM projects supported by UNDP TL it would be advisable to ensure annual budget reporting, as required under the POPP. Such reporting should be specific at least as far as output level, not merely against account code and outcome area. Ensuring regular financial reports will better enable UNDP CO management to have a timely understanding of spending trends and forecasts, and support projects and counterparts accordingly.

77. Co-financing that was planned for in the project document did not seem to be tracked by the PIU, as it is not reported on in any of the reports sighted by the TE. The Prodoc indicated that over USD 400,000 would be spent in support of the SLM Project's Objective and Outcomes by other UNDP environment projects, as well as almost USD 100,000 of Trust Fund support, and an "in-kind" contribution of USD 43,350 by the government. The trust fund support did not eventuate. The government contribution includes staff time while involved with project

---

[11] The financial and project management system of UNDP.

[12] The government has been unable to establish reliable internet in most government offices, and private internet costs are extremely high in TL.

activities, use of office space and resources. The TE estimates that the actual value of in-kind support would be significantly less, given that no operational funds were utilised to conduct activities.

78. **TE Recommendation 7:** That UNDP TL tracks and reports on relevant project level spending across the environment sector, including activities outside of UNDP. The main benefit of such a practice would be to improve the potential for coherence and connectedness between various project activities with similar objectives.

Project Results and Sustainability

79. This section of the report will review each outcome and its relevant outputs, outlining the achievements of the project and noting various challenges. It will review the prospects for sustainability of the results and provide ratings for outcomes, sustainability and M&E in accordance with the GEF Guidelines.

Outcome 1: SLM mainstreamed into national policies, plans and legislation, and Outcome 4: National Action Programme (NAP) is completed.

80. Outcomes 1 and 4 are considered together in this report,[13] as they are in reality the same outcome, with writing of the NAP being effectively an activity related to the outcome. For ease of reporting to GEF, individual ratings will be given for Outcome 1 and Outcome 4.[14]

81. **Output 1.1 - Integration of SLM into macro-economic policies and regulatory and economic incentive frameworks and multilateral and bilateral agreements:** This output as written is more outcome than an output. For that reason it is not possible to assess the project's achievement on this output in black and white terms. The activities listed under this output include the writing, approval and promotion of the SLM Mainstreaming Guidelines. The guidelines were developed with the assistance of a consultant, with opportunity provided for input by key stakeholders. It is evident that the development process involved widespread consultation, and key NDF personnel indicated that the product was very useful to them (although this seemed to refer more to future use of the document). Personnel at DOE were less enthusiastic about the utility of the document, and noting that their preference was for more practical outputs[15].

82. The TE assessed the document to be a useful guideline, and one which has the potential to be of assistance to efforts to focus attention on SLM policy and practice. It is pleasing to see that the guide is not particularly long and cumbersome, and the level of writing should normally make it accessible to a range of relevant personnel. However, as noted by the MTE, it alludes to a rather theoretical approach to the issue of "mainstreaming", and more practical examples and recommendations would have made the document more useable in the Timor context. For the TE a question exists as to whether the guidelines in their current form are able to be utilised in

---

[13] The MTE took the same approach to these two Outcomes.

[14] The rating will be the same, as the criteria cannot be utilised separately for Outcome 4.

[15] An attitude that applied to all documents produced under this project.

the context within MAF and MED, let alone across a range of other ministries.[16] The SLM project achieved its activity targets for this output, which the TE considered to be a satisfactory result that Output 1.1 as written was beyond the scope of an output.

83. The TE is of the opinion that there was a step missing in the project's approach to "mainstreaming", or integrating sustainable land management practice and policy within relevant processes. The missing step involves clarification of practical and concrete steps that government agencies can take to combat land degradation. This also relates to the question of where efforts should be focused to support good practice. For this project there is an issue with the NDF's capacity to promote SLM at a community, district or national level - which the TE found to be limited. NDF personnel would seem to have relatively little interaction with communities, groups or farmers, and thus limited opportunity to promote good practices at that level. The primary activity of NDF appears to be the development of tree plantations on public land, and they are not willing to deal with land practices on private/community land.[17] Their work in policing illegal forest activity, primarily illegal logging, is hampered by a lack of authority and resources[18]. Although the NDF has been nominated by government as the focal point for SLM, it is currently not well placed to influence many land use practices.

84. **TE Recommendation 8:** Future SLM actions should reconsider the option of being located within one particular directorate, given that this significantly reduces the potential for other directorates to feel any sense of ownership. It is often best practice to locate a mainstreaming intervention within a supra-sectoral ministry or agency, such as Ministry of Planning and Finance. Within the context of Timor-Leste MAF is very possibly the best location. However, one of the other directorates with responsibilities across other directorates (such as the National Directorate for Support to Agriculture Community Development). In addition, if a future intervention involved considerable focus on promotion of practical SLM practice at the community level then there should be a clear analysis of how this could be done by MAF and which directorates need to take lead roles.

85. **Output 1.2 – Integration of SLM into Forestry Sector Policy and Livestock Sector Policy:** In a similar vein to Output 1.2, the formulation of this output indicates a level of targeting above and beyond the output level. The activities in the Prodoc relate to production of documentation to support personnel involved with reviewing policy, which the project did, and the facilitation of a process to incorporate the relevant elements within policies, which was more problematic. The documentary aid to this output was a 25 page piece titled "Integrating SLM in Timor-Leste's Policies: An overview of the country's forest, agriculture and livestock sector policies." The project conducted a workshop to promote findings and generate action for policy improvements. An issue for this area of work was that the new government effectively sidelined the Sector Implementation Policies approach of the first government, which led to a stalling of policy development as efforts were concentrated on the new governments priorities

---

[16] This is not specific to SLM but applies across all areas requiring coordination across government, where the working culture of approval and decision making from the top, and deferral of responsibility, renders efforts at integration or mainstreaming extremely challenging.

[17] The director and department chiefs indicated that this was due to lack of clarity on land tenure - they are waiting for land laws to be passed that will provide clarity (although the TE doubts that this clarity will be forthcoming).

[18] The forest guards are typically not educated and would struggle to work in extension of SLM practices

in the National Priorities process. The SLM project manager felt that the focus of the government on immediate issues of food security, political stabilisation and security had relegated SLM activity as a priority. This view is supported by the budgeting for the current year for the NDF. With a minimal operating budget, the directorate is very limited in what it can do, particularly as it doesn't have a strategy in place to act as an advocate of SLM across government. The TE finds that this output was not achieved as intended by the design, in that there is no evidence of the SLM project having influenced the content of government policies, but notes that it was beyond the control of the project and that the relevant activities were implemented.

86. **Output 1.3 - SLM investment plan linked to priority actions defined in the NAP:** This output was not carried out. The rationale provided by the PIU was that it was not considered appropriate due to the NAP not having been approved, as well as advice from the Mid-Term Evaluation that such an approach was not the best course of action. The MTE found that having a separate investment plan encouraged the perception that SLM was separate work, rather than supporting an integrated approach by government. However, there could have been work done on promoting SLM related investment within other government strategies. The Bangkok regional office advised that other country projects had pursued the development of an integrated financing strategy as part of the NAP elaboration, and that the PIU in Timor-Leste had also attended a training workshop on this process organised by UNDP and UNCCD. Further work on this area would be essential in future mainstreaming activities.

87. **Output 1.4 - Donor's interested and commitment to sustainable land management achieved:** This output was dropped as it was also dependent on government approval of the NAP, and without the investment plan (Output 1.3) it was deemed that output 1.4 could not be implemented.

88. **Output 4.1 – 4.3: These three outputs covered the drafting, approval and publishing of the NAP.** The project design should have considered this as one output only. In the document signed with the government this "Outcome" reduces from three to two outputs. The TE has chosen to use the project document approved for funding by GEF as the basis for analysis. The SLM project successfully drafted the NAP, involving close collaboration with the NDF and DOE. The PM took the lead on this process and invested considerable time in efforts to achieve meaningful consultation and engagement. As noted in the previous section, at the time of TE the NAP had still not been presented for approved by government, some two years after approval by the Ministry of Agriculture. During an interview with the Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries, the TE learned that the NAP is still being promoted by the minister for inclusion on the agenda of the weekly Council of Ministers meetings (which has centralised approval for even lower level policy matters). The PIU was powerless to do more than enquire with the minister's office as to the situation. The minister assured the TE that the Council of Ministers would be addressing the NAP in coming meetings during April.

89. The indicators of success for Outcomes 1 and 4 were not achieved; for example, "donors have committed to finance selected SLM projects", and "the MOPF and other ministries use the SLM Guidelines as a tool for economic development planning and formulating macro-economic policies" (see Annex 2 for all indicators). This result was foreshadowed during the MTE, which

noted that without a redesign of the project strategy, many of the indicators would not be achieved.

90. Within the main counterpart agencies, NDF and DOE, the SLM project was unable to point to policy advances towards which the project had contributed. The project Terminal report notes: "The project has focused mainly on national policy development, which has proved a difficult entry point, at least in part because a new nation like Timor-Leste has many other priorities to address." It is conceivable that the project has laid the groundwork upon which future policy relating to SLM will be developed. However, discussions held with key policy development personnel within MAFF and DOE did not indicate that policy development would move ahead without significant further support.

Outcome 2: Human resources and institutional capacities needed for SLM are developed.

91. **Output 2.1 - Trained officers from NDCF, NDAL, DOE, DOPW NGOs, and NUTL at national and regional levels in technical aspects of SLM**: The activities related to this output involved preparing an appropriate training manual and conducting training for key personnel at national and district level. The project contracted an international consultant to prepare the SLM trainers' manual and to conduct a 9 day train-the-trainer course in September 2008, with support from a national training consultant. This was the most successful output of the SLM Project in the eyes of most stakeholders. All interviewees were very positive about the training, which trained 22 national level trainers, 10 from government (9 MAF, 1 DOE) and 12 from NGOs. These trainers were then required to conduct training for district level personnel shortly thereafter in order to successfully pass the course. The training report documented feedback from the participants, which was overwhelmingly positive. However, as noted previously, it would have been good practice to have conducted testing of the knowledge gained by the participants.

92. Two separate three-day TOTs were conducted in November 2008, facilitated by the trainees from the national course, and supported by the national training consultant. Unfortunately, the majority of trainee facilitators pulled out just prior to the district events, leaving only eight of the 22 to fulfill the requirement. The two sub-national TOTs involved a total of 60 participants, almost all district level technical officers or senior extension officers for MAF and the district focal points for DOE. To assist in the extension of the knowledge gained, the trainees were provided with a Catalogue of relevant good practices in SLM and educational flip-charts (see output 2.2). The TE would have liked to have seen some follow-up arrangements with these trainees. It would be preferable if MAF were tracking how/if they were using the knowledge.

93. **Output 2.2 Trained farmers and forest communities at suco and aldeia levels in SLM**: This output was revised. The MTE recommended to redirect the focus of this training to agricultural extension workers. As MAF were introducing extension workers country-wide, with one per suco, training these personnel would provide opportunity for a much broader impact due their role in supporting farmers. Also, these newly appointed staff were poorly trained and in need of capacity development. The PIU and PRE Unit agreed to this recommendation, and the project Terminal Report indicates that 280 extension officers were trained. The TE notes that this represents a positive example of adaptive management and is in agreement that the changes

were more likely to be an effective use of project resources. Local NGO staff who had completed the train-the-trainer program conducted the training in eight districts. The TE did not view any training or monitoring reports of this activity and so it is difficult to assess its potential effectiveness, but anecdotal evidence from participants in Lautem district was very positive.

94. The project decided to provide appropriate knowledge materials for the trained extension workers, given that they had very little in this regard. A local NGO, Network for Action on Forestry, Timor-Leste, was contracted to provide a Catalogue of proven good practices in SLM in Timor-Leste. Together with reproductions of other relevant material that a local permaculture NGO (Permatil) had produced, the Catalogue, which also provided a record of the locations of demonstration sites and contact persons, was distributed to the 280 trained extension workers, with further copies going to MAF. The Catalogue is a very helpful aid to extension workers, district based staff in MAF and DEO, and NGO workers as they interact with communities and farmers. It could be expected that the provision of basic SLM training and reference material and aids to community level staff will assist in the take-up of SLM practices.

95. In addition to planned activities, a television documentary was produced by the national broadcaster, TVTL, with support from the SLM project[19]. The objective of this video production was to raise community awareness about land management and land degradation issues facing Timor-Leste. This is another positive example of adaptive management for the TE, although it would have been preferable if the project had documented more regarding the production and broadcasting process

96. **Output 2.3 Gender sensitization workshop and guidelines for integrating gender into SLM activities:** The PSC recommended that gender be included within all training courses run by the project, rather than as a stand-alone workshop.[20] Guidelines regarding gender and SLM were included in the overall guidelines for mainstreaming, and in the training manual. Of the four training modules developed for the ToT course, one was devoted to gender integration into SLM activities. The TE reviewed the training module on gender and found it to be comprehensive and of a good standard, and with appropriate guidance for trainers. Again, some monitoring of the gender component by the PIU would have been advisable.

97. **Output 2.4 Mandates of NDAL and NDF strengthened with special reference to SLM and appropriate tools and guidelines developed to enhance analytical skills and inter-sectoral approaches**: This output jumps back to a higher level, more outcome in scope and somewhat beyond the control of the project. To support this area of work the SLM project engaged a consultant to review relevant mandates of directorates. The PIU increased the scope of the work from the two directorates originally mentioned to cover 12 directorates, nine within MAF, two within MED and one in the Ministry of Justice (Land, property and cadastral services). The activities planned for this output involved reviewing mandates relevant to SLM, developing tools and guidelines to enhance analytical skills and inter-sectoral approaches in SLM, and conducting a workshop and publishing proceedings and guidelines. Implementation of the

---

[19] The documentary was not viewed by the TE.

[20] See minutes of PSC/project inauguration workshop, 11 December 2007

output was primarily conducted by a consultant engaged to research the mandates of the 12 directorates and provide recommendations. The resulting report notes that the objective of the process was "to ensure that [these 12 directorates'] policies, programs and projects carry the SLM agenda, and their organizational systems can effectively and efficiently mobilize resources to deliver SLM objectives". The report provides recommendations for improvements in the mandates, for the establishment of a SLM coordinating committee that is inter-ministerial, and drafts TORs for relevant focal points. The TE found the report to be too theoretical for the context in which these directorates are operating. It could potentially prove a useful resource to these ministries in future years. Currently it is most useful to outsiders as it provides good background material. The issue of the coordinating mechanism for SLM has been recommended numerous times over a number of years; however, it has not yet found the willingness among relevant directors to institute it, or a supporter at a sufficiently high level of government to make it happen.

98. The indicators of success for Outcome 2 were partially achieved. The first indicator involved staff from a range of ministries (MAF, MPF, MPW, MED) and others (NUTL and NGOs) being actively involved in SLM. The target for this indicator was to have 18 national level and 25 regional level officers trained by mid-term of the project. This target was exceeded, with 22 personnel trained at national level and 60 at district level. As noted above, the TE found these outputs of the project to be the most successful. However, the target was not particularly connected to the actual indicator, and only staff from MAF and MED (along with NGO staff) participated in the training. It would have been preferable to have had the indicator changed to reflect a more direct connection with the training conducted. The implied logic is that if you conduct training in SLM then the participants will become active agents for SLM, however, this is not justifiable.

99. The second indicator for Outcome 2 involved "farmers and forest communities practising SLM". The SLM project changed its activities following the MTE, so instead of training farmers and community groups and members it trained district extension staff. The effect this may have had on communities has not been studied by the project, and the TE did not have the scope for community level surveys, so it is not possible to make a judgement on the achievement of this indicator.

100. The third indicator was around promotion of gender issues and encouraging more women to participate in SLM activities. The TE does not have sufficient information to assess this indicator. The project was advised to include the gender training within broader training events. While the TE found the material to be extremely relevant and well prepared, the participant feedback from the ToT at national level indicates that the gender section was considered the least relevant. While promotion of gender was clearly carried out during the project, there is no evidence that it encouraged more women to participate in SLM activities.

101. The fourth indicator involved improved mandates with regard to SLM functions and use of tools to improve functioning of NDF and NDAL. This indicator was partially achieved, as the project provided the tools and recommendations for improving mandates. There is no evidence that the directorates have utilised the material to advance SLM.

Outcome 3: Capacities for knowledge management in SLM are developed.

102. **Output 3.1 Status report on land use and land degradation in TL:** This output was produced in the last six months of the project by the national consultant for remote sensing and GIS. As with a number of the outputs, being finalised only towards the end of the project reduced the opportunity for incorporating findings into project activities and advocacy. The project decided to base this report upon the results of Output 3.2, the data for which was not finalised until the beginning of 2010, causing the delay. The report has not been shared to this point, as UNDP felt that there were some conflicts between this report and that of the International Consultant (3.2). The TE formed the view that this "Status report on land use and land degradation in TL" should be shared with all stakeholders. While there are some quality issues with this report in its current form, the TE sees it as preferable to have the report available. The report itself provides a reasonable review of the land use breakdown for the country, and the district level data should be useful for policy makers and planning to have a better appreciation of the prevailing situation.

103. **Output 3.2 Computerized land use data base and information system**: This output was one of the most significant and costly outputs of the SLM project, involving four months input from an international consultant and around USD 30,000 to purchase satellite images. The end product was an analysis/database system that utilised 11 categories to classify the land area of the country. The analysis required a process of comparison of the satellite data with actual observation in a large number of field locations, so that each land-use category could be verified and properly calibrated. This process was begun jointly by the international consultant and the national consultant and was to be finished by the national consultant. Due to a lack of resources it was not completed satisfactorily, decreasing somewhat the reliability of the categorisations. However, this type of land classification data had not been available previously and so was still considered to be a significant aid to MAF and other relevant ministries. The project handed over the raw data, analysis, maps and reports to the ALGIS section, as they are the only section within MAF with the facilities and training to manage it. The TE learned that the data was not being used by MAF, unfortunately. Apparently this is due to a lack of capacity from the ALGIS section.[21] It is worth noting that the data has proven useful to another environmental analysis that has been conducted since then (although the ALGIS section had been unable to retrieve it and it was eventually provided by a former UNDP advisor who happened to still be in the country).

104. **TE Recommendation 9:** At this stage of the institutional development of MAF, highly technical inputs (such as GIS) from projects such as the SLM project are highly unlikely to be of value beyond the immediate analysis purposes. If there is little prospect of contributing to institutional capacity development then future collaborations should carefully consider the sustainability of high technology inputs. Future SLM interventions should ensure the incorporation of existing GIS and other technical outputs, prior to initiating any further high tech products.

---

[21] ALGIS has been very problematic to get to an operational level, despite significant and long-term support from donors there continues to be no functional standing capacity.

105. **Output 3.3 Assessment of land ownership, tenure and property rights**: This activity was contracted to a local environment NGO, Haburas, during the final year of the project. At the time of the evaluation the NGO had failed to deliver the output in draft form. The reasons for this have not been forthcoming. It would have been useful if this output had been completed in the first half of the project as it could have fed into the consultation process for the drafting of national land laws. However, the barriers to other ministries contributing to the process are considerable. The land laws have now been drafted and being considered by the Council of Ministers, but unfortunately MAF/NDF was not engaged in the consultation process[22]

106. **Output 3.4 An evaluation of the impact of fuel wood harvesting on watersheds**, and **Output 3.5 An evaluation of the impact of upland and dry land farming practices on SLM:** These two outputs were contracted out to the one local consultant and the studies were carried out in 2009. The reports have been shared with the counterpart agencies. The survey carried out on fuel wood harvesting provides some interesting insights into the who, why and how trees are harvested for firewood, particularly in the Hera area, which is the primary source of firewood for Dili. The survey of upland farming practices also provides a useful summary of practice and highlights many of the negative effects. The TE finds that both of these reports are useful additions to the SLM literature in Timor-Leste, without being targeted or thorough enough to form the basis of specific new policy development. They can hopefully provide useful pointers to where further research is required. The minutes of the final PSC meeting indicate that the minister found the findings of the fuel wood survey particularly interesting and was concerned at the finding that certain businesses in Dili were responsible for the bulk of harvesting of complete trees[23]. He stated that the government needed to begin regulating these businesses to reduce deforestation[24].

107. It was noted in the previous section of this report that the national consultant felt that the survey, and her own learning, had benefitted greatly from the technical input of the PRE Unit International Advisor, Program Officer and PM. Two points are worth noting in relation to this: Firstly, that the project indirectly contributed to the capacity building of the cohort of capable national consultants (others were the training consultant, GIS consultant and SLM mainstreaming consultant). Secondly, that the pool of capable personnel available to provide such inputs is severely limited. The consultant who was selected to conduct outputs 3.4 and 3.5 was only recently graduated (with an undergraduate degree obtained abroad) and had no previous experience[25]. This is a salient point for consideration in the design of future interventions. However, it would be hoped that government agencies can be supported to conduct research activities in the next phase, with appropriate support arrangements designed into the process.

---

[22] During interview for this evaluation FAO indicated that they had encouraged NDF to become engaged in the process, given the relevance for their work.

[23] Bakeries and Tofu producers were among the biggest users. Commercial domestic firewood harvesting did not generally involve cutting entire trees, but harvesting of limbs and fallen branches.

[24] In theory there is a Forest Guard employed by NDF manning each of the three entry points to Dili and confiscating any unregulated firewood, however, trucks simply operate at night to avoid detection.

[25] When quizzed about the likelihood of her working in the future for government in the environment sector she was not optimistic, stating that the current nature of the public institutions provided no incentive for her.

108. **TE Recommendation 10:** UNDP TL and government should design future SLM projects to conduct research using local institutions. Research targets should be very simple and MAF personnel from relevant directorates should be engaged in carrying out such research in collaboration with the national university, local consultants and other relevant bodies.

109. **Output 3.6 SLM investment plan linked to priority actions defined in the NAP:** This output is a replication of output 1.3, see paragraph 85.

110. The indicators for Outcome 3 were not achieved during the project implementation period. Each of the indicators required the utilisation of the knowledge products by the staff of MAF and DOE, of which the TE found no evidence (see Annex 2 for full list of indicators). While the outputs were delivered, apart from the land survey, they were not able to produce results in regard to policy and practice. Nevertheless, the project produced useful qualitative and quantitative information that can be a valuable resource for future actions.

111. Outcome 3 involved the largest proportion of the SLM project's time and budget. The management of the many and varied consultant inputs, the requisite UNDP procedures, the organisation of consultations, provision of direct input, coordination with other stakeholders, etc, was all very time consuming.

112. The PIU learned much during the process of implementing this project, both from the technical and organisational perspective, and managed the activities competently. It is unfortunate that this learning is effectively lost to MAF, due to their personnel having had no hands-on role in the project management.

113. **TE Recommendation 11:** The next collaboration for SLM outcomes should involve a significant role for the relevant directorates in terms of managing the implementation of activities, even if UNDP retains a direct implementation modality. This will enable the directorates to obtain valuable experience in basic planning and implementation of activities with due accountability.

114. Many of the issues that have reduced the effectiveness of the outputs under Outcome 3 could have been predicted, given a realistic analysis of the working environment and conditions within the ministries.[26] The assessment of the TE is that the PIU and support staff in the PRE Unit nevertheless worked assiduously to counteract these issues.

115. A number of the knowledge outputs produced did not contain the basic referencing data of author and date, as well as what the general purpose of the document was. The formatting of the many documents also varies greatly; it would be preferable for them to have some standard elements. While there were deficiencies in the quality of some of the English writing, this is not of concern unless it results in ambiguous language that is not possible to be translated clearly.

116. **TE Recommendation 12:** UNDP TL should make efforts to include the missing basic data in those project outputs that are lacking, in order to better enable the material to be well

---

[26] The logical framework did identify many of the external risks related to government commitment, however, there was no strategy to address them.

managed and accessible. Any outputs that have not been translated and disseminated should have this done as soon as possible.

GEF Ratings[27]

Table 7: Overall ratings per Outcome and for M&E according to GEF evaluation criteria

	GEF rating	Comment
Outcome 1	Moderately satisfactory	These two outcomes suffer in terms of relevance and effectiveness. The project is unable to show results at this level for these two outcomes, however; the design was severely compromised in that it was too ambitious and over-reaching. Reasonable ranking for efficiency/cost-effectiveness.
Outcome 4	Moderately satisfactory	
Outcome 2	Satisfactory	Rated highly for relevance, while effectiveness complicated by poor indicators and lack of follow-up. Successful implementation of training with a reasonable level of efficiency/cost-effectiveness.
Outcome 3	Moderately satisfactory	Again, hamstrung by poor design and inflexibility to re-design. Relevance and effectiveness below expectations as evidenced by lack of take-up. Late provision of outputs contributed to this. Efficiency/cost-effectiveness diminished due to late provision of outputs given this Outcome area dominated the budget.
Sustainability	Moderately likely	Financial risks: the government has not prioritised or budgeted for SLM, however, there is high donor interest and this could compensate to an extent. Socio-political risks: MAF rural extension service offers best opportunity as interest is high. Other directorates have demonstrated low levels of ownership. Institutional framework and government risks: policies and laws are being further developed. Lack of coordination between directorates is a significant issue. Environmental risks: No potential risks were found in this area as the focus to-date has been mainly institutional.
M&E	Moderately unsatisfactory	Design document laid out a basic approach to M&E, however, a comprehensive M&E plan was not in evidence, and limited collection of information to track progress took place. Budgeting for M&E was restricted to occasional field visits[28], MTE and TE; and PIU workplan made no mention of ongoing monitoring. MTE was thorough and with many recommendations for improvement, some of which were able to be implemented.

---

[27] For explanation of GEF ratings see http://www.thegef.org/gef/node/1905

[28] Field activities for the PIU to visit were relatively limited.

117. The GEF guidelines additionally ask if the project being evaluated contributed towards establishing a long-term monitoring system; and if it did not, should the project have included this as a component? The TE did not see any evidence that the project contributed towards longer-term monitoring, however, it would have been unrealistic to have included such a component in the design. Issues of local capacity to manage basic monitoring systems would need to be addressed in the first instance.

118. Although many of the indicators as described in the project logframe were not achieved, and the project results in terms of outcomes, sustainability and M&E were only moderately satisfactory on the whole, the project performed significantly better in terms of results related to outputs and activities. If such an area were to be assessed under the GEF guidelines it would be achieve a rating of satisfactory. Given the design issues that have been noted in this report, the TE is of the opinion that this positive result in terms of outputs be given due consideration.

Conclusions and Lessons

119. The SLM project team achieved 11 out of 12 major outputs that were under the control of the project and immediate counterparts. The level of quality of the outputs was rated as satisfactory to highly satisfactory when reviewed by the TE. This represents a satisfactory level of achievement at the output/activity level.

120. The design of the project was problematic in terms of its analysis of the institutional and human resource contexts, and its intervention logic was essentially flawed. This reduced the chances of achieving outcome level results to a very minimal level.

121. The TE found that the project logical framework was not well constructed, and did not have appropriate indicators. Nor was it conducive to effective monitoring of outcome level results. This contributed to a very output focused approach to implementation, and limited attention being placed on the higher level impacts (e.g., take up of SLM outcomes in broader government planning and budgeting, and implementation of the NAP).

122. The overall quality of outputs was of a reasonable standard, although the sheer number of lengthy output documents that were developed, as well as finalising many of the outputs towards the end of the project cycle, made it difficult for the PIU and UNDP to maintain a strong level of quality control. Notwithstanding some inconsistency in quality, the complete set of project knowledge outputs is suitable for distribution to relevant stakeholders as they add considerably to the SLM knowledge base.

123. The TE determined that the project implementation unit was motivated, diligent and efficient. The PM was an effective manager who handled the complexities of intra and inter-ministerial

politics in a very competent manner. The PIU, and UNDP TL, managed the numerous consultant recruitments and consultation processes effectively.

124. The TE concluded that although the project achieved most of the outputs as designed, the project did not achieve significant progress at the outcome or objective level. Of the four project outcomes, considered as three outcomes by the TE, the project was assessed to have achieved moderately satisfactory results in only one (Outcome 3 -human resource and institutional capacity development). Factors that influenced this included: unrealistic design which assumed key risks would not eventuate, lack of capacity within ministries to coordinate, lack of priority and budget towards SLM by the government, lack of focus on practical SLM measures for the project to promote and overly technical nature of some of the project outputs.

125. Implementation of activities requiring highly technical inputs from international consultants on a very short-term basis, such as remote sensing analysis, is of questionable value to capacity building within MAF.

126. A lesson that can be drawn from the implementation of the SLM activities is that capacity building in Timor-Leste is very difficult to achieve through large numbers of short-term consultant interventions. More investment in technical resources, within UNDP TL and within PIUs, is more likely to deliver more sustainable results. When external inputs are required, the use of local consultants and institutions can now be utilised as a primary modality for research and short-term inputs, provided sufficient resources and time are allocated to collaborative design.

127. Lessons can also be drawn from the efforts by the SLM project to achieve collaboration across directorates within MAF and with other ministries. Location of the project within one directorate does not appear to be the best option within the Timor-Leste context, as even though the PIU worked hard to engage other directorates they were unable to overcome the cultural and institutional barriers to collaboration[29]. Future projects with the aim of promoting integrated approaches should try to avoid being associated with one specific directorate.

128. By the end of project implementation, the PM and other key informants of the TE, had concluded that follow-up actions to the SLM project needed to focus more on supporting practical activities that addressed land degradation at district and community level. The TE is in agreement with the view of the PM that the project design did not address the need of NDF/MAF to demonstrate and promote good practice to key target groups. However, future SLM interventions should not focus solely on demonstrating and/or promoting good practice, but should provide some continued support for policy advancement as well as the improvement of research techniques and knowledge products as appropriate.

129. Arrangements for project oversight, namely the Project Steering Committee and Project Working Committee, were not considered to be effective. The PSC in particular was conceived with too many members and at a level that was too senior. In an apparent effort to cultivate

---

[29] This is also the case in other country contexts apart from Timor-Leste.

coordination on SLM when none existed, the design of the PSC did fill the perceived gap, nor did it provide for effective oversight or direction to UNDP and the PIU. Future interventions would be advised to restrict PSCs to a smaller group of relevant personnel and empower them to actively review strategic approaches and intervene to overcome blockages.

130.   The direct contribution of NDF personnel towards actual SLM activities by the end of the project was found to be limited. Discussions with NDF personnel in Dili and Lautem indicated that there was little impetus or budget within NDF to support any of the potential SLM work that had been covered during project training activities. The MAF extension officers would appear to be well placed to promote good practice among farmers, particularly if they receive more support in this area. While MAF and MED staff did participate willingly in many of the project activities, particularly the training of trainers and district level training, the TE was left with the impression that the project also provided an option delaying resource allocation towards combating land degradation. While this is understandable given the government's heavy commitment to infrastructure spending, public sector employment and food subsidies, it is far from ideal.

131.   Given the wide range of donor funded activities connected to SLM and broader environmental themes, UNDP TL is advised to develop more core resources to support the sector. This would require more national staff with relevant technical skills and experience, as well as implementation of systems to support GOTL to monitor activities and coordinate information exchange and planning.

132.   The need for action to address land degradation in Timor-Leste increases and becomes more urgent as each year passes. It also represents a major underlying restriction on sustainable human development in the country, leading to increased pressure on food security and rural livelihoods, among others. Given that dealing with issues of sustainable land use is unfortunately not a current government priority, and is unlikely to become one without a significant change in approach from decision makers, future SLM actions should work to achieve higher level influence. Higher level advocacy within future project designs would require close coordination between the upper management of UNDP, donors and other agencies so that a clear and consistent set of messages are being delivered. Without a more cohesive approach among development partners to addressing land degradation and conservation issues, the potential for achieving results will be limited.

Summary of recommendations

133. **TE Recommendation 1:** Future SLM actions supported by UNDP TL should allow sufficient resources to enable a "design review and M&E system development process" to take place at, or very soon after, project inception. This would allow more scope for the PIU and UNDP to match the project design to any contextual changes or improved understandings. It is suggested that resources for design and M&E support would be better invested here than in a MTE, as by the time a MTE is conducted it is typically too far into implementation to make more than minor changes. Alternatively, although less preferable, an MTE could be conducted towards the end of the first year, allowing the findings to be well incorporated into a revised approach and M&E strategy.

134. **TE Recommendation 2:** To enable quality implementation of environment related activities, the PRE Unit should consider establishing an ongoing position for a Senior National Advisor. Such a position would require a Timorese national with reasonable experience in implementation of environmental actions, as well as suitable qualifications. While the pool of suitable personnel is very limited in Timor, such a role may well attract qualified individuals currently working out of their field (eg with bi-laterals or multi-laterals). Or, this position could be potentially be seconded from MAF or another ministry.

135. **TE Recommendation 3:** Future SLM related interventions in Timor-Leste should be provided with clear direction and support to develop and manage M&E and risk management systems. As PIUs are typically not adequately skilled or resourced to put such systems in place, UNDP TL needs to deliver appropriate support. In addition, project managers are not necessarily aware of the M&E guidance material available (POPP and other sources) and may need clear direction from the CO or regional office as appropriate. Once M&E expectations have been clarified, the establishment of results-based monitoring and robust risk management strategies would normally still require guidance and support from the UNDP TL country office, given the relative inexperience of national project managers and other PIU personnel. Costs for regular M&E activities (apart from the MTE and TE) need to be built specifically into project budgets.

136. **TE Recommendation 4:** Future SLM interventions should work to use Tetum rather than English during the development of written outputs, to better allow engagement and input from key stakeholders. The mechanisms of engagement should also more specifically take into account local customs and capacities, thus reducing the emphasis on feedback to long and complex documents, and avoiding consultations with large disparate groups.

137. **TE Recommendation 5**: Similar interventions should carefully consider the criteria for membership of the PSC, and avoid large and disparate membership. Guidance for establishing PSCs is contained in the UNDP POPP and should be taken into account. Membership should be kept to a much smaller and more manageable number of participants with close links to the activities. In the context of future SLM projects in Timor-Leste, membership could potentially be restricted to two key directors from the most relevant directorates, the most relevant Director General or Secretary of State, and key personnel from UNDP (such as the PM and PRE Unit Head). Six monthly meetings should be tightly focused and concentrate on results and obstacles, that is, more focus on relative achievements and less concern for reporting on

activities. PWC membership could be broader, but should also be focused on personnel who can add value to the process. Future SLM interventions should be cognizant of demonstrating good practice to committee members regarding their roles and that that of the committee, but should avoid trying to cover perceived gaps in broader coordination in the sector, as such an approach lacks sustainability.

138. **TE Recommendation 6:** For future SLM projects supported by UNDP TL it would be advisable to ensure annual budget reporting, as required under the POPP. Such reporting should be specific at least as far as output level, not merely against account code and outcome area. Ensuring regular financial reports will better enable UNDP CO management to have a timely understanding of spending trends and forecasts, and support projects and counterparts accordingly.

139. **TE Recommendation 7:** That UNDP TL tracks and reports on relevant project level spending across the environment sector, including activities outside of UNDP. The main benefit of such a practice would be to improve the potential for coherence and connectedness between various project activities with similar objectives.

140. **TE Recommendation 8:** Future SLM actions should reconsider the option of being located within one particular directorate, given that this significantly reduces the potential for other directorates to feel any sense of ownership. It is often best practice to locate a mainstreaming intervention within a supra-sectoral ministry or agency, such as Ministry of Planning and Finance. Within the context of Timor-Leste MAF is very possibly the best location. However, one of the other directorates with responsibilities across other directorates (such as the National Directorate for Support to Agriculture Community Development). In addition, if a future intervention involved considerable focus on promotion of practical SLM practice at the community level then there should be a clear analysis of how this could be done by MAF and which directorates need to take lead roles.

141. **TE Recommendation 9:** At this stage of the institutional development of MAF, highly technical inputs (such as GIS) from projects such as the SLM project are highly unlikely to be of value beyond the immediate analysis purposes. If there is little prospect of contributing to institutional capacity development then future collaborations should carefully consider the sustainability of high technology inputs. Future SLM interventions should ensure the incorporation of existing GIS and other technical outputs, prior to initiating any further high tech products.

142. **TE Recommendation 10:** UNDP TL and government should design future SLM projects to conduct research using local institutions. Research targets should be very simple and MAF personnel from relevant directorates should be engaged in carrying out such research in collaboration with the national university, local consultants and other relevant bodies.

143. **TE Recommendation 11:** The next collaboration for SLM outcomes should involve a significant role for the relevant directorates in terms of managing the implementation of activities, even if UNDP retains a direct implementation modality. This will enable the directorates to obtain valuable experience in basic planning and implementation of activities with due accountability.

144. **TE Recommendation 12:** UNDP TL should make efforts to include the missing basic reference data in those project outputs that are lacking it, in order to better enable the material to be well managed and accessible. Any outputs that have not been translated and disseminated should have this done as soon as possible.

Annex 1 – Terms of Reference

Title: **Sustainable Land Management Project Terminal Evaluation**

Type of Contract: SSA

Duration: 18 days over 6 weeks

Duty Station: Dili, Timor-Leste & home base

Expected Start date: 13 December 2010

Background

Sustainable Land Management is the term used to describe a comprehensive and integrated approach to the conservation and sustainable development of land and associated resources in a country. Core components of SLM include land and soil conservation; surface and ground water management and use; management of sustainable agriculture and forest use; conservation and sustainable use of terrestrial biodiversity - in forests, agricultural lands, rivers and wetlands; management of sustainable livelihoods based on land, forest and agricultural resources; reduction of risks of natural disasters through strengthened SLM and climate adaptation.

The Government of Timor-Leste, led by the National Directorate of Forestry (NDF) and with the UNDP Country Office Environment Unit, have been implementing a national Sustainable Land Management (SLM) Project for the past three years. The SLM T-L Project is part of a multi-country SLM Portfolio Project, implemented with financial support from the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and an Enabling Activity under the guidance of the UN Convention to Combat Desertification (CCD), to which the Republic of Timor-Leste is a signatory member.

The purpose of the SLM Project was to assess issues affecting Timor-Leste's land, land-use, forestry, agriculture, water and land management; prepare draft policy and an action plan for strengthened SLM in the country; and to organise initial training exercises for land-users and managers to incorporate principles of sustainable land use into their farming, forestry and other land-use activities. The project has completed most of these planned activities and outputs[1], and these have been presented to the Project Working Committee, comprising the main participating National Directorates, and to the Project Steering Committee, representing the involved Government Ministers and UNDP. Nevertheless, at its last combined meeting, the PSC and PWC members recognised that despite the Project's achievements, there is a danger that efforts to strengthen sustainable land-use, natural resource management and conservation in the country will falter at the close of the SLM Project, and the overall goal will not have been reached.

Some of the technical products developed during the later stages of the SLM Project require further editing and completion. Other government and aid agencies and NGO programs and projects are also contributing to the broad goal of sustainable land management or integrated natural resource management in Timor- Leste. These include projects involving forest protection and rehabilitation,

agro-forestry, sustainable agriculture, water resources management, resource-based livelihoods, village development, natural disaster risk reduction, climate adaptation, invasive weeds control, biodiversity conservation, protected areas, renewal energy production, pollution and waste management, rural roads and other infrastructure construction. It is significant also that other initial Enabling Activities under the other Multi-lateral Environment Agreements – NAPA and INC preparation (UNFCCC); and NBSAP preparation and the POWPA (UNCBD) – are being implemented at present, by GoTL and UNDP. A capacity development proposal has also recently been prepared[2], for institutional strengthening and coordination of general ('cross-cutting') environment & natural resources governance in Timor-Leste.

One of the key recommendations from the SLM Project has been to steadily integrate these diverse efforts into a coherent and systematic approach, through which the country's land and associated natural resources can be better managed, for both conservation and sustainable development.

The Timor-Leste SLM Project is due to close in December 2010, and these Terms of Reference describe important tasks to be carried out – to evaluate the progress the SLM Project has made towards its key objectives, and to plan the next steps towards strong SLM action programs in the country.

Proposed Actions

Against this background, the SLM PSC members (GoTL and UNDP) propose the following actions to be carried out at the close of the SLM Project:

A. **Review and evaluation** of the performance, findings and recommendations of the SLM Project.

B. **Review of broader progress** towards strengthening sustainable land management in the country, and **preparation of a concept plan** for strengthening integrated land, environment and natural resources management in Timor-Leste in the medium-term (7 – 10 years).

The following Terms of Reference describe the first of these actions, the Review & Evaluation of the Sustainable Land Management Project in Timor-Leste at the termination of the project, which will be carried out through a short-term consultancy organised by GoTL and UNDP in the periodDecember - January 2010.

TERMS OF REFERENCE

Terminal Evaluation of Project Number: 00053217, Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Timor-Leste

BACKGROUND TO SLM PROJECT EVALUATION

The Project on Building Capacity and Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Timor-Leste is a Global Environment Facility (GEF)-funded Project through the United Nations Development Program (UNDP). The Project has been implemented by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries through the National Directorate of Coffee and Forestry (NDCF), over a three year period (2007-2010). The Project has been supervised by the Project Steering Committee (PSC) and received technical guidance from a Project Working Committee (PWC).

Further details on the background and activities of the SLM Project are contained in the Project Document (2007), the Mid-Term Evaluation Report (2009) and the Project Manager's Terminal Report in August 2010.

OBJECTIVES OF THE EVALUATION

In accordance with the UNDP/ GEF Monitoring & Evaluation (M&E) policies and procedures, all projects must undergo terminal evaluation at the end of the project. The four general aims are: i) to monitor and evaluate results and impacts; ii) to provide a basis for decision making on necessary amendments and improvement; iii) to promote accountability for resource use; and iv) to document, provide feedback on, and disseminate lessons learned.

Terminal Evaluations (TE) are intended to provide an objective and independent assessment of project implementation and impact, including achievement of global environmental benefits and lessons learned to guide future conservation efforts. Specifically, the TE will assess the extent to which the planned project outcomes and outputs have been achieved, as well as assess the relevance, effectiveness and efficiency of the project as defined in the guidelines for Terminal Evaluations3. The evaluation will also evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of project design, implementation, monitoring and adaptive management and sustainability of project outcomes, including the project exit strategy. The evaluation covers the entire project including non-GEF financed components.

SCOPE OF THE EVALUATION

The TE should consider and report on the following evaluation issues and criteria:

1. **Project relevance** and consistency with country priorities and the GEF Land Degradation Focal Area (specifically GEF-4 Strategic Objective 1 & 2, to develop an enabling environment that will place Sustainable Land Management in the mainstream of development policy and practices at the regional, national, and local levels; and to scale-up SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the global environment and local livelihoods).

2. **Ownership** of the project at the national and local levels; stakeholder participation at national and local levels.

3. **Effectiveness** in realizing project immediate objectives, planned outcomes and outputs; the effects of the project on target groups and institutions; the extent to which these have contributed towards strengthening the institutional, organizational and technical capability of the government in achieving its long-term sustainable development objectives (including environmental management goals).

4. **Sustainability** of project achievements and impacts, including financial and institutional sustainability, and an assessment of planned replication and exit strategies.

5. **Management** arrangements, including supervision, guidance, back-stopping, human resources, and the Implementing Agency's (UNDP) supervision and back-stopping; the quality and timeliness of inputs, activities, responsiveness of project management to changes in the project environment and other monitoring feedback.

6. **Financial** planning and sustainability, including the timely delivery and use of committed co-financing.

7. **Efficiency** or cost-effectiveness in the ways in which project outputs and outcomes were achieved.

8. **Adaptive management**, including effective use of logframe, UNDP risk management system, annual Project Implementation Reviews, and other parts of the M&E system, tools and mechanisms as appropriate; evaluate whether project design allowed for flexibility in responding to changes in the project environment. Review the recommendations of the MTR and assess how the MTR had helped adaptive management of the project.

9. **Risk management**, including the UNDP risk management system within ATLAS, which is also incorporated in the annual PIR. The evaluators are requested to determine how effectively the risk management system is being used as an adaptive management tool. Risks may be of a financial, socio-political, institutional, operational, environmental (or other) type.

10. **Cross-cutting** issues: ☐ Poverty reduction: How has the project contributed to poverty reduction through SLM initiatives in the pilot sites and enhanced sustainable livelihoods? ☐ Governance: How has the project facilitated the participation of the local communities in natural resource management and decision making processes? ☐ Promotion of gender equity: Has the project considered gender sensitivity or equal participation of man and women and boys and girls in decision making processes? ☐ Capacity development of participants and target beneficiaries.

11. **Lessons and Recommendations**: The evaluator will present lessons and recommendations on all aspects of the project s/he considers relevant. with special attention given to analyzing lessons and proposing recommendations on aspects related to factors that contributed to or hindered attainment of project objectives, sustainability of project benefits, innovation, catalytic effect and replication, the role and effectiveness of M & E and adaptive management in project implementation.

Ratings of key evaluation criteria The evaluator will provide ratings for the following main criteria, in accordance with GEF Guidelines for Terminal Evaluations:

1. Rate the Relevance, Efficiency and Effectiveness of each Project Outcome: *Highly Satisfactory (HS) – Satisfactory (S) – Moderately Satisfactory (MS) – Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) – Unsatisfactory (US) - Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)* (Evaluators should refrain from providing recommendations to improve the project. Instead, they should seek to provide a few well-formulated lessons applicable to the type of project at hand and to UNDP's country program and the GEF's overall portfolio. Terminal evaluations should not be undertaken with the motive of appraisal, preparation, or justification for a follow-up phase. Wherever possible, terminal evaluation reports should include examples of good practices for other projects in a focal area, country or region.)

2. Rate the Sustainability of project outcomes along 4 key dimensions, Financial, Socio- Political, Institutional Framework & Governance; and Environmental, using the following scale: *Likely (L) – Moderately Likely (ML) – Moderately Unlikely (MU) – Unlikely (U)*

Rating the Project's M&E system The evaluator will give a rating of the Project's M&E system: *Highly Satisfactory (HS) – Satisfactory (S) – Moderately Satisfactory (MS) Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU) – Unsatisfactory (US) - Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)* In addition, the evaluation will assess the Project's contribution to establishment of a long-term monitoring system. If it did not, should the project have included such a component? If it did, what were the accomplishments and short comings in establishment of this system? Is the system sustainable, i.e. is it embedded in a proper institutional structure and has financing? Is the information generated by this M&E system being used as originally intended?

PRODUCTS EXPECTED FROM THE EVALUATION

The main products expected from the evaluation are:
☐ Interim draft terminal evaluation report;
☐ Final terminal evaluation report – refer to ANNEX 1 for suggested minimum contents.
☐ Completed Tracking Tool for Strategic Priority 1 & 2 of GEF 4 (Tracking Tool will be provided to the consultant for completion).

EVALUATION ROLES & RESPONSIBILITIES

The evaluator for the SLM Project TE will be an international consultant with in-depth understanding of UNDP and GEF projects including evaluation experience. S/He will be responsible for developing the evaluation methodology, conducting the evaluation and delivering the key products expected from the evaluation. ANNEX 2 specifies the requisite qualifications of the evaluator-consultant, which applicants should address in their proposals. The evaluator will work with a small consultative group from MAF, MED and UNDP Timor-Leste5. Because the SLM Project manager and implementation unit have been disbanded already, the evaluation exercise will be supported and facilitated by the UNDP Programme officer responsible for the SLM Project. The consultant will sign an agreement with UNDP to undertake the SLM Project evaluation and will be bound by its terms and conditions set out in the agreement.

METHODOLOGY and CONDUCT OF THE EVALUATION

The evaluation will include a) desk review of documents; b) a series of consultations or interviews to gather information and views from key stakeholders; c) a short field trip to observe SLM issues and sites of interest to the project; and d) preparation and delivery of the evaluation report. The work

will be undertaken both from the consultant's home base, and in Timor-Leste. The evaluation will be carried out in accordance with the requirements of GEF and UNDP as articulated in various guidelines, policies and manuals on the conduct of evaluations for GEF projects, as well as key project documents such as the approved GEF project brief, the final UNDP project document, the inception workshop report, the project log-frame and annual budgets and work plans, the annual Project Implementation Review, Project Board/ PSC and PWC meeting minutes, and other technical reports and documents as relevant. The evaluation methodology should be documented in the final evaluation report, including details of the following: ☐ Documents reviewed ☐ Interviews conducted ☐ Consultations held with stakeholders. ☐ Sites visited. ☐ Techniques and approaches used for data gathering, verification and analysis.

Tentative Schedule for the TE The consultant's input will be required for 18 days (12 days in-country and 6 days to work from home), with the terminal evaluation tentatively scheduled to begin on 13 December 2010. The tentative schedule is given below.

Action Consultant inputs Dates

Preparation, documents review **2 days** 13 – 14 December
In-country consultations, and document review **5 days** 16 – 20 December
Field trip **2 days** 21 – 22 December
Further consultations and document review; report drafting **4 days** 23 – 26 December
Presentation of initial evaluation progress; departure from T-L **1 day** 27 December
Compilation of complete draft TE report **3 days** 03 – 07 January
Delivery of draft TE report to UNDP T-L for circulation and collection of comments and additional information 10 January
Completion of final draft TE report based on comments and information received **1 day** 24 January
Delivery of final draft TE report to UNDP T-L for delivery to GoTL, UNDP and GEF 26 January
Totals **18 days** 5-6 weeks

Focal Persons

UNDP Country Office Poverty Reduction & Environment Unit Head, Lin Cao - lin.cao@undp.org

Ministry of Agirculture & Fisheries National Director of Coffee & Forestry, Luis Godhino - alba_god@yahoo.com

ANNEX 1

Suggested contents of the Terminal Evaluation report and annexes

Executive Summary – Brief description of the project and of how the evaluation was carried out; overview of the content of the report and its findings; summary table of the ratings given in the evaluation.

Introduction Project Concept and Design – Review and evaluation of the project concept and design; relevance and efficiency in addressing the problem; consistency and logic of the project strategy and the logical framework.

Project Implementation – Review and evaluation of the efficacy and efficiency of the project's management and implementation; include inter alia: use of the logical framework and broad work plans; M&E activities and changes made; adaptive management; information management; communications; participation and operating relationships between agencies and stakeholders; technical capacities achieved. – Project perfomance: were inputs, activities, results and outcomes achieved within budget and timetable? with participation of institutions; information exchange and dissemination mechanisms; financial management, co-financing. – Effectiveness of UNDP and the PMU in management and administration of the project, including staff, procurement, experts, consultants, counterpart staff, definition of roles and functions.

Project Results and Sustainability – Review and evaluation of achievements - outcomes, objectives, impacts, results and outputs; successes and failures in reaching objectives and desired outcomes; use of indicators – Assessment of prospects for sustainability of the outcomes; contribution to systemic capacity development.

Conclusions – Main conclusions of the evaluation; comments on achievements of objectives and outcomes; synthesis of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, results and sustainability of the project.

Lessons

Recommendations

Attachments – Terms of reference, list of documents reviewed, itinerary, people interviewed – Summary of results; project finances – budget, co-financing, expenditure.

ANNEX 2

Requisite Consultant Qualifications

1. The candidates should have at least MSc or higher degree in Environment, Agriculture, Natural Resource Management or related fields, and should have adequate experience in the management, design and/ or evaluation of comparable projects.

2. In-depth understanding of land and environment issues in tropical/ sub-tropical and island environments. A minimum of 10 years of relevant working experience is required.

3. Prior experience in evaluation of international technical assistance projects with major donor agencies, including UNDP-GEF projects, is an advantage.

4. Familiar with SLM approaches in Asia-Pacifc either through management and/or implementation or through consultancies in evaluation of land related projects. Understanding of local actions contributing to global benefits is crucial.

5. Demonstrated ability to assess complex situations, succinctly distil critical issues, and draw forward-looking conclusions and recommendations.

6. Excellent written and verbal communication skills in English. Good knowledge of Tetum, Portuguese and Bahasa Indonesia advantageous.

7. Ability to deliver quality reports within the given time.

Annex 2 – SLM Project Logical Framework

Project Strategy	Objectively verifiable indicators			Sources of verification	Risks and assumptions
	Indicator	**Baseline**	**Target**		
Goal: The agricultural, forest and other terrestrial land uses of TL are sustainable, productive systems that maintain ecosystem productivity and ecological functions while contributing directly to the environmental, economic and social well-being of the country.					
Objective of the Project: To strengthen the enabling environment for sustainable land management (SLM) while ensuring broad-based political and participatory support for the process.	• Best practices and guidelines for SLM are broadly disseminated and used for development planning, agricultural development and forestry management. • NAP formulated and approved.	SLM is not mainstreamed. Capacity for SLM is inadequate. NAP did not exist.	Guidelines for mainstreaming SLM completed by MT Capacity and knowledge management completed by EP NAP completed by Y1	Published best practices and guidelines Survey of users Parliament decisions on NAP and policies are published in the National Gazette.	Continued political support for integrating SLM into national development planning
Outcome 1: SLM mainstreamed into national policies, plans and legislation.	• The Ministry of Planning and Finance and other ministries use SLM guidelines as a tool for economic development planning, and formulating macro-economic policies • The Forest Policy and Agriculture and Livestock Policy contain specific sections on SLM. • The sector investment plans of Agriculture, Forestry, Natural Resources and Environment incorporate priority actions for SLM as defined in NAP. • Donors have expressed interested to fund SLM project and have committed to finance selected SLM projects.	Guidelines for incorporating SLM into macro-economic policies do not exist. Forest Policy and Agriculture and Livestock policy documents are available only in draft form. Sector investment plans in SLM inadequate. Donor commitment to fund SLM projects did not exist	Incorporation of SLM into macro-economic policies and planning completed by end of Y1. Integration of SLM into Forest Policy and Agriculture Policy completed by MT. The SLM investment plans completed by MT Donor meeting held and their commitment documented by Y3	Revised Planning and policy documents. (accompanied by relevant SLM economic analyses) Revised Forest Policy and Agriculture Policy documents Sector Investment plans of MAFF and Natural Resources & Environment. MTR, TAG, PMU Records of donor meetings, sector investment plans and pipe-line projects	Funding is mobilized for the NFP and ALP Continued political support Authorities and planners are motivated and see the advantage of SLM in sustainable development.

Outcome 2: Human resources and institutional capacities needed for SLM are developed	• Staff from NDAL, NDCF, DOE, MPF, MPW, NUTL and NGOs at national and regional level actively engaged in SLM	Inadequate trained personnel in SLM at national, regional and local levels.	18 national level officers and 25 regional level officers trained. by MT	Visit to relevant departments and field sites. Training and workshop reports and training material. MTR, TAG, PMU	GoTL put in place policies and laws favoring women's active role in development.
	• Farmers and forest communities practicing SLM	SLM practices are not adopted by farmers and forest communities.	20 villages, 50 community groups and 100 community members are trained in SLM practices by Y3	Visit to relevant departments, farmers field schools and demonstration sites. Training and workshop reports and training material. MTR, TAG, PMU	Officers are motivated for inter-institutional collaboration.
	• Gender issues are sensitized and women are motivated to participate in SLM activities.	Gender recognition and gender participation in SLM activities inadequate. Women not active in SLM.	Gender workshop and guidelines completed by Y1.	Visit to relevant departments and field sites. Publications and workshop reports. MTR, TAG, PMU	
	• NDAL and NDCF have clearly defined mandates with regard to SLM functions and use tools and guidelines to perform their functions and collaborate with each other and other relevant institutions in planning and implementing SLM activities.	NDAL and NDCF do not have clearly defined mandates with regard to SLM functions and lack tools and guidelines to enhance performance and collaboration.	Mandates, tools and guidelines developed by MT.	Visit to relevant departments and field sites. Publications and reports. MTR, TAG, PMU	

Outcome 3: Capacities for knowledge management for SLM are developed.	• Information on land use and land degradation in TL readily available and used by policy planners, technical departments and land users in implementing SLM.	Information on land use and land degradation does not exist.	Information on land use and land degradation completed by Y3.	MTR, PMU project reports, TAG	The institutions willing to collaborate on integrated approaches to sustainable land management and to sharing access to land information.
	• Agricultural and forest land uses have been digitized and are integrated into a computerized land information system. The staff of MAFF and DOE and others have ready access to the information (off-line, intranet/internet) and are using the information system to plan and manage all land uses in an integrated manner.	Computerized land information system does not exit.	Computerized land use data base and information system completed by Y3.	MTR, PMU project reports, SC, TAG	
	• Information on land ownership and rights including public, private and communal lands and protected areas developed and utilized for land use planning.	Land ownership and rights not well defined.	Land rights and ownership study completed by Y2.	MTR, PMU project reports, TAG	Government authorities will remain committed to reviewing and strengthening land ownership, land tenure and protection of traditional lands.
	• The staff of NDCF and NDAL is using the information generated by the MSP to formulate projects and programmes in forest conservation and upland and dry land farming practices.	The impact of fuel wood harvesting on watershed not fully understood.	Study impact of fuel wood harvesting on watersheds completed by MT.	MTR, PMU project reports, TAG	
	• The GoTL has a potential mechanism for sustainable financing SLM projects.	Intensification of upland agriculture is planned without adequate consideration for SLM	Study of sustainable upland farming system completed by Y2	MTR, PMU project reports, TAG	Government commits the resources necessary for knowledge management activities including digitizing the land survey/ownership records and SLM monitoring and planning.
		GoTL did not have a mechanism to finance SLM projects	Report on a mechanism to sustainability financing SLM completed by Y3	MTR, PMU project reports, TAG	
Outcome 4: National Action Programme (NAP) is completed	• NAP approved by the Council of Ministers	NAP does not exist.	NAP completed by Y1	Parliament decisions are published in the National Gazette	Continued political support for SLM and MEAs.

Annex 3 – List of key informants interviewed

Mario Ximines, Director, International Environmental Affairs, DOE, MED

Augusto Manuel Pinto, Director, National Directorate for Environment, DOE, MED

Flaminio M. E. Xavier, Chief of Department, Planning & Biodiversity Conservation, DOE, MED

Mario Nunes, Senior Advisor, NDF (former Director, NDF), MAF

Manual Mendes, Chief of Department, Biodiversity, NDF, MAF

Paula Lopes da Cruz, Project Manager, SLM Project, UNDP TL

Carsiliano Oliviera, Program Officer, UNDP - former Project Assistant, SLM Project, UNDP TL

Fernandinho Viera da Costa, Chief of Department, Reforestation, NDF, MAF

João dos Santos, District Forestry Officer, Lautem District, NDF, MAF

Toto Fernandes, District Assistant for Community Study, Lautem District, NDF, MAF

Lorenco dos Santos, Forest Guard, Lautem District, NDF, MAF

Luis Godinho, Director, NDF, MAF

Verawati Oliviera, National Consultant for fuel-wood and sloping agriculture surveys

Januario Marcal, Director, NDSACD, MAF

Abilio de Jesus Lima, Secretary of State for Environment, MED

Mariano Sabino, Minister of Agriculture and Fisheries

Lin Cao, Unit Head, Poverty Reduction and Environment Unit, UNDP TL

Peter Hunnam, former Senior Environment Advisor, UNDP TL

Mikiko Tanaka, Country Director, UNDP TL

Doley Tshering, Regional Ecosystems & Biodiversity Specialist, UNDP Asia-Pacific Regional Centre

Annex 4 – List of Project Documents reviewed

1. Project design document, as submitted to GEF Feb 2006, approved May 2006 – the Prodoc

2. Project agreement document, as signed by UNDP and GoTL February 2007

3. Mission Report of project formulation exercise by Arum Kandiah, UNDP International Consultant, 3 October - 7 November 2005

4. Project Steering Committee minutes, 2007-2010

5. Project Working Committee minutes, 2007-2010

6. Quarterly Operation Reports, 2007-2010

7. Annual Performance Reports/Simplified PIR reports, 2007-2010

8. Mid-Term Evaluation Report, August 2009

9. Management Response and Tracking Template for MTE recommendations, UNDP TL

10. Project Terminal Report, August 2010

11. Project Factsheet, SLM Project, UNDP TL

12. ATLAS Expenditure Report - FY2005-2010, SLM Project, UNDP TL

13. National Action Programme to Combat Land Degradation (Draft), February 2009

14. Guidelines for Mainstreaming Sustainable Land Management in Timor-Leste, undated

15. Integrating SLM into Timor-Leste's Policies – An Overview of the Country's Forest, Agriculture and Livestock Sector Policies, undated

16. Trainer's Manual on Sustainable Land Management, October 2008

17. Report of National Training of Trainers on Sustainable Land Management, September 2008

18. Report of Sub-national Training of Trainers on Sustainable Land Management, November 2008

19. Institutional Mandates Strengthening Towards a National Programme on Sustainable Land Management in Timor-Leste, June 2009

20. Status Report on Land Use and Land Degradation in Timor-Leste, undated

21. Report of Land Use Survey and Land Use Database and Information System Development in Timor-Leste, January 2010

22. Assessment of Fuelwood Harvesting Impact on Watersheds in Timor-Leste: A Case Study on Hera Watershed, June 2010

23. Assessment of Sloping Farming Practices in Timor-Leste, June 2010

24. Catalogue of SLM Best Practice in Timor-Leste, July 2010

Annex 5 – Interview questions for key informants

UNDP SLM Project Terminal Evaluation

Questions for examining the key areas indicated by the TOR:

1. **Project relevance and appropriateness**
   - Was the design consistent with country priorities and the GEF Land Degradation Focal Area? (GEF-4 Strategic Objectives 1 and 2 – "Develop an enabling environment for SLM mainstreaming in development policy and practice", and, "scale up SLM investments that generate mutual benefits for the environment and livelihoods")
   - Was the goal of the project relevant to the actual needs of the policy makers and implementers?
   - Was the logframe well formulated and helpful for project management?
   - What was the value of the support provided to the government in developing policies and practice related to SLM mainstreaming, etc?
   - Did the assistance provided strengthen the capacity of local agencies and take into account the longer-term context?
   - How was accountability to stakeholders dealt with?

2. **Ownership**
   - How well did UNDP support national institutions to manage and lead the process?
   - What was the level of engagement and participation by ministry and other stakeholders at the national and local levels? How did the engagement at local level take place?

3. **Effectiveness**
   How effective was the project in achieving the stated outputs and objectives?
   - Is there evidence to show that the project improved the situation for mainstreaming SLM?
   - Increased HR and institutional capacities for SLM?
   - Developed capacities for knowledge management in SLM?
   - National Action Programme completed?

   How timely was the inception phase to enable project implementation?
   - How long did it take for UNDP to begin working on project outputs?
   - Were delays in getting resources longer than could be expected?
   - Did the systems in place support the inception/establishment phase?

   How well did UNDP coordinate with other stakeholders?
   - How did UNDP support effective coordination among the range of SLM actors? (Gov't, NGOs, UN agencies, donors)
   - Did UNDP work through the local authorities and support their involvement?

   Did UNDP communicate effectively to the wider world of SLM actors?
   - How was information fed to local stakeholders? outside actors?
   - Did UNDP fulfil GEF obligations for info sharing?
   - Were media strategies used effectively?

Was the quality of project in line with GEF, UNDP or other relevant guidelines?
- What guidelines were used and were they useful?

4. Sustainability

Are the achievements considered to be sustainable?
- Has sufficient attention been paid to building on and replicating project outputs?
- Was a strategy in place for using outputs beyond the project? What approach was taken to enable ongoing benefit and adaptation of products?
- Is UNDP in a position to maintain a role with the key stakeholders and provide ongoing support?

5. Management and monitoring arrangements

How was support provided from UNDP country office to the project?
- PRE Unit: what level of support provided and was it adequate and timely?
- Support units within the country office, such as HR, procurement, finance: Were there inputs helpful did they provide added value?
- Was technical advice and support available and timely?

Were the management and administration arrangements within the project well designed?
- Was there enough management and administration capacity?
- Were technical inputs able to be achieved with the given level of staffing and consultant inputs?
- Any recommendations for UNDP regarding management arrangements for similar projects?

Was the level of support from other UNDP levels sufficient? (Bangkok, Geneva, New York). What could be improved?
- What was the involvement of each office mentioned above and how did it add value?

6. Financial planning and use of co-financing
- Was the availability of finances for project implementation appropriate and timely?
- Were co-financing arrangements effectively used?

7. Efficiency

Did the project achieve the outputs as intended?
- Were the resource materials produced as planned? Are they being used?
- Were the training activities implemented as per the prodoc? If changes were made were they justified?

Were the inputs sufficient to enable the planned outputs to be reached?
- Were sufficient staff, short-term consultants and counterparts available to carry out the work efficiently?
- Was the budget sufficient to achieve the targets? Did it restrict scale-up?

Were the outputs as designed and implemented relatively cost-effective?
- Consultants/Manuals?
- Training materials?

Could different inputs/outputs have had greater impact?

8. Adaptive Management
- Was the logframe an effective management tool?
- Was the project M&E system implemented as planned?

> ➢ Were the recommendations of the Mid-term Review found to be useful? Were they implemented in full? (if not, why not)

9.   Risk management
> ➢ What systems and processes were used for risk management?
> ➢ Did the UNDP risk management tool prove sufficient?
> ➢ Are there any recommendations for adapting the risk management system in similar projects?

10.   Impact and cross-cutting issues
> ➢ Is there evidence that the project has contributed to poverty reduction through SLM initiatives in the pilot sites? Do local people see value to their livelihoods, currently or potentially?
> ➢ Has the project facilitated increased participation by the local community in natural resource management and decision making?
> ➢ How has the project incorporated gender sensitive approaches? How have men, women, boys and girls participated, particularly in decision making?

11.   Lessons and recommendations
> ➢ What lessons could be drawn from the experience of implementing the SLM project?
> ➢ What lessons are applicable for SLM mainstreaming in general in Timor-Leste?
> ➢ For UNDP implementation of SLM activities?

Annex 6 - Notes of field visit

As part of the Terminal Evaluation a two day field trip was conducted to observe relevant activities in the districts. The TOR called for a short field visit to observe SLM issues and sites of interest to the project. It was recommended to visit the NDF activities associated with tree nurseries, as the SLM project had provided remaining funds to support tree planting and NDF saw it as a key priority. The TE consultant was accompanied on the visit to Lautem District (eastern end of Timor-Leste) by Carsilano Oliviera, UNDP PRE Unit Program Officer, and Fernandinho Viera da Costa, Chief of Department – Reforestation, NDF. Upon arrival in Lospalos, Lautem District capital, the District Forestry Officer, João dos Santos, and NDF staff Toto Fernandes (Community Study) and Lorenco dos Santos (Forest Guard) joined the party.

A visit was made to a tree plantation approximately 30 minutes drive from Lospalos, in the Suco of Soruluaa. The NDF personnel considered this to be a very typical plantation facilitated by their department. It consisted of approximately 2 hectares of primarily mahogany trees, together with a small number of sandlewood trees, which had been planted in 2007. The staff estimated that there were 30 such plantations in the district, averaging 1 ha each. Each plantation is established on communal or privately owned land, following discussion with the local community and agreements about management of the plantation being made. The NDF is not establishing plantations on government land (only in Covalima District).

Tree plantation, mahogany, planted 2007, Suco Soroluaa, Lautem District – Forest Guard Lorenco dos Santos.

The support provided directly by the SLM project went towards seedlings and transport, with activities having commenced in the last quarter of 2010 and finished in March 2011 when the seedlings were distributed. The NDF staff reported that the majority of seedlings were provided to public servants for them to plant trees under a nation-wide campaign run by MAF.

On day two of the field trip a visit was made to the Lautem tree nursery managed by NDF. This is a large facility of approximately 6000 square meters (see photos), but less than 10 percent was in use at the time of the visit. NDF staff stated that they were unable to support significant tree planting activities due to lack of budget. The contribution from the UNDP SLM Project had enabled them to pay to transport seedlings and transport water for the nursery in Lautem. Unfortunately, the nursery in Lautem was built without any connection to a water source[30]. It has a fully integrated sprinkler system but this cannot be used due to a lack of water. Instead, when funds are available, water has to be tankered to the site from the town and any seedlings are hand watered.

Newly planted trees, Suco Foeloro – Joao dos Santos, Fernandinho Viera da Costa

NDF nursery, Suco Foeloro,

The TE consulted NDF district personnel about their involvement in other aspects of the SLM project, particularly the training. Feedback from Lautem staff was that they found the training course to be very useful and feel that they have been equipped to implement SLM activities. The common complaint was that they suffered from a lack of transport and lack of budget to conduct such activities. The Lautem staff that accompanied the visit all claimed to have no access to transport, and only during special events such (such as combined actions with police to act on reported illegal logging) are they able to move about, which were relatively rare.

---

[30] The nursery was built using funds from the "Referendum Package" of GOTL funding, but apparently there was no meaningful collaboration between the Ministry of Infrastructure and MAF over the design.

Remaining tree seedlings inside NDF tree nursery, Suco Foeloro

Water storage tanks, NDF tree nursery, Suco Foeloro   Example of tree planting in Lautem Sub-District by
the Sub-District Disaster Management Committee

When the area of collaboration between NDF in Lautem and other ministries was investigated the
staff were not able to elaborate on particular examples, apart from those with PNTL against illegal
loggers. The TE learnt from the Lautem District Administration office of tree planting that was being
conducted as a land protection measure. The Disaster Management Committee of the Sub-District of
Lautem had undertaken tree planting with funds provided by an AusAID supported Disaster Risk
Management project. The TE was able to visit one of these sites along the main highway near the
coast (see photo). The activity was unknown to the District Forestry Officer, but did indicate that
there were some positive actions being implemented by inter-ministerial groups at the local level.