



Food and Agriculture
Organization of the
United Nations

A collage of four images: a forest path with a person carrying a basket, a man in a uniform looking at a phone, a river flowing through a green landscape, and a group of people standing together indoors.

Project evaluation series

Final evaluation of the
project “Securing tenure
rights for forest landscape-
dependent communities:
linking science with
policy to advance tenure
security, sustainable
forest management and
people’s livelihoods”

Project evaluation series

**Final evaluation of the project
“Securing tenure rights for forest
landscape-dependent communities:
linking science with policy to advance
tenure security, sustainable forest
management and people’s livelihoods”**

**GCP/GLO/806/GFF
GEF ID: 5797**

**FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS
Rome, 2019**

Required citation:

FAO. 2019. *Final evaluation of the project "Securing tenure rights for forest landscape-dependent communities: linking science with policy to advance tenure security, sustainable forest management and people's livelihoods"*. Rome.

The designations employed and the presentation of material in this information product do not imply the expression of any opinion whatsoever on the part of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) concerning the legal or development status of any country, territory, city or area or of its authorities, or concerning the delimitation of its frontiers or boundaries. The mention of specific companies or products of manufacturers, whether or not these have been patented, does not imply that these have been endorsed or recommended by FAO in preference to others of a similar nature that are not mentioned.

The views expressed in this information product are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of FAO.

© FAO. 2019



Some rights reserved. This work is made available under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 3.0 IGO licence (CC BY-NC-SA 3.0 IGO; <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-sa/3.0/igo/legalcode/legalcode>).

Under the terms of this licence, this work may be copied, redistributed and adapted for non-commercial purposes, provided that the work is appropriately cited. In any use of this work, there should be no suggestion that FAO endorses any specific organization, products or services. The use of the FAO logo is not permitted. If the work is adapted, then it must be licensed under the same or equivalent Creative Commons licence. If a translation of this work is created, it must include the following disclaimer along with the required citation: "This translation was not created by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO). FAO is not responsible for the content or accuracy of this translation. The original [Language] edition shall be the authoritative edition."

Disputes arising under the licence that cannot be settled amicably will be resolved by mediation and arbitration as described in Article 8 of the licence except as otherwise provided herein. The applicable mediation rules will be the mediation rules of the World Intellectual Property Organization <http://www.wipo.int/amc/en/mediation/rules> and any arbitration will be conducted in accordance with the Arbitration Rules of the United Nations Commission on International Trade Law (UNCITRAL).

Third-party materials. Users wishing to reuse material from this work that is attributed to a third party, such as tables, figures or images, are responsible for determining whether permission is needed for that reuse and for obtaining permission from the copyright holder. The risk of claims resulting from infringement of any third-party-owned component in the work rests solely with the user.

Sales, rights and licensing. FAO information products are available on the FAO website (www.fao.org/publications) and can be purchased through publications-sales@fao.org. Requests for commercial use should be submitted via: www.fao.org/contact-us/licence-request. Queries regarding rights and licensing should be submitted to: copyright@fao.org.

Cover photo credits (top to bottom): ©FAO/Isaac Kasamani, ©FAO/Giulio Napolitano, ©FAO, ©FAO/Giulio Napolitano, ©FAO, ©FAO,

Contents

<i>Acknowledgements</i>	v
<i>Acronyms and abbreviations</i>	vi
Executive Summary	vii
1 Introduction	1
1.1 Purpose the evaluation	2
1.2 Scope and objective of the evaluation.....	2
1.3 Methodology	3
1.4 Limitations	5
1.5 Structure of the report	6
2 Background and context of the Project	6
2.1 Background of the Project.....	7
2.2 Global and national contexts of the Project	8
3 Evaluation questions: key findings by component	11
3.1 EQ1: Was the intervention relevant to the needs of stakeholders, government, NGOs and communities, and in line with FAO and GEF strategic objectives?	11
3.2 EQ 2: What results, intended and unintended, did the Project achieve?	15
3.3 EQ 3: Monitoring and Evaluation - What were the strengths and weaknesses of the Project M&E plan and its implementation?	19
3.4 EQ 4: How effective was the Project implementation/execution?.....	20
3.5 EQ 5: Sustainability of results achieved - What is the likelihood that project results will continue to be useful after the end of the Project?	23
4 Other relevant issues	27
4.1 Need for follow-up.....	27
4.2 Materialization of co-financing.....	27
4.3 Gender and human rights.....	27
4.4 Environmental and social safeguards.....	29
4.5 The FAO Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM).....	29
5 Lessons learned	33
6 Conclusions and recommendations	35
6.1 Conclusions.....	35
6.2 Recommendations	38
Bibliography	40
Appendix 1. People interviewed	45
Appendix 2. Field mission agenda	50
Appendix 3. Evaluation matrix	52
Appendix 4. GEF rating scheme	61
Appendix 5. Financial data	66
Appendix 6. Theory of Change	68

Figures

Figure 1: Semi-structured Interview Process	5
Figure 2: Basic Theory of Change used by the GCS-Tenure initiative	68
Figure 3 Detailed TOC developed by the GCS-Tenure initiative.....	69

Acknowledgements

The FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) would like to thank everyone who contributed to this report. The evaluation was conducted by Dr William Jackson, Dr Deborah Delgado Pugley and Dr David Hafashimana, with support from Lavinia Monforte and Douglas Magunda, Evaluation Managers from OED. Martin Corredoira provided administrative and logistical support for the evaluation missions.

The Office of Evaluation would like to acknowledge the following people who contributed to the evaluation: Esther Mwangi, Anne Larson, Rogier Klaver, Bethany Davies, Wendy Bullen, Wanty Tambunan (interpreter), Iliana Monterroso and Joe Saldaña for their support and assistance in organizing the missions, and for their contributions to our understanding of the Project.

Thanks also to project partners, communities, government officials and other stakeholders for their informative discussions about the Project. The Office particularly appreciate all those in the three project countries who met with members of the evaluation team to discuss the Project, including from governments, NGOs, universities and other partners and providers. The Office particularly wishes to recognize the contribution of members of the Project target communities who welcomed the evaluation team to their localities and openly shared their thoughts and experiences of the Project.

Acronyms and abbreviations

AUPWAE	Association of Uganda Professional Women in Agriculture and Environment
CGIAR	Consultative Group on International Agricultural Research
CIFOR	Center for International Forestry Research
DFID	Department for International Development
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FORDA	Forestry Research Agency in Indonesia,
FSSD	Forestry Sector Support Department (Uganda)
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GEF-IEO	GEF Independent Evaluation Office
GCS-Tenure	Global Comparative Study on Tenure
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
OPIM	Operational Partners Implementation Modality
PPA	Participatory Prospective Analysis
PSC	Project Steering Committee
TOC	Theory of Change
VGGT	Voluntary Guidelines on the responsible Governance of Tenure

Executive summary

Introduction

1. This report presents the findings of the final evaluation of the three-year Global Environment Facility - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (GEF-FAO) *Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape-Dependent Communities: Linking science with policy to advance tenure security, sustainable forest management and people's livelihoods* project. The Project was implemented between October 2015 and April 2019 and executed by the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR). The Project's objective was 'to improve the way knowledge about forest and land tenure reforms is understood, communicated and used so that decision makers, practitioners and forest dependent people in developing countries are well-equipped to develop and implement policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management.'
2. This final evaluation serves a dual purpose of accountability and learning. The evaluation documents lessons and identifies good practices and challenges that can inform the design and implementation of ongoing and future similar projects. The evaluation will contribute to GEF-IEO databases for aggregation and analysis.
3. The main evaluation questions, which were designed to address the evaluation objectives, as well as the achievement and sustainability of the Project outcomes, are:

EQ1: Was the intervention relevant to the needs of stakeholders, government, NGOs and communities, and in line with FAO and GEF strategic objectives?

EQ 2: What results, intended and unintended, did the Project achieve?

EQ 3: What were the strengths and weaknesses of the Project M&E plan and its implementation?

EQ 4: How effective was the Project implementation/execution?

EQ 5: What is the likelihood that project results will continue to be useful after the end of the Project?

EQ6: What are the key lessons learned?
4. The final evaluation assessed the Project over the implementation period from October 2015 to January 2019, covering the Project's planned Outcomes and Outputs in all three project target countries. The evaluation examined the Project's achievements at global, national, subnational and local levels.
5. The final evaluation was conducted by three independent international consultants, assisted by the Project Coordinators from CIFOR and the CIFOR Team Leader, Project Management and Coordination. Assistance was mainly in terms of facilitating and organizing consultations and field visits, gathering and collating project reports and information, and exchanging views on the issues faced by each country.

6. The evaluation utilized several methods to gather and analyse information including a literature review, stakeholder consultations and field visits to a sample of the Project's sites including focus group meetings with project communities in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda. Due to logistical and financial constraints, it was not possible to undertake visits to all project field sites. The findings of this final evaluation are summarized below, followed by the conclusions and a series of recommendations.

Main findings

7. The main findings of the evaluation are presented below, grouped by evaluation question and including GEF criteria rating as appropriate.

Findings for EQ1: Was the intervention relevant to the needs of stakeholders, government, NGOs and communities, and in line with FAO and GEF strategic objectives?

GEF Criteria strategic relevance - rating: Highly Satisfactory

Finding 1: The Project was relevant to the needs of key stakeholders in relation to the implementation of forest and land tenure reforms. The Project adapted its interventions to the specific needs of each of the target countries.

Finding 2: The Project was relevant to both FAO and GEF strategic objectives insofar as security of rights to resources is a key step in reducing poverty, increasing food security and securing livelihoods.

Findings for EQ 2: What results, intended and unintended, did the Project achieve?

GEF Criteria effectiveness - rating: Satisfactory

Outcome 1 - Highly Satisfactory

Outcome 2 - Highly Satisfactory

Outcome 3 - Highly Satisfactory

Outcome 4 - Satisfactory

Outcome 5 - Highly Satisfactory

Finding 3: The impact of the Project has primarily been through its substantial contribution to knowledge at global, national and subnational levels, of the barriers to the implementation of forest and land tenure reform. The approach adopted by the Project has left national stakeholders with new knowledge and improved capacity within the target sites and to some extent nationally to identify key opportunities from and constraints to reform (Outcome 1).

Finding 4: The Project increased the awareness of policymakers and other stakeholders on:

- i. ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during tenure reform processes (Outcome 2);
- ii. the impacts of tenure reform processes on livelihoods (Outcome 3).

Finding 5: Multi-stakeholder processes that link multiple layers of governance are more likely to succeed than top down policy-driven or normative approaches (Outcome 2).

Finding 6: The Participatory Prospective Analysis process is an important legacy of the Project. The PPA approach engaged multi-stakeholders from multiple governance levels in a process that led to stakeholders developing plans of action to address tenure implementation (Outcome 2).

Finding 7: The Project built the capacity of policymakers and other stakeholders to implement forest and land tenure reforms, manage conflict and improve multi-actor collaboration (Outcomes 4 and 5).

Finding 8: No unintended negative consequences attributable to the Project were identified.

Findings for EQ 3: Monitoring and Evaluation - What were the strengths and weaknesses of the Project M&E plan and its implementation?

GEF Criteria overall quality of M&E - rating: Satisfactory

GEF Criteria M&E design - rating: Moderately satisfactory

GEF Criteria M&E implementation - rating: Satisfactory

Finding 9: Progress with the implementation of activities, outputs and outcomes was reported on a regular basis. A series of country-level case studies were commissioned by CIFOR in the final year of the Project. The methodological approaches used by the Project, and in particular the Participatory Prospective Analysis, provided strong evidence-based information for project field sites.

Finding for EQ 4: How effective was the Project implementation/execution?

GEF Criteria efficiency - rating: Highly satisfactory

GEF Criteria factors affecting performance - ratings:

Project design and readiness - Satisfactory

Quality of project implementation - Satisfactory

Project oversight - Satisfactory

Quality of project execution - Satisfactory

Project management arrangements and delivery - Satisfactory

Project partnerships - Highly Satisfactory

Stakeholder engagement - Highly Satisfactory

Communication and knowledge management - Highly satisfactory

Finding 10: The Project was well managed by CIFOR and the partners. Project management was both highly focused and adaptable to changing circumstances. Budgets were well managed and the delivery of outputs exceeded targets in many instances.

Finding for EQ 5: Sustainability of results achieved - What is the likelihood that the Project results will continue to be useful after the end of the Project?

GEF Criteria sustainability of project outcomes

Overall likelihood of sustainability - rating: Likely

Financial sustainability - Likely

Socio-political sustainability - Moderately Likely

Institutional sustainability - Likely

Environmental sustainability - Likely

Finding 11: The results of the Project are likely to be sustained through project partners, local communities and other stakeholders. The focus on implementing existing laws and policies related to tenure and forest reform was appropriate given the context within the three Tier 1 countries and because of this, stakeholders are motivated to continue many of the activities supported by the Project.

Finding 12: Weak capacity and lack of resources at local levels can potentially inhibit the application of the knowledge and skill developed through the support of the Project

Finding 13: The key risks for sustainability relate to the willingness of government agencies to genuinely enable local communities to benefit from tenure reform and devolution of rights, and the ability of local communities and indigenous people to manage the resources, maintain productivity and tap into economically viable markets.

Finding for Gender and Human Rights

GEF Criteria Gender equity - rating: Highly Satisfactory

Finding 14: The Project maintained a consistently high level of attention to gender and social concerns. Gender issues were taken into consideration for project research, awareness raising and capacity building. Gender-disaggregated data was collected throughout the Project and used to adapt project activities to improve equitable outcomes.

Finding for the FAO Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM)

Finding 15: The FAO Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) was a relevant, effective and efficient approach for the Project. It leveraged the comparative advantages of both CIFOR and FAO. CIFOR was able to use its scientific, evidence-based approach and networks to focus the Project on the right partners and pathways of influence. Challenges and issues were within tolerable limits to be anticipated in a project of this size, complexity and duration.

Conclusions

Conclusion 1 (EQ1 - Relevance). The Project was highly relevant to the needs of stakeholders, including national and subnational government agencies, NGOs, universities and target communities. The lack of planned outputs and outcomes related to livelihoods may have made the Project less relevant to stakeholders who were expecting direct benefits from tenure reforms.

Conclusion 2 (EQ2 - Effectiveness). The Project was effective at building awareness about, and improving capacity for, implementation of tenure reform in the targeted field sites. Securing local and indigenous rights to land and forests, including through formal land titles and other institutional arrangements such as social forestry, is a necessary but insufficient step to improving livelihoods and maintaining the productivity of natural resources. Long-term changes to the focus and culture of government institutions and improving the capacity of local and indigenous communities to manage and benefit from natural resources are likely to be required to achieve sustainable and equitable outcomes; among other things, this will occur through regular monitoring and support to local and indigenous communities by technical staff from the local and central government.

Conclusion 3 (EQ3 - Monitoring and Evaluation). The ‘satisfactory’ rating given in the final evaluation for the overall quality of monitoring and evaluation in the Project belies the highly satisfactory work undertaken by the Project on gender and social equity issues. The collection and use of gender-disaggregated data enabled the Project to adapt activities to support gender and social equity. More generally, the Project may have benefited from explicitly using the Theory of Change as its conceptual framework for evaluation.

Conclusion 4 (EQ4 - Efficiency of project implementation and execution). The Operational Partners Implementation Modality was appropriate for executing the Project. It enabled efficient access to the comparative advantages of CIFOR as a well-recognized research institution and enabled the Project to tap into an effective network of partners. The Modality also enabled CIFOR to link to FAO’s extensive technical expertise and project implementation experience. Linkages between the Project and the FAO country offices was variable.

Conclusion 5 (EQ5 Sustainability). Improving the way knowledge about forest and land tenure reforms is understood, communicated and used is an important step to implementing policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management. However, the sustainability of forest and land tenure reforms is likely to also require changes to the way relevant government agencies operate if they are to genuinely enable local communities to benefit.

Conclusion 6 (Gender). The Project demonstrated the value of purposefully mainstreaming gender into all aspects of the Project.

Recommendations

To FAO and CIFOR

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

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

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

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

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

To FAO and GEF

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

To FAO and GEF

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

Suggested actions:

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

1. Introduction

1. This report presents the findings and recommendations of the independent final evaluation of the *"Securing Tenure Rights for Forest Landscape-Dependent Communities: Linking science with policy to advance tenure security, sustainable forest Management and people's livelihoods"* project GCP /GLO/806/GFF (hereafter called the Project) which was conducted between November 2018 and March 2019.
2. The Project has been implemented under an Operational Partner Implementation Modality (OPIM)¹ agreement with the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) being the implementing agency responsible for oversight, monitoring and guidance.
3. The Project is part of a two-project initiative within the Global Comparative Study on Forest Tenure Reforms (GCS-Tenure Initiative) implemented by CIFOR. The other component of the GCS-Tenure initiative *"Securing tenure rights for forest dependent communities: A global comparative study of design and implementation of tenure reform"* was funded by the European Commission and the International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) and implemented between 2014 and 2018.
4. The FAO component of the GCS-Tenure initiative commenced 8 October 2015 and was scheduled to conclude on 7 October 2018. The Project was granted a first no-cost extension until 7 January 2019 and a further no cost extension until 7 April 2019. The Project had a total planned budget of USD 3 115 852 of which USD 2 million was funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF). The remaining amount was to be co-financed by project partners as follows: USD 815 852 from CIFOR, and USD 300 000 from FAO.
5. The FAO Office of Evaluation (OED) launched an independent final evaluation of the FAO component of the GCS-Tenure initiative (the Project). CIFOR independently conducted a series of country level case studies evaluating the work of the Initiative in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda. As explained in the methodology section, to the extent possible, these case studies have been used to inform the final evaluation and triangulate evidence collected.
6. The GCS-Tenure initiative operated in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda (the initiative describes these as Tier 1 countries, being the three countries that the activities primarily focused on) and to lesser extent in Kenya and Nepal (the initiative describes these as Tier 2 countries, being countries with a limited focus of project activities).

¹ The OPIM modality is defined in Section 701 of the FAO Manual as "indirect execution of projects or programs that involve the transfer of funds from FAO to operational partners for the execution of program or project components based on program / project objectives, commonly defined and shared. FAO maintains general responsibility towards the donor and the Government to ensure adequate management of funds, technical quality and the achievement of results. "It should be noted that the Project agreement was signed prior to Section 701 being released, but for the purposes of evaluation Section 701 has been referred to.

1.1 Purpose the evaluation

7. This final evaluation serves a dual purpose of accountability and learning. The evaluation documents lessons and identifies good practices and challenges that can inform the design and implementation of ongoing and future similar projects. The evaluation contributes to the GEF-IEO databases for aggregation and analysis.
8. Primary users of the evaluation report will be the GEF, national counterparts, communities and Indigenous Federations, in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda, the Project Steering Committee (PSC), project partners and FAO. Secondary users will be various line ministries in the Governments of the target countries and other concerned local and international organizations both public and private.

1.2 Scope and objective of the evaluation

9. **Scope:** The final evaluation assessed the Project over the entire implementation period from October 2015 to January 2019,² covering the Project's planned Outcomes and Outputs in all three project countries. The final evaluation examined the Project's achievements at global, national, subnational and local levels, based on the available evidence. The final evaluation considered the soundness and relevance of project design against national priorities and needs (in particular, the ability to adapt to changes in national priorities), the results achieved, their replicability and lessons learned.
10. The final evaluation was confined to the work of the Project undertaken in Indonesia, Uganda and Peru. It includes the activities funded by the GEF and any co-financing. The evaluation did not extend to the European Commission and IFAD funded component of the GCS-Tenure initiative.
11. The final evaluation considered the Project's contribution to the GEF Land Degradation Strategic Objective (SO) 2 - Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in arid, semi-arid and sub-humid zones, including sustaining livelihoods of forest-dependent people, and specifically to the attainment of the following outcomes:
 - i. enhanced enabling environment within the forest sector and across sectors;
 - ii. improved management of forest landscapes.
12. The final evaluation considered the Project's contribution to FAO's two strategic objectives, Strategic Objective (SO) 1 - help eliminate hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition; and SO 3 - reduce rural poverty.
13. **Objectives:** The main objective of the evaluation is to assess results achieved and in particular the extent to which stakeholders were empowered to develop and implement policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management. In doing so, the final evaluation also aims to identify lessons learned and recommendations that can be useful to similar initiatives. The evaluation sought to establish the extent to which the empowerment can be attributed to the Project.

² No mid-term evaluation of the Project was undertaken.

14. The main **evaluation questions** were:
- EQ1:** Was the intervention relevant to the needs of stakeholders, government, NGOs and communities, and in line with FAO and GEF strategic objectives?
- EQ 2:** What results, intended and unintended, did the Project achieve?
- EQ 3:** What were the strengths and weaknesses of the Project M&E plan and its implementation?
- EQ 4:** How effective was the Project implementation/execution?
- EQ 5:** What is the likelihood that project results will continue to be useful after the end of the Project?
- EQ6:** What are the key lessons learned?


1.3 Methodology

15. The evaluation adhered to the United Nations Evaluation Group Norms and Standards (UNEG, 2005), and was in line with the OED Manual and methodological guidelines and practices. It adopted a consultative and transparent approach with internal and external stakeholders. Triangulation of evidence and information gathered underpinned the validation and analysis and supported the conclusions and recommendations.
16. An evidence-based approach was used for the evaluation. The evaluation team took into consideration the Project's Theory of Change (TOC - see Appendix 6) when assessing the extent to which the implementation of activities led to the achievement or not of the results. The TOC provided a framework for evaluating relevance and effectiveness including:
- i. the assumptions underpinning the TOC, including the causal pathways that link Project activities to impacts;
 - ii. the relevance and effectiveness of project outputs and outcomes (both intended and unintended);
 - iii. the impacts of the Project.
17. The evaluation also considered:
- i. an assessment of the strengths and weaknesses of the Project monitoring and evaluation (M&E) plan and its implementation;
 - ii. the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes after project termination, including risks (financial, socio-political, institutional and environmental); to continuation of benefits from the Project. The overall sustainability of project outcomes was rated on the GEF's four-point scale (Likely to Unlikely);
 - iii. the level of country ownership of project outcomes, stakeholder involvement, and partnership/co-financing.
18. An Evaluation Question Matrix (EQM - Appendix 3) was used to guide the evaluation. The EQM included key questions and sub-questions, indicators, the methods and tools for collecting data and information, the likely sources of information and the GEF evaluation criteria that the question seeks to address.

19. The evaluation used the GEF evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency, and the GEF's Rating Scale for Outcomes using a six-point scale (Highly Satisfactory to Highly Unsatisfactory) after considering outcome relevance, effectiveness and efficiency. The evaluation also considered sustainability using a scale provided by FAO and the GEF criteria for sustainability of project outcomes. The evaluation presents financial data, including co-financing break up, as per Annex 3 of the Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluations for Full-sized Project (GEF, 2017) (see Appendix 4 for the GEF ratings).
20. The methodology focused on qualitative methods and included quantitative methods where appropriate and feasible. Data collection tools included desk review of documents, semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders (decision makers, natural resources managers in relevant government departments and ministries, practitioners and forest-dependent people who participated in Project activities or were expected to be affected by the Project); an analysis of the tracking tool submitted with the final Project Implementation Report (PIR) to the GEF Secretariat; as well as time-series analysis to highlight changes in policies, regulations and behaviors. Every effort was made to use diverse sources of evidence (triangulation) to validate data and information.
21. Field sites for the evaluation were selected in consultation with CIFOR and in consideration of final evaluation budgetary constraints (see Appendix 2 for the field mission agenda). An evaluator visited one subnational location in each country. The final evaluation considered the three country level case studies that were being prepared for CIFOR, whilst maintaining the independence of the FAO evaluation and avoiding, to the extent possible, duplication. This involved the following:
 - i. In Indonesia, the lead consultant, Dr William Jackson conducted the field mission jointly with the CIFOR evaluator responsible for the field work of CIFOR's Indonesian case study. While running in parallel, the two processes benefited from each other by ensuring that information required for each evaluation was collected. Field visits were undertaken to Maluku in January 2019.
 - ii. In Peru, a national consultant, Dr Deborah Delgado Pugley, validated the findings of the CIFOR case study and filled in the gaps deemed essential for the FAO evaluation. Field visits were undertaken to Loreto in February 2019.
 - iii. In Uganda, a national consultant, Dr David Hafashimana, validated the findings of the CIFOR case study and filled in the gaps deemed essential for the FAO evaluation. The Ugandan consultant visited the field site in November/December 2018 and undertook interviews in January and February 2019.
22. At the time of preparing the final evaluation, final versions of the CIFOR Peru case study and an incomplete draft of the CIFOR Uganda case study were available. The CIFOR Indonesian case study was not available.
23. In addition to the EQM, a detailed protocol based on the EQM was developed to guide the evaluators. Additional protocols were also developed to assist in determining the extent to which project staff employed Free Prior and Informed Consent (FPIC) principles, and to gather detailed information at community level. The protocols provided an aide-memoire for the evaluators to ensure all relevant questions were asked to stakeholders. The linkages between the EQM and other documents is shown in the graphic below.

24. A list of stakeholders was developed based on recommendations from the Project. The list included officers from FAO, CIFOR, Implementing Partners, Government at national and subnational level, NGOs, Academic Institutions, Communities and Indigenous federations.

Figure 1: Semi-structured Interview Process



Source: Evaluation team

25. Semi-structured interviews were undertaken with a range of stakeholders from the global, national and subnational levels. Stakeholders were categorized into a typology (e.g. research/academic, project staff, FAO, International agencies, government - national and subnational, NGOs, Indigenous Federations, and Communities). Efforts were made to cover a representative sample of people from each stakeholder group, with a focus on people that have knowledge of key elements of the Project, land tenure and sustainability. A list of people interviewed is included as Appendix 1.

1.4 Limitations

26. The risks and limitations associated with the methodology used by the final evaluation include:
- i. The complexity of attributing the contribution that the FAO/CIFOR component of the GCS-Tenure initiative made given the two projects that comprised the GCS-Tenure initiative were implemented by CIFOR as a coordinated entity.
 - ii. The complexity of identifying impacts and being able to reasonably assign responsibility for these impacts to the actions of project partners, compared to impacts that may have resulted from other actors or factors. Moreover, some

impacts may take considerable time to be realized, given the long time needed for policy change.

- iii. The number of people available for interview. It is likely that not all relevant stakeholders were interviewed due to time and logistic constraints. Some stakeholders that had an important role during the implementation of the Project no longer occupy the positions they held (this is mainly the case for civil servants and Indigenous peoples representatives).
- iv. Due to budgetary constraints, the evaluation included only limited field verification as the evaluators did not visit all eight field sites. This posed a risk that information gathered was not representative of the Project's impact overall.
- v. CIFOR, as the Project executing partner, commissioned a series of case study reviews that were still being undertaken whilst the final evaluation was ongoing. This generated a risk of interview participant fatigue. The evaluation was designed to mitigate this risk to the extent possible.

1.5 Structure of the report

27. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 presents the background and context of the Project; Chapter 3 presents key findings based on each evaluation question; Chapter 4 reports other relevant issues as for co-financing and environmental and social safeguards; lastly, Chapter 5 presents lessons learned, followed by conclusions and recommendations in Chapter 6.

The report is accompanied by the following annexes:

Annex 1. Terms of reference

Download here: <http://www.fao.org/3/ca7318en/ca7318en.pdf>

2. Background and context of the project

28. The GCS-Tenure initiative was premised on the recognition that benefits and improvements for communities and resource management that should be associated with forest and land tenure reforms have not been achieved in most cases. This situation exists even though land and forest tenure reforms are of interest to many countries and are now part of the international agenda, including recognition of customary rights of indigenous and other local communities.
29. The Project, which is the focus of this final evaluation, aims to *improve the way knowledge about forest and land tenure reforms is understood, communicated and used so that decision makers, practitioners and forest-dependent people in developing countries are well-equipped to develop and implement policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management.*
30. **Focus:** The Project comprised five components and associated outcomes as follows:
- i. **Component 1.** Analysis and synthesis of the emergence of reforms and the interaction between customary and formal land and forest tenure.
 - Outcome 1. Increased awareness by policymakers of impact of and barriers to reform implementation across different sociopolitical and historical settings.
 - ii. **Component 2.** Analysis and synthesis of policy implementation processes and practices.
 - Outcome 2. Increased awareness of ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination.
 - iii. **Component 3.** Analysis of livelihoods and sustainability outcomes of tenure reforms.
 - Outcome 3. Increased awareness of reform impact on livelihoods and sustainability in target countries.
 - iv. **Component 4.** Knowledge management, sharing of information and best practices, and monitoring and evaluation.
 - Outcome 4. Enhanced awareness and increased application of good practice in reform implementation by policymakers, officials, [and] customary authority.
 - v. **Component 5.** Capacity development of stakeholders for uptake results.
 - Outcome 5. Enhanced skills in reform implementation.
31. **Geographic focus:** The Project focused globally and on Indonesia, Peru and Uganda. This includes activities in eight subnational areas, as follows: Peru - Madre de Dios and Loreto; Indonesia - Maluku and Lampung; Uganda - Lamwo, Kibaale, Masindi and Kakumiro districts. In addition, the Project undertook some activities in Kenya and Nepal.
32. **Strategy:** To achieve the planned outcomes the Project strategy included three interactive pillars:
- i. scientific research and analysis
 - ii. multi-stakeholder approaches to problem-solving

- iii. information provision, dissemination, increased awareness and capacity building, specifically
33. **Implementing agency:** FAO was the GEF implementing agency for the Project. FAO was responsible for overseeing the Project to ensure that GEF policies and criteria were adhered to; and that the Project efficiently and effectively met its objectives and achieved expected outputs and outcomes as established in the Project document.
34. **Executing partner:**³ CIFOR was the executing partner for the Project. CIFOR led, managed and coordinated the Project under its global research initiative entitled "Securing Tenure Rights for Forest-Landscape Dependent Communities". CIFOR hosted the Project Implementation Unit (PIU) which was responsible for day-to-day project operations. Project implementation was guided by a Project Steering Committee comprising senior level government officials from Indonesia, Peru and Uganda as well as representatives from FAO, the Rights and Resources Initiative (RRI) and the International Land Coalition (ILC).
35. **Project partners** included the following:
- i. **Indonesia:** Forestry Research and Development Agency (FORDA), University of Lampung (UNILA), University of Pattimura (UNPATTI), Pusat Kajian Wanita dan Gender Universitas.
 - ii. **Peru:** Universidad Agraria La Molina and Dirección de Saneamiento de la Propiedad Agraria y Catastro Rural (DIGESPACR), Ministerio de Agricultura y Riego (MINAGRI) (the government focal point - they did not receive funds from the Project).
 - iii. **Uganda:** Makerere University (MUK), the Association of Uganda Professional Women in Agriculture and Environment (AUPWAE), the Land Development and Governance Institute (NGO). Other: Forest Action Nepal, the RRI and ILC, members of the PSC.

2.1 Global and national contexts of the project

36. The Project document notes that the implementation of recent tenure reforms in Africa, Asia and Latin America provide greater legal recognition of customary and local authorities, indigenous territorial rights and women's rights. However, implementation of these reforms has been uneven and has led to mixed results, including increasing tenure insecurity.
37. Unclear tenure and conflict are cited in the Project document as major factors in deforestation in forest areas being targeted by the Project. These countries also have a reputation for their biodiversity. Peru is among the world's ten mega-diverse countries, while Indonesia's rainforests shelter 10-17 percent of the world's known plant, mammal and bird species. Although Uganda covers a relatively small terrestrial space, its forests are home to about 7.5 percent of mammal and 10.2 percent of the bird species that are globally recognized, and for its size supports the world's highest number of primate species.

³ The GEF uses the term executing partner, whereas the term Operational Partner is used in FAO MS 701 (OPIM tool).

38. The Project aimed to improve the way knowledge of forest and land tenure reforms are understood, communicated and used so that decision makers, practitioners and forest dependent people in developing countries are well-equipped to develop and implement reforms.
39. The Project links to GEF's Land Degradation Focal Area, and specifically Objective 2 (generate sustainable flow of ecosystem services) and to FAO's Strategic Objective 1 (help eliminate hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition) and Strategic Objective 3 (reduce rural poverty).
40. The Project is relevant to a range of multilateral environmental agreements including the Convention on Biological Diversity (CBD) and the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD). In particular, the Project was designed to respond to major constraints such as lack of tenure security and low capacity related to the implementation of UNCCD.

3. Evaluation questions: key findings by component

41. Findings are analysed and presented according to the evaluation questions.

3.1 EQ1: Was the intervention relevant to the needs of stakeholders, government, NGOs and communities, and in line with FAO and GEF strategic objectives?

Strategic relevance: Highly Satisfactory

Finding 1: The Project was relevant to the needs of key stakeholders in relation to the implementation of forest and land tenure reforms. The Project adapted its interventions to the specific needs of each of the target countries.

Finding 2: The Project was relevant to both FAO and GEF strategic objectives insofar as security of rights to resources is a key step in reducing poverty, increasing food security and securing livelihoods.

42. The Project was highly relevant to land and forest tenure issues in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda. The focus of the Project was refined during project implementation to ensure continued relevance to current and emerging tenure policy and practice issues in the target countries. For example, in Indonesia the focus was adjusted in the two primary field sites to reflect different contexts between the sites. The Project also developed and adapted tools and approaches for use in the field to reflect the actual situations encountered.

43. In all Tier 1 countries (Indonesia, Peru and Uganda), the Project was highly relevant to needs of stakeholders in relation to the factors that enable or constrain the implementation of key forest and land tenure reforms. All three Tier 1 countries have, to varying degrees, been facing challenges with implementing land and forest tenure reform. Whilst tenure reform policy and laws are largely in place in all three Tier 1 countries, the awareness of related rights and responsibilities, capacities to implement reforms and institutional arrangements related to reforms are generally inadequate. The Project has focused appropriately on improving implementation arrangements and capacities, generating and sharing knowledge and building awareness.

To what extent was the Project design informed by the context of the target countries, including the major factors that influence land and forest tenure policy development and implementation?

44. In **Indonesia**, the general view of respondents was that the Project was well focused on key forest tenure issues. In Maluku, the key issues relate to customary tenure and indigenous people, accordingly the Project focused on building capacity for indigenous people to secure customary rights. In Lampung, the tenure reform process had already commenced prior to the Project and, accordingly, the Project focused on how to optimize livelihood benefits for local communities through government social forestry schemes.

45. During the implementation of the Project, the Indonesian government issued a new policy on social forestry and set a target of establishing 12.7 million hectares of forest under social forestry.⁴ The Project quickly adapted its activities to take advantage of this policy development by focusing on how to use the policy to promote forest tenure reform within the target sites.
46. In **Peru**, a view shared by respondents was that the Project was very well focused on contemporary forest tenure issues. Interviewees perceived CIFOR as a well-informed agent in the current context. Many respondents pointed out that the Project researchers had good access to key insiders regarding the latest developments on tenure reforms. Respondents consider CIFOR to be experienced, and their opinion and advice was insightful. They highlighted that project leaders were able to bring together relevant actors for reflection on key tenure implementation issues.
47. There are as many as nine projects underway in Peru that seek to advance land tenure and support the state in this process. There is, however, no clear and unified national policy on collective land tenure. During the implementation of the Project a letter of intent (Declaración conjunta de intención sobre REDD+) was signed by the governments of Germany, Norway and Peru. It included, as enabling conditions, requirements to avoid deforestation and forest degradation, to clarify tenure over 5 million hectares on indigenous peoples' collective lands and to include at least 2 million hectares of forest in native communities under incentives for forest conservation.
48. Large titling projects, such as the third phase of the Proyecto de catastro, titulación, y registro de tierras rurales en el Perú (PTRT3) and some climate change policy incentives were open to considering evidence-based research outputs of the Project. Several regional agencies (related to indigenous affairs, conditional transfers for conservation and titling) were in touch with the Project and used their reports.
49. The Project adapted its focus to address different regional contexts in Peru. Respondents pointed out that the Project helped the "Dirección General de Saneamiento de la Propiedad Agraria y Catastro Rural (DIGESPACR)" and regional governments, understand that collective land titling is part of their obligations and that the law supports them (NGOP2). In Loreto, for example, the Project had a very active role at the regional level.
50. In **Uganda**, the 1995 Constitution radically changed land ownership. The previous land tenure system that existed since colonial time vested land ownership in the central government, with only a small fraction of land owned by private individuals. The reforms vested ownership of all land in the citizens of Uganda.
51. The 1998 Land Act further reinforced land reform in Uganda by recognizing customary ownership of land.
52. The Uganda Forestry Policy (2001) and the National Forestry and Tree Planting Act (2003) made it clear that local people/communities and private individuals could own forests on their lands, as long as they registered such lands with the District Land Boards and managed them sustainably according to an approved Management Plan.
53. Despite these reforms, many people continued to believe that forests on their land still belonged to the government.

⁴ After the evaluation was undertaken in Indonesia, the FAO Country Office in Indonesia advised that in January 2019 the Minister of Environment and Forestry proposes to downsize the target to 4.38 million hectares.

54. The Project was highly relevant to the situation in Uganda as it focused on improving implementation of the new laws and policies related to tenure. The Project helped create awareness of the legal reforms and their implications for forest use. The information and awareness created fed into the process of implementing guidelines on the registration and declaration of private forests and the preparation of management plans (the preparation of management plans was spearheaded by a related project - FAO/Forestry Sector Support Department -FSSD/Department for International Development - DFID). In this way, the Project contributed towards processes that were supported by different actors which helped the government of Uganda to turn good intent (described in the Forestry and Tree Planting Act, but had not yet implemented) into reality.
55. The Project was relevant to Uganda's national forestry related targets, including targets in the Uganda Vision 2040, the National Development Plan II (2015/16—2019/20), the Uganda Forestry Policy 2001 and the National Forest Plan (2011/12—2021/22). It was also relevant to Uganda's National Environment Management policy (1994); National Wetland Policy (1995); National Policy for Disaster Preparedness and Management (2010); National Climate Change Policy (2012); National land policy (2013); National Agriculture Policy (2013) and the National Water Policy (1999).

How realistic were the assumptions that underpinned the Theory of Change (TOC)?

56. A **theory of change** for the global level of the Project was constructed after the commencement of the GCS-Tenure initiative and this was soon followed with the development of TOC for each of the three target countries. The TOCs were updated towards the end of the Project to reflect lessons learned about key actors and pathways of change.
57. Project staff reported that the TOC was a very useful conceptual framework to focus both research and practical interventions. The TOC was also useful in guiding the Project partners in terms of the key actors to engage with and the pathways of change.
58. As one respondent put it:
The assumptions behind the theory of change were correct but change takes a lot of process to achieve results. So our research looked at the real situation in the field by collecting data at community level and engage with relevant stakeholders using a multi-stakeholder approach and tools. This generated knowledge on real needs of the various stakeholders. Then together we worked to identify relevant knowledge and capacity needed. In this way the Project managed to build capacity at local, subnational and national levels. We also consulted at national level about needs and how to improve implementation to identify gaps at government level and find solutions for this.
59. The TOC included working with strategic partners in each country that would, theoretically, use their network connections to promote research findings about the constraints to implementation of tenure reforms, to influence the development of new regulations, to encourage the application of improved approaches, and to enhance capacity of local partners to advocate for change.
60. The evidence suggests that the Project found it challenging to keep the strategic partners consistently involved in learning and maintaining momentum for change. Ongoing management effort by the Project was required to make the strategic partners effective.
61. The assumptions underpinning the TOC in **Indonesia** were realistic. The research and diagnostic tools used by the Project and partners were considered highly rigorous and thorough by respondents. The Participatory Prospective Analysis (PPA) was a particularly

- important tool for activating the pathways of change identified in the TOC. The key actors identified in the TOC were appropriate. The engagement of national media in project activities proved more challenging than expected.
62. The Project used the TOC to identify pathways of change in Indonesia and this enabled the Project to focus on key issues such as conflict management and gender equity.
 63. In **Peru** the TOC was realistic. All interviewees recognized the quality of CIFORs research outputs and used them in their work. Evidence provided by respondents indicates that the Project's knowledge products are highly valued and provide a critical source of data about concrete aspects of land tenure reform implementation that were not clear before. In Loreto, key stakeholders were engaged in discussions. The PPA was highly appreciated as a tool for promoting discussions.
 64. The TOC was useful in terms of helping stakeholders in Peru to recognize the difficulties and limits of tenure reform processes for incorporating facts, evidence and research outputs. It was noted by respondents that powerful private interests and institutionalized stereotypes on who can make productive use of land and resources prevail. In such situations, only modest impact of tenure reforms was expected.
 65. To address this situation, the Project used coalition-building and mass media tools as strategies to extend the impact of research evidence and to unblock the pathways to change. International organizations such as RRI, GIZ, Norad and the Tenure Facility (The International Land and Forest Tenure Facility) had a lot of communication with CIFOR research leaders and participated in meetings, provided feedback on the Project products and collaborated in the organization of some activities related to the Project. Project findings were published in international journals, and the Project made good use of radio and printed media.
 66. In **Uganda**, the assumptions underpinning the TOC were realistic. However, the assumption that all stakeholders would be willing and able to undertake innovative practices did not hold up in all situations. In some cases, although willingness may have been there, challenges prevented some stakeholders from adopting new approaches. For example, whilst the PPAs undertaken in three districts generated activity plans, the anticipation that government or other resources would be available to implement the plans was not realized. The Project had made it clear that resources from the Project were not for plan implementation. Moreover, land tenure issues in Kibaale and Kakumiro constrained follow up action by communities as they did not own the land on which they live and which harbours community forests. These issues were not evident in Indonesia and Peru.

3.2 EQ 2: What results, intended and unintended, did the Project achieve?

Effectiveness: Satisfactory

Assessment of project results: Satisfactory

Outcome 1: Highly satisfactory

Outcome 2: Highly satisfactory

Outcome 3: Highly satisfactory

Outcome 4: Satisfactory

Outcome 5: Highly satisfactory

Finding 3: The impact of the Project has primarily been through its substantial contribution to knowledge at global, national and subnational levels, of the barriers to the implementation of forest and land tenure reform. The approach adopted by the Project has left national stakeholders with new knowledge and improved capacity within the target sites and to some extent nationally to identify key opportunities from and constraints to reform (Outcome 1).

67. A table summarizing the activities by project outcomes as reported in the Project reports (as of mid-2018) is included as Annex 2. This includes a list of training sessions with details of the type of training, location and number of participants (gender-disaggregated in most instances).
68. **Outcome 1** - The Project synthesized knowledge on the implementation of tenure reforms contributed a critical understanding of the history of the relationships between customary and formal forest tenure rights in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda. The sharing of this knowledge led to an improved understanding at global, national and subnational level of the impacts of and barriers to reform implementation across different sociopolitical and historical settings.
69. In addition, the Project improved the awareness of barriers to and impacts of forest tenure reforms with 188 policymakers at national and subnational levels in three countries, held policy roundtable events in three countries: (eight in Peru, seven in Uganda, two in Indonesia) and developed a series of policy briefs (including, for example, a comparative paper on reforms and an info-brief on Indonesia) (CIFOR, 2016). See Bibliography and Annex 2 for a list of policy briefs available at the time of the final evaluation.
70. As a result of the Project, stakeholders in project sites, and those involved in tenure issues at national and subnational levels in all three Tier 1 countries, are more aware of the factors that constrain tenure reform.

Finding 4: The Project increased the awareness of policymakers and other stakeholders on:

- i. **ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during tenure reform processes (Outcome 2);**
- ii. **the impacts of tenure reform processes on livelihoods (Outcome 3).**

Finding 5: Multi-stakeholder processes that link multiple layers of governance are more likely to succeed than top down policy-driven or normative approaches (Outcome 2).

Finding 6: The Participatory Prospective Analysis process is an important legacy of the Project. The PPA approach engaged multi-stakeholders from multiple governance levels in a process that led to stakeholders developing plans of action to address tenure implementation (Outcome 2).

71. **Outcome 2** - The Project identified key actors involved in the implementation of different forest tenure reforms in the study countries and examined the content of relevant laws and policies and related them to the choices, capacities and constraints of selected government actors (or local authorities) mandated with implementation.
72. By working with relevant partners on multi-stakeholder processes, the Project was able to increase the awareness of policymakers and other stakeholders on:
 - i. the impacts of and barriers to reform implementation across different sociopolitical and historical settings;
 - ii. ways to improve multi-actor collaboration, coordination and inclusiveness during tenure reform processes;
 - iii. the impacts of tenure reform processes on livelihoods.
73. A key deliverable of this Outcome was the completion of Participatory Prospective Analysis in all Tier 1 countries. The PPAs helped build awareness and capacity across stakeholder groups and enabled multi-stakeholder groups to identify key driving forces of local tenure security and develop scenarios which were used by stakeholders to design action plans.
74. The PPA processes in Tier 1 countries involved 883 people, including 130 policymakers and 64 NGO practitioners. In addition, a South-South exchange was completed, and policy briefs developed.
75. **Outcome 3** - The Project developed knowledge sharing outputs aimed at increasing awareness of reform impacts on livelihoods and sustainability. It also produced and shared many publications, reports and presentations (see Bibliography). Outputs included an International Colloquium on Forest Tenure Reform in Lima and an International Colloquium on Recognition of Collective Tenure Rights and Challenges of Tenure Security in Madre de Dios, (a total of 162 participants including 24 government representatives), community research results reports produced for 22 villages (unpublished to ensure community privacy but provided in hardbound copy to the communities), regional level outcome reports and survey reports, comparative synthesis of results presented at a World Bank conference in 2017 and a series of policy briefs.

Finding 7: The Project built the capacity of policymakers and other stakeholders to implement forest and land tenure reforms, manage conflict and improve multi-actor collaboration (Outcomes 4 and 5).

76. **Outcome 4** - The Project focused on deepening, strengthening and consolidating knowledge sharing. This included supporting community feedback workshops on tenure, multi-stakeholder forums at national and subnational level on barriers and opportunities for reform, tenure security, conflict management and gender, and engagement in national, regional and global forest and land tenure processes.

77. Conflict management in Peru has been identified as a major concern, with data available to back up this observation. The guide developed by the Project in Peru will help with this directly (CIFOR, 2019).
78. The Project made important contributions to knowledge sharing at the global level, through participation in relevant global meetings and through publications (see Bibliography), including:
- i. presentation of four papers at the Land and Poverty Conference, Washington DC, USA;
 - ii. an ILC Roundtable discussion on Land Related Global Agenda, Bogor, Indonesia;
 - iii. contributions to the International Congress on Forest and Land Tenure Security, Lima, Peru;
 - iv. attendance at the RRI Strategy Meeting on Gender Justice in Community Lands and Forests;
 - v. involvement in the CGIAR collaborative platform on gender: Strengthening women's tenure rights (Webinar);
 - vi. support to the Yale Forest Dialogue: Scoping dialogue on forest and land tenure reform, New Haven, USA;
 - vii. attendance at the expert Group Meeting, building sustainable and resilient societies through the gender-responsive implementation of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, Nairobi, Kenya.
79. **Outcome 5** - The Project provided training for communities, policymakers and practitioners on a wide range of issues including, for example:⁵
- i. tenure reform (procedures and steps to formalize collective rights in Peru);
 - ii. REDD+ and indigenous communities;
 - iii. community forestry;
 - iv. tenure literacy;
 - v. strengthening forest tenure security;
 - vi. justice, gender and forest tenure;
 - vii. legal literacy;
 - viii. collective titling;
 - ix. climate change and REDD+.
80. To assist with the enhancement of skills in tenure reform, the Project developed a PPA guide for tenure security, a training manual on conflict resolution, an illustrated handbook on relevant laws, policies and institutions targeted at different actors, a guide on integrating gender in tenure reform processes and implementation (in preparation), a practitioner guide for reform implementation, and a PPA manual/guide for tenure security.
81. In **Indonesia**, the Project focused capacity building on two field sites, Maluku and Lampung. The context differs between the two sites. In Maluku indigenous communities still widely practice customary tenure and the key tenure issues relate to how the Indonesian Government's social forestry schemes that are associated with tenure relate to customary tenure. In Lampung the population largely comprise migrants from other areas

⁵ Note that the training offered by the Project varied between countries and not all training exercises were offered in each country.

- in Indonesia and the government's social forestry programmes were already being implemented before the Project commenced. The key issue in Lampung related to how communities could improve the benefits from the land reform processes. The Project raised awareness and built capacity of local communities in Lampung related to the rights of communities under the Government's social forestry scheme.
82. In **Peru**, the Project acted as a vector for sharing information and promoted interaction between sectors and across multiple levels of governance. Strategic actors were involved in the co-production of knowledge outputs. On several occasions, the Project provided a useful platform for formal and informal meetings between actors that would not have otherwise convened. This was particularly appreciated by women indigenous people's leaders, regional agencies and local NGOs.
 83. As a result of the Project, the academic community in Peru, particularly in the forest and agricultural studies sector, has a clearer, broader understanding of collective tenure, indigenous rights and gender and land tenure issues.
 84. The Project introduced new tools for socio-environmental research that have been used in new courses in Indonesia and Peru. New academic course at the Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina in Peru have been designed employing methodologies that were used for data collection and analysis in the Project. Responsible involvement with communities has been reinforced. Similarly, the University of Pattimura (Indonesia) has used the tools developed by the Project in teaching and socio-economic research. In addition, the Project contributed to the Forest Department's introduction of a new required concentration area on social science within the forestry curriculum in 2019.
 85. In **Uganda**, organizational and institutional capacities of public and private institutions were built by the Project at national, regional, district and local levels. This included the Ministry of Water and Environment/Forestry Sector Support Department, Uganda Forestry Working Group (Environmental Alert, CODECA, COVOID and TREE TALK), the District Local Government of Masindi, Lamwo, private forest owners, and community forestry institutions.
 86. Organizations and networks in Uganda were strengthened to support innovation and a transition toward more sustainable agricultural production systems. This was achieved by holding national forest fora and regional training through awareness creation and via district/sub-county and village meetings. It is important to note that in addition to the four original districts that the Project focused on, an additional 20 districts were brought on board through the regional training. As a result, understanding of the Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security (VGGT) has been increased (it should be noted that VGGT issues were also included in project sessions in Indonesia and Peru).
 87. Public and private organizations and institutions, management agencies and networks in Uganda received organizational and institutional and/or technical capacity development support from the Project through sensitization meetings, awareness raising, support for the registration of the private forests and the strengthening of community forestry institutional arrangements (arising from the training and sensitization sessions). It should be noted that the Project was not focused directly on improving environmental conditions, generating ecosystem services or improving livelihoods. The available evidence does not allow any conclusions to be drawn about the long-term impact of the Project on environmental conditions, ecosystem services or livelihoods.

Finding 8: No unintended negative consequences attributable to the Project were identified.

3.3 EQ 3: Monitoring and Evaluation - What were the strengths and weaknesses of the Project M&E plan and its implementation?

Overall quality of M&E: Satisfactory

M&E design: Moderately Satisfactory

M&E implementation: Satisfactory

Finding 9: Progress with the implementation of activities, outputs and outcomes was reported on a regular basis. A series of country-level case studies were commissioned by CIFOR in the final year of the Project. The methodological approaches used by the Project, and in particular the Participatory Prospective Analysis, provided strong evidence-based information for project field sites.

88. The ProDoc notes that the monitoring of project implementation will be driven by the preparation and implementation of an annual work plan and budget (AWP/B). It anticipates that the AWP/B will provide the necessary details to monitor implementation, including specific monitoring tasks and supervision activities
89. The ProDoc includes indicators, baselines, targets and milestones for each outcome. The ProDoc does not include a requirement for the development of a separate M&E plan other than the AWP/B. The ProDoc notes that following the approval of the Project, the Project's first year AWP/B will be adjusted to synchronize it with FAO financial reporting requirements.
90. The targets within the AWP/B were adjusted in the first year of project implementation to make them more specific. In addition, some targets were moved between outcomes to provide a more logical flow than contained in the original ProDoc. These changes did not materially affect the intent of the Outcomes, nor alter the overall planned budget.
91. However, these changes did result in a complex reporting structure whereby the original and the modified targets were reported separately. This generated additional burden on project staff and likely resulted in missed opportunities for CIFOR and FAO to focus project reporting and project steering committee time on learning and applying strategic lessons from the Project research.
92. In 2015 a draft Outcome Monitoring and Assessment Plan (see document 29 listed in Appendix 2) was developed by CIFOR for the GCS Initiative that outlined possible assessment methods and tools. Whilst many of the assessment tools were applied by the Project, the Outcome Monitoring and Assessment Plan itself was not finalized nor apparently used by the Project.
93. Nevertheless, the Project did monitor activities and outputs and regularly reported on these to the Project Steering Committee and to FAO in a timely manner.
94. The ProDoc includes a relatively high-level baseline and the Project subsequently detailed knowledge on land and forest tenure issues through 'bureaucrat surveys' and Participatory Prospective Analysis. In addition, the Project assessed the immediate outcomes of training events.
95. The PPA process was instrumental in providing the Project, partners, communities and other stakeholders with structured evidence-based information on the communities targeted by the Project. The PPAs, as well as other tools including historical institutional

analysis, provided detailed information that was not in the original baseline of the Project. The data obtained from the PPAs and other tools was used to report on progress with results.

96. CIFOR initiated a series of country-level case studies in the final year of the GCS-Tenure initiative. These case studies used the initiative's theory of change to focus on assessing implementation and outcomes. The Peru case study and a draft of the Uganda case study were available at the time of the current final evaluation. The Indonesian case study was being undertaken in parallel with the final evaluation and a fourth 'synthesis' evaluation of the three case studies had been commissioned (but not available to the evaluation team), to identify what worked, where and for who.

3.4 EQ 4: How effective was the Project implementation/execution?

Efficiency: Highly Satisfactory

Factors Affecting Performance

Project design and readiness: Satisfactory

Quality of project implementation: Satisfactory

Project oversight: Satisfactory

Quality of project execution: Satisfactory

Project management arrangements and delivery: Satisfactory

Project partnerships: Highly Satisfactory

Stakeholder engagement: Highly Satisfactory

Communication and knowledge management: Highly Satisfactory

Finding 10: The Project was well managed by CIFOR and the partners. Project management was both highly focused and adaptable to changing circumstances. Budgets were well managed and the delivery of outputs exceeded targets in many instances.

97. The Project was executed in collaboration with key partners at both the global and national levels. CIFOR provided project management, research skills, methodologies and networks. The partners provided a broad range of skills and local networks. Partners included:
- i. In Indonesia:
 - Forestry Research and Development Agency (FORDA) - skills in biophysical and social research on forests. Strong networks with government and researchers.
 - University of Lampung (UNILA), the University of Pattimura (UNPATTI), Pusat Kajian Wanita dan Gender Universitas - skills in research and community engagement, gender and networks with local organizations, communities, academia and local government bodies.
 - ii. In Peru:
 - Universidad Agraria La Molina - skills in agricultural and social research, community engagement and gender. Networks with local organizations, communities, academia and local government bodies.
 - iii. In Uganda:
 - Makerere University (MUK), the Association of Uganda Professional Women in Agriculture and Environment (AUPWAE), the Land Development and Governance

Institute (NGO) - skills in forestry, agricultural and social research, community engagement, and gender. Networks with policymakers, local organizations, communities, academia and local government bodies.

iv. Other:

- Forest Action Nepal - skills in community forestry, gender, social and biophysical research, advocacy and policy formulation. Networks with NGOs, user group associations, policymakers and local officials.
 - The RRI and ILC, high level skills and experience with land tenure reforms, law and policy, community engagement, indigenous peoples issues and international policy fora. Networks with indigenous peoples groups, International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN), UN agencies, national governments and regional economic bodies.
 - Members of the PSCs - a range of skills amongst members. Strong national and local networks.
98. The Project engaged a post-doctoral research fellow in each of the Tier 1 target countries to provide coordination between partners and to provide research skills for the Project and with stakeholders. This proved to be a highly effective and efficient approach. The fellows had research skills and a capacity to coordinate in-country activities and work with project partners. Fieldwork research teams were gender-balanced and included local people that had deep knowledge of cultural practices and social and political context.
99. Overall, project partners performed their roles effectively. The partners were appropriate for the issues being addressed by the Project. The level of influence that the partners had on policy and practice was variable. Examples are reported below by country.
100. In all three target countries, improving the implementation of tenure reforms had been a focus of the partners prior to the commencement of the Project. By selecting these partners, the Project was able to tap into existing networks, knowledge and skills. CIFOR was able to complement this approach through its skills, knowledge and networks. CIFOR's highly regarded reputation at global and national levels added considerable, although unmeasurable, credibility to the results of the Project.
101. The Project faced no major challenges with stakeholders and feedback from stakeholders interviewed for the final evaluation in all three Tier 1 countries was generally positive in terms of progress made and outcomes achieved. Stakeholders were notably complimentary about the efforts the Project had taken to focus on issues of national and local importance, to provide useful tools and approaches, to offer capacity building and to assist in conflict resolution.
102. As noted in the section of this report on gender, the Project made substantial efforts to ensure project interventions were gender-responsive in all target countries. For example, training on gender and forest tenure reform was provided in all three countries (estimated 144 people trained, 95 women, 45 men).
103. As shown in Appendix 5, the Project exceeded the level of co-financing that was anticipated in the ProDoc. CIFOR attracted considerable support (USD 1.8 million) from donors, civil society organizations and the private sector.
104. In **Indonesia**, partnering with universities had several benefits. The universities already had considerable knowledge of tenure issues and good networks in the Project field sites. Moreover, the Project benefited the universities by supporting the development of new

- skills and methodologies and providing case material that has subsequently been incorporated into curriculum.
105. NGO partners in Indonesia provided quality products that have been helpful in raising awareness about the government's social forestry programme, notably in terms of the rights and responsibilities of local people.
 106. Linkages with subnational forestry agencies in Indonesia proved to be helpful for implementation and respondents from the provincial level reported using conflict management and PPA skills learned from the Project.
 107. In **Peru**, the Project had very good and effective partners. The Universidad de La Molina is a very well-established institution on all rural affairs. It facilitated trust building *vis-à-vis* local communities and establishing continuity in the process of implementation that facilitated the incorporation of gender perspectives and awareness of the legal gaps and overlaps in the policy agenda.
 108. The engagement of Indigenous peoples was prioritized, and the Project generated good results in gender issues. The Organización Nacional de Mujeres Indígenas Andinas y Amazónicas del Perú (ONAMIAP - the National Woman Indigenous People's Organization) became a stable partner of the Project.
 109. The Project's involvement with civil society was well considered. Indigenous local and regional organizations involved in the Project are recognized as effective and fair. NGO partners spread the research findings the Project produced.
 110. In **Uganda**, the Association of Uganda professional Women in Agriculture and Environment (AUPWAE) and Makerere University College of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences (CAES) performed their roles well under the guidance and supervision of CIFOR.
 111. The partnership with Makerere University enabled the Project to tap into relevant experience and expertise as well as the University's extensive experience in working with government agencies, NGOs, community-based organizations (CBOs) and traditional and cultural institutions. The Project also benefited from working with AUPWAE experts in gender and participatory methodologies.
 112. The Project successfully contributed further to the engagement of policymakers in Uganda to promote increased funding to the forestry sector. This change was a result of awareness raised about the processes required under the law to have community forests registered; this provided the justification for the sector, especially at district level, requiring more funding. It was complementary to the work done earlier under the FAO/DFID/FSSD project, but whose recommendations had not yet been fully implemented despite the increased awareness and desire to register private and community forests, due to the delay in government approval of the Template for Declaration and Registration of Private and Community Forests.
 113. However, there were several delays in government processes at national and district level in Uganda that affected the outputs of the Project. These included:
 - i. Delays in approving the Template for Declaration and Registration of Private and Community Forest; and in approving the Statutory Instrument for Declaration of Community Forests developed under the FAO/DFID/FSSD project. The Project contributed to the further understanding and appreciation of these Templates through training and awareness raising, but they could not be applied due to the

delay in the approval process (this was still the situation at the time of this evaluation. However, attempts were made to understand the cause of the delay and it was explained to the evaluation team that the officer who was handling the document was ill and the responsible officer at FSSD was advised to re-submit the Template so that it could be assigned to another person).

- ii. Another issue that arose was sustainability after the end of project support which needed more commitment of funds and alternative sources of financial support beyond government. The work of the Project raised the awareness about the need for monitoring, further convinced communities to register their forests and manage them sustainably and convinced the government of the need for more staffing in the Forestry Departments both at district (such as in Masindi District) and national levels.
 - iii. Delays in project implementation as a consequence of the election period (late 2015 until the first half of 2016).
 - iv. Delays due to lack of District Land Boards in some of the districts.
114. A shortcoming was identified in Uganda, where demand for support with private/community forests exceeded the capacity of the Project. This put the Government under pressure to find alternative sources of funding to support communities.

3.5 EQ 5: Sustainability of results achieved - What is the likelihood that project results will continue to be useful after the end of the Project?

Sustainability of Project Outcomes

Overall likelihood of sustainability: Likely

Financial sustainability: Likely

Sociopolitical sustainability: Moderately Likely

Institutional sustainability: Likely

Environmental sustainability: Likely

Finding 11: The results of the Project are likely to be sustained through project partners, local communities and other stakeholders. The focus on implementing existing laws and policies related to tenure and forest reform was appropriate given the context within the three Tier 1 countries and because of this, stakeholders are motivated to continue many of the activities supported by the Project.

Finding 12: Weak capacity and lack of resources at local levels can potentially inhibit the application of the knowledge and skill developed through the support of the Project

Finding 13: The key risks for sustainability relate to the willingness of government agencies to genuinely enable local communities to benefit from tenure reform and devolution of rights, and the ability of local communities and indigenous people to manage the resources, maintain productivity and tap into economically viable markets.

115. The PPA is noteworthy in terms of its contribution to the sustainability of results. The PPAs brought together stakeholders from multiple sectors and multiple levels of governance to reflect on the factors that threaten community rights and to develop

- scenarios for the future. From the chosen future scenario, the participants develop a plan of action.
116. The plans of action developed through the PPA process are a key tool for national, subnational and local institutions to carry out the activities after the Project concludes.
 117. The primary factors that could inhibit the application of the knowledge and skill developed through the support of the Project are weak capacity and lack of resources at local levels.
 118. The key risks for sustainability relate to the willingness of the bureaucracy to genuinely enable local communities to benefit from tenure reform and devolution of rights, and the ability of local communities and indigenous people to manage the resources, maintain productivity and tap into economically viable markets.
 119. In **Indonesia**, project partners reported an intent to continue to use the Project's research results, methodologies and awareness raising materials. The PPAs were referred to by several respondents as a substantially improved method compared to what they had used previously, and that they intended to continue to use the approach, resources permitting.
 120. The provincial forest agency staff in Indonesia reported that the Project's conflict management approach, including conflict resolution and gender, has been incorporated into provincial level guidelines.
 121. Academic institutions linked to the Project in Indonesia reported incorporating project methodologies and lessons into curricula and research agendas.
 122. Numerous respondents mentioned the value of posters and brochures prepared by the Project in Bahasa Indonesia that will be of long-term value.
 123. In **Peru**, the improvement of university courses and academic research related to land tenure indicates that several key land tenure reform issues are now incorporated in academic debate. This constitutes an impact both in the short and medium term. Research methodologies, innovations in research protocols and techniques on how to design awareness raising materials are now used by progressive actors. Forestry professors are spreading interest to new researchers, practitioners and academics. Project partners are linking research and practice through field placement (this is the case of professors, students and young professionals from the Universidad Agraria la Molina).
 124. Despite the successful achievement of intermediate and end-of-project outcomes, high political instability at national and subnational levels in Peru is a key factor affecting the achievement of the sustainability of the Project's outcomes. Nevertheless, there are deeply engaged and committed NGOs and others who are using the Project's research findings and are likely to carry on no matter the political complexities. This includes the Proyecto de Catastro, Titulación y Registro de Tierras Rurales en el Perú - Tercera Fase (PTRT-3) which is arguably the most important titling initiative in the country.
 125. In **Uganda**, the Project helped to fill knowledge gaps in the provisions of the Forestry Policy, Land Act, Forestry and Tree Planting Act and supported the implementation of several other relevant laws that had not been implemented effectively. This was complementary to the work done earlier under the FAO/DFID/FSSD project that had carried out policy and law analyses relating to Private and Community Forest Tenure. The training and awareness raising undertaken and the sensitization and awareness materials

- produced will help ensure that the knowledge acquired during the Project is used to further sensitize and educate more stakeholders beyond the life of the Project.
126. At the central government level, the Ministry of Water and Environment/FSSD is committed to ensuring that all relevant government programmes under the ministry will contribute funds to the process of registration and securing of forests/tree tenure.
 127. There are several ongoing programmes that will be used for scaling up the outcomes of the Project in Uganda. The Ministry of Water and Environment is committed to supporting implementation of forest management plans (not a direct product of this project but a necessity for the outcomes of this project to be implemented) with support from the Government, development partners and individuals.
 128. By engaging civil society organizations (CSOs), Ministry of Lands, Housing and Urban Development and the district local Government, particularly the District Land Boards, the Project has helped in awareness raising amongst governmental and non-governmental agencies and hence contributed to implementation of the content of the reformed laws relating to community and private forest tenure which will help improve and secure forestry tenure in Uganda.
 129. At the district local Government level, one result of the Project has been the impact of the training that improved support to the implementation of the multi-stakeholder action plans, developed under the FAO/DFID/FSSD project. The increased awareness of the importance of the plans and what it takes to implement them and monitor their implementation has seen an increase in the number of staff in the Forestry Department, and an increase in the number of communities wishing to have their communal forests registered in Masindi District spearheaded by NGO stakeholders (after the end of the Department for International Development and GEF Projects). This is likely to have improved the forest tenure security of both women and youth who are now included in Community Forest management.
 130. Forest Management Plans (FMPs) were developed under the FAO/DFID/FSSD project, for over 50 community and private forests. However, this did not cover all the forests that required them, yet the FMPs are mandatory before any forest can qualify for registration. Although the Project's work was not focused on the preparation and implementation of forest management plans, it created further awareness about their importance with communities that did not benefit from the FMPs developed under the FAO/DFID/FSSD project. FMPs are being supported by local organizations (private forest owners/community forestry institutions), NGOs and donor agencies, including Ecotrust.

4. Other relevant issues

4.1 Need for follow-up

131. The evaluation team did not find any need for specific follow-up of the evaluation findings.

4.2 Materialization of co-financing

Co-financing: Highly Satisfactory

132. The Project reported a range of co-financing had been secured during the life of the Project. The total co-financing was estimated to be USD 6 45 million, USD 1 84 million above the level planned in the ProDoc. Details of co-financing can be found in Appendix 5.

4.3 Gender and human rights

Gender equity: Highly Satisfactory

Finding 14: The Project maintained a consistently high level of attention to gender and social concerns. Gender issues were taken into consideration for project research, awareness raising and capacity building. Gender-disaggregated data was collected throughout the Project and used to adapt project activities to improve equitable outcomes.

133. In **Indonesia**, the Project was well focused on gender and social issues. Staff from CIFOR, FORDA and Pusat Kajian Wanita dan Gender Universitas were skilled in gender issues and used their skills to design and implement project activities and to support gender training. The PPAs and other research tools provided detailed gender-disaggregated data and highly relevant information on social, economic and environmental issues. The information obtained was used to guide project interventions and by partners, both government and NGO. Respondents from subnational government and NGOs interviewed by the evaluation team were particularly impressed with the conflict management training that the Project provided. Conflict management training was used by both NGOs and subnational government agencies to better understand the nature of conflict within and between communities and between communities and others. Improved conflict management skills enabled clearer identification of the causes of local conflict and the potential solutions to conflicts that relate to land and forest tenure and use rights, using inclusive participatory processes. Subnational forest agencies noted that conflict management training had been incorporated into their training systems as a result of project support.
134. In **Peru**, participants from communities, relevant NGOs and government organizations are now better informed and, in some cases, empowered to deal with issues related to gender, conflict, VGGTs, tenure security/insecurity, the titling process and related roles and responsibilities, the impacts and outcomes of titling. These stakeholders now have improved connections to make the process work. Through the process of acquiring new knowledge, participants were empowered. This was particularly important for young indigenous peoples, young scholars and woman indigenous leaders. The Project also provided a specific one and a half-day capacity building workshop on gender in titling.

135. Indigenous organizations in Peru appreciated the support and flexibility of the Project as it was willing to prepare extra workshops to support women indigenous leaders. As one of the leaders of the organization of indigenous women said "They did a workshop on tenure for us. They had targeted regions, and we proposed to work with the other regions. So, they helped us [at national level]. They were quite open and gave us interesting support. They had willingness to support us."
136. In Peru the Project's efforts to provide intergenerational platforms and ensure the representation of women indigenous leaders in multi-stakeholder dialogues provided valuable forums for this agenda. It sensitized key actors on forest tenure reform.
137. In **Uganda** improved land and forest tenure rights are vital for communities that are heavily dependent on forests and land if they are to benefit fully from natural resources. These communities have, however, lacked knowledge of their rights and privileges under the law regarding what they are entitled to. This was reported by the Project implementing partners and corroborated by all the District Natural Resources Officers for all participating districts who were interviewed during the evaluation as well as the one participating community - Alimugonza community forest group, Pakany sub-county, Masindi district - that was interviewed during the evaluation. The Project helped communities know their rights through training exercises, including four training exercises on collective community forest tenure rights and privileges (legal literacy), and three exercises for district, sub-county and community leadership in gender, conflict management and leadership.
138. The Ugandan Central and Local Government, technocrats and NGOs were trained in various aspects of forest and land tenure to better implement the provisions in the laws. This was done through a series of engagements carried out through an inception workshop and training workshops for selected stakeholders as follows:
- i. one national project inception meeting;
 - ii. three district inception meetings;
 - iii. two national level colloquiums;
 - iv. three district level engagements-feedback meetings;
 - v. one training of district technocrats and NGO officials on "Promoting the protection of collective forest rights and ensuring women and the marginalized groups are protected";
 - vi. one training of district technocrats and NGO officials on "National Forestry and Tree Planting Regulations of 2016";
 - vii. Four trainings of sub-county technocrats and political officials in collective community forest tenure rights and privileges;
 - viii. four trainings of forest adjacent communities in collective community forest tenure rights and privileges (legal literacy);
 - ix. three trainings for district, sub-county and community leadership in gender conflict management and leadership;
 - x. one training with media personnel.
139. Although gender targets were not expressly stated in the Project design for Uganda, gender issues were taken into consideration. The elderly, men, women and youth were all encouraged to participate actively from the beginning. The three trainings for district, sub-county and community leadership in gender, conflict management and leadership built the capacity of the forest adjacent local communities in the four project districts

(Kakumiro, Kibaale, Masindi and Lamwo 80 participants, 28 women, 52 men). Training of journalists in reporting gender issues in natural resource management saw attendance of 18, including 13 reporters (8 men and 5 women) and 5 project officials from Makerere University and AUPWAE.

140. The initial PPA exercises undertaken in Uganda had low participation of women. The result of this was that the voices of women were not being heard in the PPA exercise. To ameliorate this situation, the Project organized PPA sessions for women which enabled them to express their views. During training/capacity building, men and women were given equal opportunity to express their views.
141. The action plans that emerged from the PPA processes in Uganda included several actions aimed at empowering youth and women. PPA meetings in three districts resulted in three action plans. PPA feedback meetings were held in the three districts. The approach helped identify the driving forces behind forest tenure security in the study districts and resulted in action plans for enhancing good practices and mitigating challenges. In addition, household surveys were conducted in all four project districts by Makerere University. Feedback meetings were held at community level and focus group discussions undertaken with NGOs at district level. To understand how forest tenure reforms affected the livelihoods of forest adjacent communities and the forest health, CIFOR and Makerere University conducted household interviews, focus group discussions and key informant interviews in 16 villages (4 per district).

4.4 Environmental and social safeguards

Environmental and social safeguards: Satisfactory

142. The Project applied CIFOR's Research Ethics Policy. Free Prior and Informed Consent principles were applied by the Project for study sites.

4.5 The FAO Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM)

Finding 15: The FAO Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) was a relevant, effective and efficient approach for the Project. It leveraged the comparative advantages of both CIFOR and FAO. CIFOR was able to use its scientific, evidence-based approach and networks to focus the Project on the right partners and pathways of influence. Challenges and issues were within tolerable limits to be anticipated in a project of this size, complexity and duration. Efficiency of OPIM

143. Overall, the FAO Operational Partners Implementation Modality was highly relevant for the context of the Project. CIFOR, as the Project executing agency, had a comparative advantage to work on forest and land tenure issues. CIFOR has an internationally recognized reputation of forest policy issues and for science-based research. It has well-established, relevant networks, and is a trusted partner of the governments in the three targeted countries.
144. CIFOR was an effective and efficient executing partner. Its methodologies and practices were consistent with and aligned to FAO's normative work and to approaches that have been supported by FAO (e.g. Voluntary Guidelines on the Responsible Governance of Tenure of Land, Fisheries and Forests in the Context of National Food Security).

145. FAO, as the implementing agency, has strong national level linkages with all three project target countries and relevant technical knowledge of forest policy and tenure issues. FAO also has a well-developed series of guidelines and other materials that were relevant to the Project.
146. The Project governance structure was effective in facilitating project execution, although the lack of participation of some members of the PSC in meetings may have resulted in a lost opportunity to share information and influence the achievement of project objectives.

The role of OPIM in sustainability

147. CIFOR was the key driver in the formulation of the Project and had strong ownership of the activities undertaken during implementation.
148. The selection of appropriate partners by CIFOR contributed to national and subnational ownership of project results and the likely continuation of relevant activities that support implementation of forest and land tenure reform.
149. CIFOR's approach to execute project activities included relevant and well-focused efforts to build capacity at local, subnational and national levels.
150. The extent to which the Project and the FAO Country Offices engaged with each other was variable. In Indonesia, the engagement of the FAO Country Office in the Project was minimal. In Peru, the Project had good interactions with the FAO Country Office. In Uganda the relationship with the FAO Country Office was reported as good and respondents spoke positively about FAO. However, there was no indication that the FAO Country Offices in Uganda or Indonesia had actively used the results of the Project.

Factors affecting progress related to OPIM

151. CIFOR provided quality financial reports, PPRs and PIRs and project staff reported that they received funds and no-cost extensions in a timely manner.
152. As mentioned previously, the Project exceeded the level of co-financing that was anticipated in the ProDoc. This suggests that OPIM was an effective mechanism for leveraging co-funding. Given the difficulty that projects often face with securing co-funding, the factors that enabled co-funding in this case deserve further investigation than was feasible during the final evaluation.
153. Some adjustments were required by both FAO and CIFOR as they learnt to implement the Project through the OPIM tool. This indicates that the approach by both FAO and CIFOR to project implementation was flexible, whilst remaining within the terms of the agreement.
154. Two issues emerged from operational partner respondents regarding implementation of the Project, namely a) that the Project reporting templates were confusing and labour intensive for project staff to complete; and b) that FAO's oversight of the Project presented some perceived challenges to CIFOR in terms of maintaining their science-based independence.
155. The addition of more specific targets to the Project logical framework and the rationalization of some project activities necessitating the movement of planned activities

- between various project Outcomes, undertaken in the first year of project implementation, was a sensible development for the Project. However, these changes resulted in CIFOR reporting against both the original logical framework targets and also against the revised targets. This resulted in additional work for CIFOR and complex and long project reports for FAO. FAO and CIFOR could have worked to simplify and harmonize the reporting templates and perhaps enable a stronger focus on reporting of outcomes and potential impacts.
156. Article XI clause 49 of the Execution Agreement requires FAO to technically clear all publications prepared or produced pursuant to the agreement. This generated concern with some of the CIFOR staff that the technical reviews potentially risked impinging on CIFOR's scientific independence. From FAO's perspective, the technical clearance of publications was an important step in linking FAO's extensive technical expertise to the Project and also providing quality assurance.
 157. Many of the administrative challenges faced by the Project could have potentially been avoided if there was a more thorough process of negotiation and induction prior to the Project commencing. For example, reporting requirements, FAO involvement in the Project, conflict management, mechanisms for agreeing changes and intellectual property rights. It should be noted, however, that the administrative challenges faced by the Project were relatively minor, they were largely addressed through the development of protocols and via the PSC, and they did not impact on delivery of outcomes.
 158. The implementation of the Project may have benefited from FAO and CIFOR more clearly establishing the basis for the operation of the Project before it commenced. FAO's procedures regarding reporting and publications were not well understood by the Project and this led to confusion and to complicated reporting systems. It is understood that CIFOR has since amended its procedures for internal clearance of projects including requirements for legal review.
 159. Project staff may have benefited from training on GEF requirements and FAO's approach to project implementation, monitoring and reporting at the time of project commencement.
 160. The evaluation team acknowledges that FAO has developed an e-learning course "An Introduction to the Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM)", the OPIM brochure - 2019, "Delivering projects and programmes in Operational Partners" (FAO, 2019), and the OPIM brochure - 2017, "Enhancing national delivery systems through operational partners"(FAO, 2017).

5. Lessons learned

161. In **Indonesia** each project site had a unique context with distinct stakeholders who have knowledge, capabilities and interests, distinct natural resource situations, unique history, access to markets and financial resources. These differential factors affected the ability of stakeholders to benefit from land reform. Communities in Lampung had already secured rights to forest resources under Indonesia's social forestry programme and thus the Project worked with these communities to secure greater benefits from these rights. In Maluku, the communities have yet to secure rights to forests and thus the focus of the Project was more on securing rights than on sharing benefits.
162. The rigorous collection of site level information that was undertaken by the Project enabled identification of key issues, key stakeholders and likely pathways of change. Information gathered enabled a sound understanding of the local context within local project sites and subsequently to the design of activities suited to the local context.
163. Bottom-up participatory, multi-stakeholder approaches helped to build awareness and improve capacity of communities and other stakeholders.
164. In **Peru**, working across sectors and on different scales of governance built a useful platform for civil society. In a context of land tenure reform, less powerful actors, such as indigenous women, used it to make their voices heard.
165. The use of participatory tools and the deliberate engagement of stakeholders required flexibility and adaptation of research methods and strategies. This was key to guaranteeing the achievement of outcomes that focused on building capacity, raising awareness and contributing to change. At the subnational level in Peru the use of participatory tools paid off.
166. The Project worked well with established public universities which supported sustainable impacts.
167. The Project shared research results with various actors (international media, cooperation, NGOs, indigenous organizations at different levels) and tried to link these actors together. The aim was to change mindsets, reduce resistance of the public sector and help them to recognize collective tenure.
168. The Project provided ethnographic information relevant to regional and context-dependent processes. This helped avoid conflict and poor implementation practices during land tenure reform. As stated in interviews with civil servants, there is a new openness from some national agencies to receive grounded data (ethnographic and otherwise) to improve the implementation of tenure-related policies.
169. There is also a need for local and regional agencies to have adequate plans and resources to implement reforms and undertake follow-up. Support and information given by this project was considered useful in this regard.
170. A key lesson for **Uganda** is the need to repeat the PPAs after a period to engage all stakeholders in reform implementation.
171. The Project noted that Uganda's forest tenure reforms had not improved forest tenure security for communities and especially not for women due to the strong link between forest ownership and land ownership; which, for cultural reasons, remains mainly the preserve of men given the strong patrilineal society common in Ugandan communities. For reforms to achieve intended objectives, there is need for communities adjacent to the

forests to be at the centre of the process of reform and for them to have buy in to the process. Integrating reforms into cultural norms can take a long time.

172. Before a project undertakes tenure reform activities it is important to carry out due diligence on factors that could hinder successful implementation. For example, after sensitization and training was completed and the expectations of the Community Forest Associations raised in Kibaale and Kakumiro, Uganda, it was found that the forests earmarked for registration and declaration as community forests were on lands owned by "Absentee Landlords". For the communities occupying and using the land to be given registrable rights and land titles, the Absentee Landlords first need to be compensated by the government (as provided for in the Land Act, 1998 using money from the Land Fund). This process has been very slow and none of the earmarked community forests in the two districts have benefited from the Land Fund. The issue of Absentee Landlords dates back to colonial times in Uganda. The majority of absentee landlords have never occupied or used such land and there were people already living on these lands when the colonial government allocated it to absentee landlords. People continued settling on such lands. The Land Act of Uganda (1998) recognizes and protects the tenants on land that belongs to absentee landlords. The Land Act created a Land Fund to compensate absentee landlords when land ownership is transferred to occupying communities who can acquire land titles using the funds from the land fund. However, the process of capitalizing the land fund has been slow. No forest owners in the districts concerned (Kibaale and Kakumiro) had benefited from the land fund as at the time of project closure.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. Conclusions and recommendations

6.1 Conclusions

Conclusion 1 (EQ1 - Relevance). The Project was highly relevant to the needs of stakeholders, including national and subnational government agencies, NGOs, universities and target communities. The lack of planned outputs and outcomes related to livelihoods may have made the Project less relevant to stakeholders who were expecting direct benefits from tenure reforms.

173. The Project was appropriately focused on improving the implementation of land and forest tenure reforms. However, securing rights through land titles and institutional arrangements such as social forestry is only one step in the process of improving sustainability for local communities and indigenous peoples. Enabling rights holders to benefit from the sustainable management of natural resources is critical for improving livelihoods and food security and reducing poverty, as well as for the conservation of biodiversity.
174. Where possible, future projects should consider including outcomes focused on improving livelihoods through the sustainable generation of values from ecosystem services and building capacity to process and market products and services from land and forests.
175. Alternatively, or in addition to the above, future projects should consider how to link to other existing initiatives that promote livelihoods through the sustainable management of ecosystem services.
176. The national focus of the Project was adapted to the context and identified priorities of Indonesia, Peru and Uganda. The historical institutional analysis undertaken by the Project was useful in this regard. In each case, the focus was on improving the implementation of tenure reform laws and policies.
177. The global element of the Project enabled sharing of lessons between countries as well as with global processes related to rights and tenure.

Conclusion 2 (EQ2 - Effectiveness). The Project was effective at building awareness about, and improving capacity for, implementation of tenure reform in the targeted field sites. Securing local and indigenous rights to land and forests, including through formal land titles and other institutional arrangements such as social forestry, is a necessary but insufficient step to improving livelihoods and maintaining the productivity of natural resources. Long-term changes to the focus and culture of government institutions and improving the capacity of local and indigenous communities to manage and benefit from natural resources are likely to be required to achieve sustainable and equitable outcomes; among other things, this will occur through regular monitoring and support to local and indigenous communities by technical staff from the local and central government.

178. The Project developed and applied a range of tools including historical studies, bureaucratic surveys, Participatory Prospective Analysis and actor mapping. Stakeholders considered that PPAs were the most effective tool used by the Project. The PPAs enabled multi-stakeholder dialogues to identify issues of concern, develop scenarios for change and agree on action plans. This approach empowered local stakeholders to design steps that would enable them to implement relevant elements of tenure reform.

179. Some of the potential impacts of the Project can only be identified after more time has passed. For example, the influence of tenure research on tenure policy is likely to take several years before results can be observed.
180. The careful selection of partners enabled the Project to access appropriate skills, capabilities and networks. This approach also contributed substantially to the likelihood of project outcomes being sustained.
181. The tenure reform laws and policies that were in place in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda provided the basis for the focus of the Project. In all three countries, implementation of tenure reform was lagging.
182. The Project's efforts to generate knowledge about reform implementation and then use this knowledge to build awareness and improve capacity were effective for target sites, and to variable extent at national level. There is, however, further work needed to enable communities and indigenous peoples to benefit from tenure reform through improved livelihoods. This will likely require changes to the approaches of relevant government agencies to focus more on supporting local communities, not only in forest management and ownership, but also in identification and implementation of alternative sustainable activities, such as beekeeping, handicraft making and other high quality products that require small areas of land. In Peru, for example, the Project worked to raise awareness among government staff that land titles should not represent the end of their commitment to indigenous communities.

Conclusion 3 (EQ3 - Monitoring and Evaluation). The 'Satisfactory' rating given in the final evaluation for the overall quality of monitoring and evaluation in the Project belies the highly satisfactory work undertaken by the Project on gender and social equity issues. The collection and use of gender-disaggregated data enabled the Project to adapt activities to support gender and social equity. More generally, the Project may have benefited from explicitly using the Theory of Change as its conceptual framework for evaluation.

183. The complex reporting requirements used by the Project resulted in over-reporting of activities by CIFOR which may have affected the ability of the PSC, CIFOR and FAO to focus efforts on evaluating progress towards outcomes and impacts and using this knowledge to adapt interventions.
184. CIFOR's country case study series, which are focused on evaluating the work of the GCS-Tenure Initiative in Indonesia, Peru and Uganda, provide useful lessons on the relevance of the Project's TOC to evaluation. There is evidence that the CIFOR country case study for Peru is already being used by regional stakeholders and the process of developing the case study influenced the views at national level.

Conclusion 4 (EQ4 - Efficiency of project implementation and execution). The Operational Partners Implementation Modality was appropriate for executing the Project. It enabled efficient access to the comparative advantages of CIFOR as a well-recognized research institution and enabled the Project to tap into an effective network of partners. The Modality also enabled CIFOR to link to FAO's extensive technical expertise and project implementation experience. Linkages between the Project and the FAO country offices was variable.

185. The concept of having a global study with several countries as case studies is attractive in terms of enabling comparisons and drawing out common lessons. However, the reality of operating a two-project initiative proved to be highly complex and logistically difficult.

186. The changes made to project targets in year one of implementing the Project were logical, although they resulted in CIFOR adopting a complex approach to reporting.
187. Implementation challenges (relatively minor) that emerged could have potentially been avoided or at least mitigated if greater effort had been made by both FAO and CIFOR to develop more efficient and effective ways of reporting and interacting prior to commencing the Project, or soon thereafter.
188. The Theory of Change was an effective conceptual framework that provided the Project 's strategic partners with clear focus on key stakeholders and pathways of change. The TOC enabled the Project to learn and adapt as knowledge of the actual situation within the target countries and field sites emerged. The logical framework in the ProDoc (as subsequently amended through the PSC) was focused on targets and activities and there is no evidence to suggest that this was useful in enabling the Project to learn or adapt. In highly dynamic situations where understanding emerges as the Project develops there is a need for flexibility and adaptability.

Conclusion 5 (EQ5 Sustainability). Improving the way knowledge about forest and land tenure reforms is understood, communicated and used is an important step to implementing policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management. However, the sustainability of forest and land tenure reforms is likely to also require changes to the way relevant government agencies operate if they are to genuinely enable local communities to benefit.

189. The case study approach used by the Project enabled the generation of detailed information on each target site which informed the adaptation of project interventions to suit both the national and local context.
190. The Participatory Prospective Analysis approach used by the Project provided a useful tool for sustainability insofar as it enabled stakeholders themselves to generate multi-stakeholder action plans to address key tenure reform related issues.
191. The Project developed and applied a range of tools including historical studies, bureaucratic surveys, the Participatory Prospective Analysis and actor mapping.
192. PPAs were seen by stakeholders to be the most effective project tool as they enabled multi-stakeholder dialogues to identify issues of concern, develop scenarios for change and agree on action plans. This is likely to be an important step towards improving the way government agencies interact with local and indigenous communities.
193. The Project's TOC included an assumption that by building capacities and supporting a strong constituency with evidence-based arguments, stakeholders will continue to pressure government into the future. The available evidence does not allow confirmation of this assumption, but this may be evident in the future.

Conclusion 6 (Gender). The Project demonstrated the value of purposefully mainstreaming gender into all aspects of the Project.

194. The Project made a substantial effort to mainstream gender and social equity into its activities. It collected and analysed gender-disaggregated data and used this information to adapt activities and to target awareness raising and capacity building. CIFOR ensured project staff had appropriate gender skills, linked to key partners that had demonstrated gender expertise, applied gender-disaggregated analyses to project activities and developed specific gender training and communication materials.

6.2 Recommendations

To FAO and CIFOR

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

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

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

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

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

To FAO and GEF

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

To FAO and GEF

Recommendation 6. In the case of global and regional OPIM projects (such as the Project which is the subject of this evaluation), OPIM operational partners should be encouraged and supported to engage with FAO country offices. Links with country offices can help to:

- i. communicate key messages from the Project to policymakers at the national level;
- ii. create with FAO a virtuous circle of lessons learned across countries and;
- iii. enhance quality of project delivery and sustainability of results from the capitalization of country offices' knowledge of the context and technical expertise.

Suggested actions:

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

References

- CIFOR.** 2006. Forest tenure reform in Indonesia: When? What? Why? [online]. <https://www.cifor.org/library/6333/>.
- CIFOR.** 2006. Recognition and Respect for Tenure Rights [online]. <https://www.cifor.org/library/6386/>.
- CIFOR.** 2019. Conflict in collective forest tenure: Lessons for Peru from a comparative study [online]. <https://www.cifor.org/library/7148/>.
- CIFOR.** 2019. Guía práctica para el proceso de titulación de comunidades nativas [online]. <https://www.cifor.org/library/7162/>.
- FAO.** 2016. FAO Gender Policy. FAO. Rome. (also available at <http://www.fao.org/docrep/017/i3205e/i3205e.pdf>).
- FAO.** 2017. Fact sheet – “Enhancing national delivery systems through operational partners”. FAO. Rome. (also available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/a-i7522e.pdf>)
- FAO.** 2019. Public document – “Delivering Projects and Programmes in Operational Partnership”. FAO. Rome. (also available at: <http://www.fao.org/3/ca3441en/ca3441en.pdf>).
- GEF.** 2007. Guidelines for GEF Agencies in Conducting Terminal Evaluation for Full-sized Projects [online]. <https://www.gefio.org/sites/default/files/ieo/evaluations/files/gef-guidelines-te-fsp-2017.pdf>.
- UNEG.** 2005. 2005 Norms for Evaluation in the UN System [online]. <http://www.uneval.org/document/detail/21>.

Bibliography

- CIFOR.** 2017. A better way to sell Eucalypts. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/45430/a-better-way-to-sell-eucalypts?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2017. A once forbidden tree. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/45374/a-once-forbidden-tree?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2017. Communities want collaboration, customary law. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/52220/communities-want-collaboration-customary-law?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2017. For secure land rights, indigenous forest communities need more than just titles. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/50929/for-secure-land-rights-indigenous-forest-communities-need-more-than-just-titles?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2016. Gender relations in community forestry. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/45120/gender-relations-in-community-forestry?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2015. How does land tenure affect agricultural productivity? A systematic review. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/26908/land-tenure-reforms-africa-review?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2016. Hunters, gatherers and all those gender roles. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/39151/hunters-gatherers-and-all-those-gender-roles?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2017. Lampung, Indonesia's model province for social forestry. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/52241/lampung-indonesias-model-province-for-social-forestry?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2016. Land tenure and livelihoods: What's the connection? In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/41555/land-tenure-and-livelihoods-whats-the-connection?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2017. Land-rights policies in Latin America still fall short, studies show. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/50253/land-rights-policies-in-latin-america-still-fall-short-studies-show?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2017. Long road ahead to indigenous land and forest rights in Peru. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/50276/long-road-ahead-to-indigenous-land-and-forest-rights-in-peru?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2016. Obstacles to forest tenure reform deeply rooted in the past. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/45045/obstacles-to-forest-tenure-reform-deeply-rooted-in-the-past?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2015. Owning the Amazon: Individual titles might not be the answer. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/36425/owning-the-amazon-individual-titles-might-not-be-the-answer?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2016. Promoting progress through prospection. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/44510/promoting-progress-through-prospection?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2015. Rights, returns and restoration: 3Rs for landscapes. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/28860/rights-returns-and-restoration-3rs-for-landscapes?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2015. Stronger rights for the commons: A new generation of challenges. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/38367/stronger-rights-for-the-commons-a-new-generation-of-challenges?fnl=en>

- CIFOR.** 2017. Tenure reform: Lessons from the Global South. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/48869/tenure-reform-lessons-from-the-global-south?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2017. Three decades of tenure reform in Indonesia. In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/48963/three-decades-of-tenure-reform-in-indonesia?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2016. What's in a land title? In: *Forests News* [online]. <https://forestsnews.cifor.org/44493/whats-in-a-land-title?fnl=en>
- CIFOR.** 2016. Escenarios participativos sobre la seguridad de la tenencia comunal de la tierra en la región de Madre de Dios. Indonesia. (also available at: http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/Reports/Result_report2016.pdf)
- CIFOR.** 2016. Informe Subnacional Región Madre de Dios. Universidad Nacional Agraria La Molina; Instituto de la Pequeña Producción Sustentable. July, 2016. (also available at: http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/Reports/Regional_report2016.pdf)
- CIFOR.** 2016. South-South Exchange on Tenure Reform. Indonesia. (also available at: http://www.cifor.org/publications/pdf_files/Reports/Tenure_eventreport2016.pdf)
- FAO.** 2015. Office of Evaluation. Document name: GCS_Tenure ME Plan 27112015.docx. FAO internal document: M&E Plan. Rome.
- FAO.** 2016. Office of Evaluation. Document name: GEF IFAD Review of Activities Deliverables_Final Review for Submission_27Apr2016.xls. FAO internal document: M&E report. Rome.
- FAO.** 2016. Office of Evaluation. Document name: PSC Meeting Notes 15 July 2016 Final.docx. FAO internal document: PSC and PAC reports. Rome.
- FAO.** 2016. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Progress report October 2015 - June 30_2016.docx. FAO internal document: Project progress report. Rome.
- FAO.** 2016. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Progress report July 2016 - December 31_2016.docx. FAO internal document: Project progress report. Rome.
- FAO.** 2016. Office of Evaluation. Document name: FS SECURING TENURE FAO30 Oct 2015 - June 2016.pdf. FAO internal document: Financial Statement. Rome.
- FAO.** 2016. Office of Evaluation. Document name: CIFOR GEF Review of Activities Deliverables - Feb 2016.xlsx. FAO internal document: Review of deliverables. Rome.
- FAO.** 2017. Office of Evaluation. Document name: PSC Minutes March 2017.docx. FAO internal document: PSC and PAC reports. Rome.
- FAO.** 2017. Office of Evaluation. Document name: FS SECURING TENURE FAO30 Jan 2017 - June 2017.pd. FAO internal document: Financial Statement. Rome.
- FAO.** 2017. Office of Evaluation. Document name: FS SECURING TENURE FAO30 July 2017 - Dec 2017.pdf. FAO internal document: Financial Statement. Rome.
- FAO.** 2017. Office of Evaluation. Document name: PIR July 30 June 2017.pdf. FAO internal document: Project implementation reports. Rome.
- FAO.** 2017. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Progress report January 2017 - June 30_2017.docx. FAO internal document: Project progress report. Rome.
- FAO.** 2017. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Progress report July 1 - December 31_2017.docx. FAO internal document: Project progress report. Rome.

- FAO.** 2017. Office of Evaluation. Document name: CIFOR GEF Review of activities deliverables - March 2017.xlsx. FAO internal document: Review of deliverables. Rome.
- FAO.** 2018. Office of Evaluation. Document name: PSC Meeting Notes 6 Sept 2018 Draft.docx. FAO internal document: PSC and PAC reports. Rome.
- FAO.** 2018. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Co-financing report as of June 30 2018 for PIR.xls. FAO internal document: Co-financing Report. Rome.
- FAO.** 2018. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Financial statement 1 January - 30 June 2018.pdf. FAO internal document: Financial Statement. Rome.
- FAO.** 2018. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Progress report January 2018 - June 30_2018.docx. FAO internal document: Project progress report. Rome.
- FAO.** 2018. Office of Evaluation. Document name: FAO-GEF-PPR_Jan-Jun2018_31July2018 SA-rk SA.docx. FAO internal document: Project progress report. Rome.
- FAO.** 2018. Office of Evaluation. Document name: CIFOR GEF Review of activities deliverables - 1Mar2018 Final.xls. FAO internal document: Review of deliverables. Rome.
- FAO.** 2018. Office of Evaluation. Document name: 2018-PIR-CIFOR GCS Tenure_31 July 2018 draft final.docx. FAO internal document: Project implementation reports. Rome.
- FAO.** 2018. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Outcome Evaluation_Land Tenure GCS_Peru Case-Sep9_2018_Clean-version.docx. FAO internal document: M&E report. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Financial statement 1 July - 31 December.pdf. FAO internal document: Financial Statement. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Uganda Case Study Plan.pdf. FAO internal document: M&E report. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Execution Agreement.pdf. FAO internal document: Execution agreement. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Execution Agreement_Revised.pdf. FAO internal document: Execution agreement. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: CIFOR Project_Document_GEFPMIS.pdf. FAO internal document: Project document. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Project Agreement_Indonesia.pdf. FAO internal document: Project Agreement. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Project Agreement_Peru.pdf. FAO internal document: Project Agreement. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Uganda Agreement.pdf. FAO internal document: Project Agreement. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Back to Office report Peru.pdf. FAO internal document: Back to office Report. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Back to Office report Indonesia.pdf. FAO internal document: Back to office report. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Tracking tool.xls. FAO internal document: Tracking Tool. Rome.
- FAO.** Office of Evaluation. Document name: Budget.xls. FAO internal document: Budget. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Budget revision.xls. FAO internal document: Budget. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Report PAC Meeting 1.pdf. FAO internal document: PSC and PAC reports. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. PSC and PAC reports. Document name: Report PAC Meeting 2.pdf. FAO internal document: PSC and PAC reports. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Meeting Note_PACIII-23AGS.docx. FAO internal document: PSC and PAC reports. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Original theory of change summary to share (008).pptx. FAO internal document: Theory of Change. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Indonesia TOC v1.pdf FAO internal document: Theory of Change. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: brief-Can safeguards guarantee gender equity.pdf. FAO internal document: Brief. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: infobrief-163.pdf. FAO internal document: Brief. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: infobrief-169.pdf. FAO internal document: Brief. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: infobrief-170.pdf. FAO internal document: Brief. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Analyzing social differentiation within collective tenure regimes.pdf. FAO internal document: Presentation. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Challenges and outcomes of collective tenure reforms.pdf. FAO internal document: Presentation. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Forest tenure reform implementation.pdf. FAO internal document: Presentation. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Greater than the sum of its parts.pdf. FAO internal document: Presentation. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Mangrove governance and tenure.pdf FAO internal document: Presentation. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Outcomes of land and forest tenure reform implementation.pdf. FAO internal document: Presentation. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: CIFOR-GCSBrochure2014-E.pdf. FAO internal document: Brochure. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: WP223-Siscawati.pdf FAO internal document: Published papers. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: WP224-Monterroso.pdf FAO internal document: Published papers. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: WP228-Zamora.pdf FAO internal document: Published papers. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: WP229-Zamora.pdf FAO internal document: Published papers. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Hasil penelitian proyek GCS-Tenure-Desa Hunitetu.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Hasil penelitian proyek GCS-Tenure-Desa Kamariang.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Hasil penelitian proyek GCS-Tenure-Desa Mornaten.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Hasil penelitian proyek GCS-Tenure-Desa Uwen.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Perhutanan Sosial dan Tata Cara Permohonannya-1_HD-Menteri.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Perhutanan Sosial dan Tata Cara Permohonannya-2_HD-Gubernur.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Perhutanan Sosial dan Tata Cara Permohonannya-3_HK-Menteri.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Perhutanan Sosial dan Tata Cara Permohonannya-4_HK-M-Gubernur.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Perhutanan Sosial dan Tata Cara Permohonannya-5_HTR-Menteri.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Perhutanan Sosial dan Tata Cara Permohonannya-6_HTR-Gubernur.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Perhutanan Sosial dan Tata Cara Permohonannya-7_HA-Menteri.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Perhutanan Sosial dan Tata Cara Permohonannya-8_KK-Menteri.pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

FAO. Office of Evaluation. Document name: Studi komparatif global-kepastian hak tenurial masyarakat sekitar hutan (GCS Tenure).pdf. FAO internal document. Rome.

Appendix 1. People interviewed

Last Name	First Name	Gender	Role	Organisation
Adata	Margaret	Female	Commissioner	FSSD, Uganda
Aggarwal	Safia	Female	Forestry Officer, Tenure	FAO Forestry Department. Social Forestry Team
Akooko	Anthony	Male	AFO	Masindi District, Uganda
Ameu	Martin	Male	Programme Associate	FAO, Uganda
Arenas Aspilcueta	Marco Antonio	Male	Director, Dirección de Gestión de las Areas Naturales Protegidas	SERNANP
Babiiha	Adam	Male	Vice Chairperson	Alimugonza CF- CLA, Masindi district, Uganda
Baldovino	Silvana	Female	Directora Programa de Conservación	SPDA
Balikuddembe	Louis	Male	DNRO/ NPAC	Kibaale District, Uganda
Banana	Prof. Abwooli	Male	Team Leader (Uganda)	Makerere University, Uganda
Banjade	Mani Ram	Male	Project Team member	CIFOR
Biryetega	Simon	Male	District Forest Officer	Masindi district, Uganda
Bolanos	Omaira	Female	Facilitador América del Sur	RRI
Braun	Genevieve	Female	GEF Unit	FAO
Byakagaba	Dr. Patrick	Male	Member, NPAC	Makerere University, Uganda
Chase Smith	Richard	Male	Director	Instituto del Bien Comun NGO
Che Piu	Hugo	Male	Especialista en temas amazónicos y derecho forestal	Derecho Ambiente y Recursos Naturales
Cruz Burga	Zoila Aurora	Female	Profesora	UNALM

Last Name	First Name	Gender	Role	Organisation
Davies	Bethany	Female	Team Leader - Research to Impact	CIFOR
del Aguila	Rosario	Female	Regional Director	Pronaturaleza, now PCCB (attached to the regional government)
Driciru	Fiona Florence	Female	Coordinator, CFM	NFA, Uganda
Firdaus	Asep Yunan	Male	Director	Epistema Institute
Fordekosu	Endeanina	Female	villager	Piru villagers
Freitas Alvarado	David	Male	Technical support	ORPIO (Organizacion Regional de los Pueblos Indigenas del Oriente -Community organization)
Gonzales	Ana María	Female	Regional Coordinator	Naturaleza y Cultura - NC
Guerrero Chota	Warren	Male	Director	DISAFILPA
Herawati	Tuti	Female	Project Team	FORDA
Herianto	Ageng	Male	Deputy FAO representative	FAO
Herrera	Johana	Female	Profesora	Pontificia Universidad Javeriana
Ikamudi	Franky	Male	villager	Piru villagers
Kazungu	Bob	Male	Senior Forest Officer/ NPAC Member	FSSD, Uganda
Kiisa	Miriam	Female	Treasurer	Alimugonza CF-CLA, Masindi district, Uganda
Kiyingi	Gaster	Male	NPAC	Tree Talk Plus, Uganda
Klaver	Rogier	Male	Team Leader, Program management and Coordination	CIFOR
Komakech	Richard	Male	DNRO	Lamwo District, Uganda
Langoya	Dickson	Male	National Project Coordinator, Land	C/O FAO, Uganda

Last Name	First Name	Gender	Role	Organisation
			Tenure Project	
Larson	Anne	Female	Team Leader, Equal Opportunities, Gender Justice & Tenure	CIFOR
Latutuabraya	Lisa	Female	villager	Piru villagers
Lawry	Steve	Male	Principal Scientist	CIFOR
Liswanti	Nining	Female	Project Team	CIFOR
Marcelo Lopez	Ketty	Female	President	ONAMIAP (organización nacional de mujeres andinas y amazónicas del Perú)
Maruapey	Zulfikar I.Y.	Male	Head of Section	Forestry Agency of Maluku Province (Customary forest and tenurial unit)
Meruwe	Yeheskial	Male	villager	Piru villagers
Mukasa	Concepta	Female	Programme Manager/ NPAC	AUPWAE, Uganda
Mwangi	Esther	Female	Principal Scientist & Hub Leader	CIFOR
Ndiroraaho	Hanaan	Male	Chairperson	Alimugonza CF-CLA, Masindi district, Uganda
Nsiimire	William	Male	DNRO	Masindi District, Uganda
Nsita	Steve Amooti	Male	Director	Havilla Company, Uganda
Nugraha	Januar Satya	Male	Staff	Ministry of Forestry; Centre Social Forestry and Environmental Partnership (BPSKL) Maluku Papua Area
Obbo	Dennis Fred	Male	Principal Information Officer	MLHUD, Uganda
Ombedra	Yose	Male	Natural Resource Coordinator	CODECA, Uganda
Patampang	Sony	Male	staff	Forestry Agency of Maluku Province (Planning and

Last Name	First Name	Gender	Role	Organisation
				Budgeting unit)
Peñaloza Macha	Danny Oswald	Male	Especialista Forestal Senior Dirección de Política y Regulación	
Persulesy	Yan	Male	Staff	NGO Toma Lestari
Pinto	Vladimir	Male	Especialista en temas amazónicos y derecho indígena	OXFAM
Quaedvlieg	Julia	Female	Articulación de actores + South-South exchange	CIFOR
Ramos	Rene	Male	Director de la Dirección de Políticas Indígenas	Ministerio de Cultura
Ramos Paredes	Juan	Male	Gerencia Regional de Asuntos Indígenas - GOREL & CONAP	Regional Government
Ramos Urrutia	Irene	Female	Dirección de políticas	MINCUL
Rubio Condo	Richard	Male	Presidente de AIDSESP	AIDSESP-UCAYALI (Asociación Interétnica de Desarrollo de la Selva Peruana)
Rudgard	Stephen	Male	Country representative	FAO
Salazar	Ronald	Male	Director, Dirección General de Saneamiento de la Propiedad y Catastro Rural	MINAGRI- DIGESPACR
Saldaña	Joe	Male	Coordinador de campo Loreto	CIFOR
Segura Urrunaga	Frida	Female	Dirección de políticas	MINCUL
Sharanamual	Ir. Leny	Female	Head	Forestry Agency of West Seram
Silaya	Ir. Thomas M.	Male	Professor and Vice Dean	Pattimura University

Last Name	First Name	Gender	Role	Organisation
Suárez Alvites	Margarita	Female	Directora, Dirección General de Gestión del Conocimiento Forestal y de Fauna Silvestre	SERFOR
Tahalea	Vivian	Female	Villager	Piru villagers
Tatulue	Rina	Female	villager	Piru villagers
Timisela	Woody	Male	Staff	Forestry Agency of West Seram
Tindiari	Tommy	Male	Villager	Piru villagers
Tjoa	Dr. Martina	Female	Project staff	Pattimura University
Valencia	Frangi	Female	Coordinadores de campo Madre de Dios	CIFOR
Viacrio	Tommaso	Male	FAO/GEF Secretariat	FAO
Wenzel	Sondra	Female	staff	GIZ
Wiranto	Ir	Male	Director Social Forestry	Ministry of Forestry of Indonesia
Zamor	Alejandra	Female	Líder PPA	CIFOR

Appendix 2. Field mission agenda

Indonesia

Day	Activity	Place
19 January 2019	Travel to Indonesia	
20 January	Travel Jakarta-Ambon	Ambon
21 January	Interviews Forest Agency at Maluku Province	Ambon
	Interview UNPATTI	Ambon
22 January	Travel to Piru	
	Focus Group Discussion with community from Lokki, Honitetu, Uwen, Mornaten villages.	Piru
	Interview KPH Seram Barat	Piru
23 January	Travel to Ambon	Ambon
	Interview UNPATTI	Ambon
	Interview NGO Toma Lestari	Ambon
24 January	Travel to Jakarta	Jakarta
25 January	Interviews CIFOR staff	Bogor
Sat/Sun	Report writing	
28 January	Interviews Jakarta and Bogor - FORDA and EPISTEMA	
29 January	Interview Jakarta - Pak Ir. Wiratno (Ministry of Forestry)	Jakarta
30 January	Report writing	Jakarta
31 January	Skype interviews - ex CIFOR project staff	Jakarta
1 February	Interview Jakarta FAO Country Office	Jakarta
2 February	Depart Indonesia	

Peru

Day	Activity	Place
5 February	Interview MINCUL	Skype / Lima
12 February	Interviews NGO Oxfam	Lima
13 February	Interviews in the Regional Loreto Government	Iquitos
	Interviews with NGO Naturaleza y Cultura	Iquitos
14 February	Interview regional government	Iquitos
15 February	Travel to Pebas	Loreto
16 February	Visit to the indigenous people's community "Pucaurquillo" (boras and huitoto)	Loreto
17 February	Visit to the indigenous peoples community "Brillo Nuevo"	Loreto

Day	Activity	Place
	(boras) and San Jose de Piri (yanesha)	
19 February	Interviews University partners (Universidad Agraria La Molina) and NGO (IBC - Instituto del Bien comun)	Lima
20 February	Interviews with NGOs (Instituto del Bien Comun; Sociedad Peruna Derecho Ambiental; DAR)	Lima
21 February	Interviews university partners (Universidad Agraria La Molina)	Lima

Uganda

Day	Activity	Place
26 Oct 2018	Interview with Commissioner FSSD and her team	Kampala
7 Nov	Interview with Team Leader of the Project in Uganda and a member of the Steering Committee	Kampala
21 Nov	Meeting with DNRO (and his technical team) Masindi	Masindi
21 Nov	Meeting with Alimugonza Community Forest, Pakany Sub-county, Masindi District	Masindi
29 Nov	Meeting with National Project Coordinator Forest Tenure Project	Kampala
7 Dec	Focal Person Forest Tenure Project, FSSD/ member Project Steering Committee	Kampala
20 Dec	Meeting with Focal Person Land Tenure/ Ministry Spokesperson MLHUD	Kampala
1 Feb 2019	Interview with Coordinator CFM, NFA	Kampala
1 Feb	Interview with DNRO, Kibaale District	Kampala
4 Feb	Interview with Programme Associate FAO Uganda -CO	Kampala
6 Feb	Interview with DNRO, Lamwo	Kampala

Appendix 3. Evaluation matrix

Sub-questions	Indicator/End of project target	Methods/tools	Sources	GEF Evaluation criteria addressed
EQ1: Was the intervention relevant to the needs of stakeholders, government, NGOs and communities, and in line with FAO and GEF strategic objectives?				Relevance Impact
1. To what extent has the Project design taken into consideration the context of the target countries, including the major factors that influence land and forest tenure policy development and implementation?	From desk review and qualitative analysis of stakeholders' views and perception/experience:	Qualitative and mixed-methods: Face to face/phone/skype interviews. Desk review.	Project steering committee, project team, GEF liaison officers, any other relevant stakeholder, i.e. main partners and community representatives. Project design team (if available), FAO GEF @ HQ, others involved in PPG phase, NPCs. PIF, Project documents, PIRs, MTE (if exists). Evidence collected under EQ2.	Relevance
2. How realistic were the assumptions that underpinned the Theory of Change (TOC) in terms of the FAO/GEF project?	From desk review and qualitative analysis of stakeholders' views and perception/experience: The design phase identified a set of realistic assumptions to underpin the ToC.	Qualitative and mixed-methods: Face to face/ phone/skype interviews. Desk review.	Project steering committee, project team, GEF liaison officers, any other relevant stakeholder, i.e. main partners and community representatives. Project design team (if available), FAO GEF @ HQ, others involved in PPG phase, NPCs. PIF, Project documents, PIRs, MTE (if exists) Evidence collected under EQ2	Relevance

Sub-questions	Indicator/End of project target	Methods/tools	Sources	GEF Evaluation criteria addressed
<p>3. To what extent were environmental, social and gender concerns taken into consideration, as outlined in the GEF guidelines?</p>	<p>The Project document includes clear environmental, social and gender strategies that addressed identified needs and priorities.</p> <p>An environmental and social baseline was undertaken during project design.</p> <p>Gender analysis has been carried out during project design and/or at the beginning of project implementation.</p> <p>Environmental, social and gender concerns are mainstreamed throughout project components.</p>	<p>Qualitative and quantitative assessment:</p> <p>Desk review.</p> <p>Face to face/phone/skype semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Protocols for interviews/focus groups have been developed based on the OED framework to assess gender mainstreaming toward FAO Gender Policy objectives.</p> <p>Data analysis.</p> <p>Review of risk management plan (if it exists) and relevance to future projects in terms of social and environmental safeguards.</p>	<p>Project document, environmental, social and gender strategies if any (for both FAO and executing agencies), technical reports, trainings protocols/invitations/awareness campaign material, MTE.</p> <p>Gender disaggregated data.</p> <p>Risk management plan.</p> <p>Project team and other government staff, partners and local community representatives.</p> <p>Trainees and women in the communities of selected project sites.</p> <p>Project/national counterparts.</p>	<p>Relevance</p> <p>Gender equality</p>
<p>4. To what extent do the Project strategy and results align with and contribute to FAO (SO1&SO3) and GEF (SO2) priorities?</p>	<p>The extent to which the Project generated sustainable flow of ecosystem services through an enhanced enabling environment for sustainable management of forest landscapes.</p> <p>Contribution to UNFCCC and CBD scientific</p>	<p>Qualitative and mixed-methods:</p> <p>Face to face/ phone/Skype interviews.</p>	<p>Project steering committee, project team, GEF liaison officers, any other relevant stakeholder, i.e. main partners and community representatives.</p> <p>PIF, Project documents, PIRs, MTE (if</p>	<p>Relevance</p> <p>Effectiveness</p>

Sub-questions	Indicator/End of project target	Methods/tools	Sources	GEF Evaluation criteria addressed
	<p>and policy forums, including their Gender Days.</p> <p>The extent to which the Project contributed to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the eradication of hunger, food insecurity and malnutrition • increasing and improving the provision of goods and services from agriculture, forestry and fisheries in a sustainable manner, • reducing rural poverty, 	Desk review.	<p>exists).</p> <p>Evidence collected under EQ2.</p>	
EQ2: What results, intended and unintended, did the Project achieve?				<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>Impact</p>
<p>1. To what extent has the Project influenced policy/project formulation (now or in the mid to long-term)?</p>	<p>Number of new policies and legislation enacted attributable to project support.</p> <p>Policies and projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management follow current best legal practices and are adequately enforced.</p> <p>Institutions with a major impact on tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management are aware of the most important issues and take these into account in their policies.</p> <p>Project stakeholders have the legal, technical and financial capacity to influence policies and/or undertake projects that support tenure security, livelihoods and sustainable forest management.</p> <p>Barriers to tenure security, livelihoods and</p>	<p>Qualitative and quantitative assessment:</p> <p>Face to face/phone/skype semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field observation.</p> <p>Desk review and dataset analysis.</p> <p>Time-series analysis to highlight changes in policies, regulations, behaviours.</p>	<p>Project team, GEF liaison officers, any other relevant stakeholder, i.e. main partners and community representatives.</p> <p>Interviews with PTF, partner representatives and government.</p> <p>Local communities in selected project sites.</p> <p>Main project documents, risk management matrix, tracking tools, available databases.</p> <p>Copies of policies and regulations, other project reports.</p>	<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>Impact</p>

Sub-questions	Indicator/End of project target	Methods/tools	Sources	GEF Evaluation criteria addressed
	<p>sustainable forest management removed.</p> <p>Tenure reform debates and policy developments in targeted countries benefit from the products of the Projects.</p>			
<p>2. To what extent are stakeholders now aware of the factors that constrain tenure reform, how to align reforms with customary practices and the impacts of tenure reform on livelihoods forest-dependent people?</p>	<p>Numbers of appropriate tailored awareness raising materials produced/disseminated/ installed (compared to planned targets).</p> <p>Numbers of land owners, Government staff and other relevant stakeholders trained in tenure reform and other relevant issues (disaggregated by gender).</p> <p>The extent the Project has generated enhanced skills in reform implementation.</p>	<p>Qualitative assessment:</p> <p>Face to face/ phone/skype semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field observation.</p> <p>Desk review.</p>	<p>Policy makers.</p> <p>Other stakeholders.</p> <p>Project, document, PIRs, MTE, technical reports, laws/regulations, technical reports.</p> <p>Project surveys and baselines.</p>	<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>Impact</p>
<p>3. To what extent has the Project contributed to the empowerment of women, youth and Indigenous federations?</p>	<p>The extent of empowerment of women, youth and indigenous federations in targeted areas, as a result of project interventions.</p> <p>No negative impact from project implementation has affected women and youth.</p> <p>Women's access to land rights has been formalized and improved</p> <p># and proportion of women, youth and indigenous federations participating in project capacity building activities (if available).</p> <p>Women, youth and indigenous federations feel empowered by capacity development activities.</p> <p># and proportion of women, youth and</p>	<p>Qualitative and quantitative assessment:</p> <p>Desk review.</p> <p>Face to face/ phone/skype semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Protocols for interviews/focus groups have been developed on the basis of the OED framework to assess gender mainstreaming toward FAO Gender Policy objectives.</p> <p>Data analysis.</p>	<p>Project document, environmental, social and gender strategies if any (for both FAO and executing agencies), technical reports, trainings protocols/invitations/awareness campaign material, MTE.</p> <p>Gender, youth and indigenous federations disaggregated data.</p> <p>Project team and other government staff, partners and local community representatives.</p> <p>Trainees and women in the communities of selected project sites.</p> <p>Project/national counterparts.</p> <p>Interventions, policies and regulations undertaken prior and at the end of the</p>	<p>Gender</p> <p>Equality</p> <p>Inclusion</p> <p>(each rated separately)</p>

Sub-questions	Indicator/End of project target	Methods/tools	Sources	GEF Evaluation criteria addressed
	<p>indigenous federations participating in project capacity building activities (if available).</p> <p>No negative impact occurred related to work burden or division of labour between women/men.</p>	<p>Time-series analysis to highlight changes in policies, regulations, behaviours regarding gender equality.</p>	<p>Project.</p>	
<p>4. To what extent are stakeholders now aware of the factors that constrain tenure reform, how to align reforms with customary practices and the impacts of tenure reform on livelihoods forest-dependent people?</p>	<p>Numbers of appropriate tailored awareness raising materials produced/disseminated/ installed (compared to planned targets).</p> <p>Numbers of land owners, Government staff and other relevant stakeholders trained in tenure reform and other relevant issues (disaggregated by gender).</p> <p>The extent the Project has generated enhanced skills in reform implementation.</p>	<p>Qualitative assessment:</p> <p>Face to face/ phone/skype semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Field observation.</p> <p>Desk review.</p>	<p>Policy makers.</p> <p>Other stakeholders.</p> <p>Project, document, PIRs, technical reports, laws/regulations, technical reports.</p> <p>Project surveys and baselines.</p>	<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>Impact</p> <p>Relevance</p>
<p>5. To what extent has the Project contributed to the empowerment of women, youth and Indigenous federations?</p>	<p>The extent of empowerment of women, youth and indigenous federations in targeted areas, as a result of project interventions.</p> <p>No negative impact from project implementation has affected women and youth.</p> <p>Women's access to land rights has been formalized and improved.</p> <p># and proportion of women, youth and indigenous federations participating in project capacity building activities (if available).</p> <p>Women, youth and indigenous federations feel empowered by capacity development</p>	<p>Qualitative and quantitative assessment:</p> <p>Desk review.</p> <p>Face to face/phone/Skype semi-structured interviews</p> <p>Protocols for interviews/focus groups have been developed based on the OED framework to assess gender mainstreaming toward FAO Gender Policy</p>	<p>Project document, environmental, social and gender strategies if any (for both FAO and executing agencies), technical reports, trainings protocols/invitations/awareness campaign material, MTE.</p> <p>Gender, youth and indigenous federations disaggregated data</p> <p>Project team and other government staff, partners and local community representatives.</p> <p>Trainees and women in the communities of selected project sites.</p> <p>Project/national counterparts.</p> <p>Interventions, policies and regulations</p>	<p>Relevance</p> <p>Effectiveness</p> <p>Impact</p>

Sub-questions	Indicator/End of project target	Methods/tools	Sources	GEF Evaluation criteria addressed
	<p>activities.</p> <p># and proportion of women, youth and indigenous federations participating in project capacity building activities (if available).</p> <p>No negative impact occurred related to work burden or division of labour between women/men.</p>	<p>objectives.</p> <p>Data analysis.</p> <p>Time-series analysis to highlight changes in policies, regulations, behaviours regarding gender equality.</p>	<p>undertaken prior and at the end of the Project.</p>	
<p>EQ3: What were the strengths and weaknesses of the Project M&E plan and its implementation?</p>				<p>M&E quality</p>
<p>1. To what extent was an M&E plan designed and implemented for the Project? Did it include a baseline and SMART indicators? Has it facilitated timely tracking of progress toward stated project objectives?</p>	<p>The M&E plan has been implemented and includes objectives, outcomes, outputs and clear SMART indicators. It allowed efficient tracking of project progress.</p> <p>Data collection methodologies clearly defined.</p> <p>The extent information from the M&E system was used during project implementation.</p> <p>The budget was managed effectively</p>	<p>Qualitative assessment.</p> <p>Face to face/phone/skype semi-structured interviews.</p> <p>Desk review.</p>	<p>Project team, partners' representative, GEF liaison officers.</p> <p>M&E records, quality of tracking tools and other indicators.</p> <p>Evidence collected under other EQs.</p>	<p>M&E quality</p>
<p>EQ4: How effective/efficient was the Project implementation/ execution?</p>				<p>Effectiveness</p> <p>Efficiency</p>
<p>1. To what extent did the partners undertake their roles as outlined in the Project document and agreements?</p>	<p>Partners supported the achievement of outputs, avoiding duplications and fostering a catalytic effect of the Project activities.</p>	<p>Qualitative and quantitative assessment:</p> <p>Face to face/phone/Skype</p>	<p>Project team, execution agencies, other partner representatives.</p> <p>Relevant Government staff, other consultants / contractors who worked on the Project, executing agencies and</p>	<p>Efficiency</p> <p>Partnerships effectiveness</p>

Sub-questions	Indicator/End of project target	Methods/tools	Sources	GEF Evaluation criteria addressed
		semi-structured interviews. Desk review.	other partner representatives. Project reports on strategies and management plans, Execution Agreements, PIRs, Project Document, MTE, reports on executing agencies activities implemented under this project.	
2. To what extent did the Project involve the right partners, leverage ongoing initiatives, institutional arrangements and synergies?	Implementation and execution arrangements contributed to a smooth implementation of project activities and outputs achievements. The Projected started as planned in the ProDoc. Evidence of any delays the Project experienced and the impact of these delays on the achievement of project results? The contribution of the Project's institutional / organizational structure contributed to efficient and results-based management. The adequacy of financial, technical and operational resources and procedures	Qualitative analysis: Face to face /phone/Skype semi-structured interviews. Desk review.	Project team, GEF liaison officers, other partner representatives. Relevant Government staff, other consultants / contractors who worked on the Project, partner representatives. Project M&E records, project reports on strategies, and management plans, Execution Agreements, PIRs, Project Document.	Partnership effectiveness
3. Did the envisaged co-financing materialize?	Co-financing represented a timely and quality support to achievement of project outputs and outcomes.	Qualitative and quantitative-methods: Face to face/ phone/Skype semi-structured interviews. Desk review.	Project team, government representatives, main partners. Project document, project reports, output revision, MTE, Project M&E and financial records.	Co-financing
4. To what extent the implementation arrangements	The Operational Partners Implementation Modality (OPIM) helped with the delivery of	Qualitative and quantitative-methods:	Project team, government representatives, main partners.	Implementation

Sub-questions	Indicator/End of project target	Methods/tools	Sources	GEF Evaluation criteria addressed
and OPIM execution modality favoured or hindered the implementation of project activities and the achievement of project results?	project outcomes and outputs. CIFOR methodologies and practices were consistent with and aligned with FAO normative work (e.g. Voluntary Guidelines on Land and Resource Tenure of FAO).	Face to face/ phone/Skype semi-structured interviews. Desk review.	Project document, project reports, output revision, MTE, Project M&E and financial records.	Execution
EQ5: What is the likelihood that the Project results will continue to be useful after the end of the Project?				Sustainability
1. To what extent do national stakeholders own the Project's processes and results?	There is evidence of sustainability of project activities (environmental, social, institutional and financial levels) in terms of activities up-scaling/replication after project completion National stakeholders are leading/co-leading project activities and feel they own/co-own project results. National stakeholders have widely disseminated knowledge acquired through the Project	Qualitative assessment: Face to face/phone/Skype semi-structured interviews.	Project exit strategy and national counterpart plans/financial strategies for future implementation, Country studies and project risk management matrix. Project teams and government staff, partners and local community representatives.	Impact Relevance Country ownership
2. Have national and local institutions been prepared to carry out the activities after the Project?	See above.	See above.	See above.	Sustainability
3. What factors may promote or hinder the application of the knowledge and skill gained in formulating and implementing reforms?	National and local stakeholders acquired needed knowledge to manage and implement similar activities after project completion. Other donors decided to support similar activities thanks to the Project activities to raise awareness on the topics addressed at		Other similar initiatives from the governments, other donors/partners. Project team, government staff, partners and local community representatives, other local and international donors. Economic national strategy for future	Sustainability

Sub-questions	Indicator/End of project target	Methods/tools	Sources	GEF Evaluation criteria addressed
	local/regional/international level.		implementation.	
4. What are the key risks which may affect the sustainability of the Project benefits?	<p>The Project adequately foresaw socio-politic or environmental risks and related mitigation strategy.</p> <p>Risk management matrix has been regularly updated to respond to context changes.</p> <p>Mitigation actions have been successfully implemented (within the Project possibilities to affect the context).</p>	<p>Qualitative assessment:</p> <p>Desk review.</p> <p>Face to face/phone/Skype semi-structured interviews.</p>	<p>Country studies and project risk management matrix.</p> <p>Project team, government staff, partners and local community representatives.</p>	Sustainability
EQ6: What are the key lessons learned?				Impact Relevance
1. Considering the above assessment, what lessons-learnt can inform future similar FAO and/or GEF projects (design, implementation and sustainability)?	n/a.	<p>Qualitative assessment by ET.</p> <p>Examples.</p>	Evidence collected under EQs above.	Impact Relevance

Appendix 4. GEF rating scheme

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating	Summary comments ⁶
A. RELEVANCE		
1. Strategic relevance	HS	The Project was very relevant to the implementation of tenure reform in the three Tier 1 countries. All of these countries had law and policy related to land and forest tenure reform but were facing challenges with implementation. The Project was strategically important at subnational level and provided key lessons at national and global levels.
B. EFFECTIVENESS		
2. Assessment of project results⁷	S	
2.1. Component 1: Analysis and synthesis of the emergence of reforms and the interaction between customary and formal land and forest tenure.	HS	The Project has provided a comprehensive range of science-based evidence related to key challenges and opportunities for implementing land and forest tenure reform. It has highlighted a suite of issues related to customary tenure and the need for greater effort to support these arrangements.
2.2. Component 2: Analysis and synthesis of policy implementation processes and practices.	HS	The Project rapidly concluded that project activities would have greater impact if they focused on helping stakeholders to better implement existing land and forest tenure reform policies than focusing on policy reform per se. The Project's analysis of challenges to the implementation of tenure reform policies was effective, relevant and timely.
2.3. Component 3: Analysis of livelihoods and sustainability outcomes of tenure reforms.	HS	The field work undertaken by the Project and the methodologies introduced provided detailed, robust data on livelihoods and equity issues.

⁶ Include reference to the relevant sections in the report.

⁷Assessment and ratings by outcome should be undertaken. A composite scoring of all outcome ratings, however, is not advised. The outcome rating should not include the rating of M&E, which is rated separately. even if M&E is a separate component of the Project,

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating	Summary comments
2.4. Component 4: Knowledge management, sharing of information and best practices, and monitoring and evaluation.	S	The Project has documented its work and findings and sought to publish and communicate key issues. A misunderstanding between FAO and CIFOR has resulted in a number of knowledge products being withdrawn from websites. This risks the knowledge being lost and the impact of the Project diminished. Whilst the Project has technically complied with reporting requirements for FAO, CIFOR could have potentially applied a more outcomes-based approach to monitoring and evaluation which may have provided more strategic lessons of relevance to the broader work of FAO, CIFOR, partners and others. It should be noted, however, that the Project did disseminate findings widely through publications, meetings and the website.
2.5. Component 5: Capacity development of stakeholders for uptake results	HS	The Project had a strong focus on capacity building and took great effort to be as gender-balanced in its approach as conditions allowed. The tools and approaches used by the Project including PPA, gender and conflict management were appreciated by project beneficiaries and in some cases have been incorporated into practices of government agencies and NGOs.
C. EFFICIENCY		
3. Efficiency ⁸	HS	The Project used its resources in a highly efficient manner. The use of post-doctoral staff in each Tier 1 country was a notably efficient approach to ensuring scientific methods were applied and partners were engaged in project activities.
D. FACTORS AFFECTING PERFORMANCE		
4. Project design and readiness ⁹	S	The design of the Project was ambitious and relied on timely approval and execution for it to most effectively contribute to the broader Global Comparative Study on Tenure. The delay in the start of the Project created some challenges with the implementation of the initiative. Other delays were experienced as a result of the slow government processes associated with tenure reform.

⁸ Includes cost-efficiency and timeliness

⁹ It refers to factors affecting project's "readiness" to start as expected, such as capacity at project's launch, including the capacity of project's partners to begin the Project, the legal and administrative systems are in place.

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating	Summary comments
5. Quality of project implementation	S	The evidence from interviews and meeting minutes suggests that neither FAO nor CIFOR took full advantage of the Project implementation modality OPIM. Whilst some effort was made to link the Project to FAO's considerable skills and resources, opportunities to build two-way learning and sharing processes between the Project and FAO do not appear to have been well capitalized on. The links between the Project and FAO country offices were variable and, in some cases, weak. Conflict between FAO technical staff and senior project staff should have been better managed by both FAO and CIFOR.
5.1 Project oversight (FAO, PSC, PTF, etc)	S	FAO maintained strong oversight of the Project. The PSC minutes indicate that the government representatives from Indonesia and Peru did not attend PSC meetings. The reasons for the lack of attendance and the implications for project oversight are no known.
6. Quality of project execution	S	The Project was well executed. Project managers struggled at time to understand the FAO systems and requirements and perhaps slightly over-compensated for this by providing very detailed and complex reports.
6.1 Project management arrangements and delivery	S	CIFOR managed the Project very effectively. The inclusion of post-doctoral fellows as in-country staff provided relevant scientific and coordinating skills at national level. The effective engagement of partners enabled access to knowledge, skills and networks.
7. Co-financing	HS	The Project exceeded co-financing targets
8. Project partnerships	HS	The Project worked with an effective network of partners on all Tier 1 countries. This included links with universities, indigenous peoples organizations, NGOs and government agencies.
9. Stakeholder engagement	HS	The Project maintained a very strong focus on engaging relevant stakeholders from local to national levels and global actors.
10. Communication and knowledge management	HS	The Project has published a large volume of material in numerous languages. It emphasized production and dissemination of materials that raised awareness and built capacity of target stakeholders. The Project also contributed to knowledge at national, regional and global levels through publications and presentations.
11. Overall quality of M&E	S	The Project has regularly reported to FAO and has undertaken a series of evaluative

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating	Summary comments
		case studies to better understand the impact of the Project and the relevance of the Theory of Change.
11.1. M&E design	MS	The Project developed an M&E strategy at the commencement of the Project, but this strategy was not fully implemented. The ProDoc includes targets and indicators and the targets were clarified and refined during year one of project implementation.
11.2. M&E plan implementation (including financial and human resources)	S	The Project provided detailed activity and output focused reports to FAO .
E. GENDER AND CROSSCUTTING DIMENSIONS		
Gender equity	HS	The Project maintained a very strong focus on gender. Gender-disaggregated data was collected, and considerable effort made to reach women through awareness and capacity building exercises. In addition, the Project networked with key partners who had substantial gender skills and provided gender awareness training.
Environmental and social safeguards	S	The Project incorporated effective social safeguards. It was not directly focused on altering environmental conditions, reducing poverty or improving livelihoods, but on enabling local communities and indigenous people to better understand and claim their rights to forests and land. It was assumed that securing rights was a necessary enabling condition for livelihoods.
F. SUSTAINABILITY OF PROJECT OUTCOMES		
12. Overall likelihood of risks to sustainability	L	The Project focused on improving the implementation of existing laws and policies related to land and forest tenure and used a case study approach focused on selected communities and the associated stakeholders. It is highly likely that the outputs of the Project will continue to be used and key stakeholders will continue to support the implementation of tenure reform.
12.1. Financial risk	L	There is very little financial risk from the Project as it focused on empowerment, capacity building and knowledge generation.
12.2. Socio-political risk	ML	The sociopolitical risks relate to broader political and social processes in the target countries. The influence of large-scale agribusiness, changes in political agendas and government institutional arrangements that are resistant to enabling tenure reform are all risks that remain.
12.3. Institutional risk	L	The key institutional risks are a) Government agencies responsible for implementing land and forest tenure

GEF criteria/sub-criteria	Rating	Summary comments
		<p>reform are often ill-equipped to do so. Their institutional cultures and staff capacity are often not focused on service delivery to indigenous peoples and local communities, but on enforcement and compliance.</p> <p>b) Decentralization processes can leave a partial institutional vacuum at local level as subnational governments assume new responsibilities and must build new institutional arrangements. Political processes at subnational level are sometimes reluctant to enable land reform due to concerns about generating unintended local conflicts.</p>
12.4. Environmental risk	L	The Project has a low potential to generate environmental risks. It has a moderate potential to improve environmental conditions in the mid- to long-term if communities and indigenous groups are empowered to manage their resources and are protected from harmful external influences.
Overall project rating	S	The Project has made some important contributions to knowledge, assisted national and subnational stakeholders to improve their networks and capabilities and generated methodologies and tools that should remain useful in target countries and beyond.

Appendix 5. Financial data

GEF's project funding

Particulars	At CEO Endorsement	At project completion
GEF project grant	2 000 000	2 000 000
Co-financing	4 545 852	6 389 983
Total	6 545 852	8 389 983

Project co-financing break up


Name of co-financer	Co-financer source	Type of co-financing	Co-financing at project start			Actual co-financing at project end		
			In Kind	Cash	Total	In Kind	Cash	Total
International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD)	Other	Grant		3 430 000	3 430 000		3 150 927	3 150 927
CIFOR	Other	Other		815 852	815 852		25 000	25 000
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO)	GEF Agency	Grant		300 000	300 000	603 728		603 728
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH	Donor Agency	Grant					88 720	88 720
International Food Policy Research Institute (IFPRI)	Other	Other					42 525	42 525
World Resources Institute	Civil Society Organization	Grant					17 000	17 000
International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN) - Switzerland	Civil Society Organization	Grant					8 000	8 000
Austrian Development Agency (ADA)	Donor Agency	Grant					603 921	603 921
Tetra Tech International Development	Private Sector	Grant					144 084	144 084

Appendix 5. Financial data

Name of co-financer	Co-financer source	Type of co-financing	Co-financing at project start			Actual co-financing at project end		
			In Kind	Cash	Total	In Kind	Cash	Total
Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit (GIZ) GmbH	Donor Agency	Grant					906 078	906 078
NORAD	Donor Agency	Grant					800 000	800 000
GRAND TOTAL			-	4 545 852	4 545 852	603 728	5 786 255	6 389 983


Appendix 6. Theory of Change

Figure 2: Basic Theory of Change used by the GCS-Tenure initiative




Source: Evaluation team

Figure 3 Detailed TOC developed by the GCS-Tenure initiative



Source: Evaluation team

INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES



*1. Durban world forest congress (FAO Point) 2. Peru meeting (preliminary, 3. World bank conference, Tier 1+2 country gov reps no DRC), pre+post networking, presentations, trainings, round table presentation

Source: Evaluation team

OFFICE OF EVALUATION
E-mail: evaluation@fao.org
Web address: www.fao.org/evaluation

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
Viale delle Terme di Caracalla
00153 Rome, Italy