

# Mid-Term Review Report

for the UNEP/GEF Project titled  
“Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in  
Tanzania” “GEF ID Number 5691”



Submitted to:

**The United Nations Environment Programme**

By:

Julian K. Bagyendera, PhD  
Provide and Equip Ltd  
Website: [www.provide-equip.com](http://www.provide-equip.com)

**August 2022**

**Cover page picture:** Fruit growing group demonstration in Kyela District

## Acknowledgements

The mid-term evaluation consultant would like to express appreciation for the technical oversight provided by UNEP/GEF team, particularly the Head GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit, Mr. Johan Robinson; the Task Manager, Ms. Jane G. Nimpamya, the Fund Management Officer, Mr. George Saddimbah and the Finance Assistant, Mr. Weldon Lemelin.

Special appreciation goes to the Chairpersons of the District Steering Committees in Ludewa, Nyasa, Mbinga, Kyela, and Makete districts. Further appreciation is extended to the focal point persons in the 5 mentioned District Local Government Authorities for participating in the interviews.

Appreciation also goes to the project partners entailing the Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Water Basin Board Office, the Land Use Plan Commission, Sokoine University of Agriculture and the five District Authorities.

Furthermore, appreciation is extended to Mr. Paul E. Deogratus Nyangu, the Project Coordinator from Vice President's Office (VPO), for coordinating the interviews.

We further acknowledge the contribution of the District Local Government Authorities in scheduling and organising the focus group discussions among local communities. Special gratitude goes to the local communities of Ludewa and Kyela districts which participated in the focus group discussions.

All our contributions in form of ideas, time, financial resources and in-kind contributions are highly appreciated; they will contribute towards enhancing project performance in the remaining period.

## Consultant's Biography

Dr. Julian K. Bagyendera has over 27 years of work experience in conducting baseline, mid and end-term evaluations for programmes in Climate Change (CC), environment, agriculture, HIV/AIDS, population, reproductive health, malaria, socio-economic strengthening, social protection, education, gender mainstreaming and integration, human and child rights, governance, advocacy, private/public partnerships, capacity building and community development. She has wealth of experience in managing complex programs with multiple implementers and funding agencies with particular reference to the World Bank, GEF, UNRCO, UNDP, UNEP Kenya, UNICEF, UNAIDS, UNFPA, UN Women, WHO, CDC, EU, USAID, DoD, US Embassy, Pearce Corps, Iris Group, DFID, DANIDA, SIDA, Italian Corporation and Irish Aid. Others are Makerere School of Public Health, Uganda AIDS Commission, Comic Relief, Danish Aid, Amref Health Africa, and Save the Children International. She has international experience working in Uganda, South Africa, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, P.R. China, Ethiopia, Liberia, Malawi, U.S.A, Thailand, Netherlands and Canada.

As a team leader, she has worked as an international and national consultant for over 60 related assignments. These include a mid-term review of GEF/UNEP evaluating SLM/SFM project in Kenya, Terminal Evaluation of GEF/Conservation International Program on Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Uganda to Comply with the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement, GEF/FAO mid-term evaluation of integrating climate resilience into agricultural and pastoral production in Uganda, through a farmer/agro-pastoralist as well as end-term evaluation for World Bank (WB)/GEF terminal evaluation for enhancing performance and accountability of social service contracts in Uganda; evaluation of WB Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation (SCCE). She developed the Uganda national CC indicators and facilitated a series of CC mainstreaming workshops for key sectors supported by USAID/Feed the Future. Other related are end-term evaluation for WB/GPSA project on Enhancing Performance and Accountability of Social Service Contracts in Uganda; developed Liberia Country Program for EU/UN Spotlight to address GBV and SRHR issues, UNAIDS/Geneva HIV/Social Protection Assessment Malawi and Uganda. Currently, she works as the Executive Director/Team Leader Evaluations for Provide and Equip (P&E) Ltd, an M&E/Management Consultancy Firm headquartered in Uganda. She previously worked in several senior project management positions, including the Chief of Party, Deputy Chief of Party, M&E Program Director, Senior M&E Technical Advisor, M&E Coordinator and M&E Manager. She holds a PhD in Project Management (with a thesis in M&E), MBA and BA (Social Sciences). Please refer to **Annex 7** for the full curriculum vitae of the consultant.

## Table of Contents

|   |     |
|---|-----|
| Acknowledgements.....   | iii |
| List of Tables .....  | vi  |
| List of Figures.....  | vi  |
| Acronyms/Abbreviations.....   | vii |
| Project Identification Summary.....   | ii  |
| Executive Summary.....  | iii |
| 1.0 Project Overview.....   | 1   |
| 1.1 Background.....   | 1   |
| 1.2 Project Rationale.....  | 1   |
| 1.3 Project Objectives and Components.....  | 1   |
| 1.4 Implementing and Executing Arrangements.....  | 2   |
| 2.0 Mid-Term Review Methods.....  | 4   |
| 2.1 Review Approach.....  | 4   |
| 2.2 Methodology.....  | 4   |
| 3.0 Review Findings.....  | 6   |
| A. Strategic Relevance.....   | 6   |
| 1. <i>Alignment of UNEP Medium Term Strategy, Programme Work and GEF Strategic Priorities</i> ..... | 6   |
| 2. <i>Alignment of UNEP/GEF Strategic Priorities</i> .....  | 6   |
| 3. <i>Relevance Regional, Sub-Regional and National Environmental Priorities</i> .....              | 6   |
| 4. <i>Complementarity with Existing Interventions</i> .....   | 7   |
| B. Quality of Project Design.....   | 7   |
| C. Nature of External Context.....  | 8   |
| D. Effectiveness.....   | 9   |
| 1. <i>Achievement of Direct Outputs</i> .....   | 9   |
| 2. <i>Achievement of Direct Outcomes:</i> .....   | 9   |
| 3. <i>Likelihood of Impact</i> .....  | 11  |
| E. Efficiency.....  | 12  |
| F. Monitoring and Reporting.....  | 17  |
| 1. <i>Monitoring Design and Budgeting</i> .....   | 17  |
| 2. <i>Monitoring of Implementation</i> .....  | 17  |
| 3. <i>Project Reporting</i> .....   | 18  |
| 4. <i>Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meetings</i> .....   | 18  |
| G. Sustainability.....  | 19  |
| 4.0 Factors Affecting Performance.....  | 20  |
| 1. <i>Preparation Readiness</i> .....   | 20  |
| 2. <i>Quality of Project Management and Supervision</i> .....                                       | 20  |
| 3. <i>Stakeholder's Participation Cooperation</i> .....   | 21  |
| 4. <i>Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity</i> .....                                    | 21  |
| 5. <i>Country Ownership Driven-ness</i> .....   | 21  |
| 6. <i>Communication and Public Awareness</i> .....  | 21  |
| 5.0 Conclusions, Lessons Learnt and Recommendations.....  | 22  |
| 5.1 <i>Conclusions</i> .....  | 22  |
| 5.1.1 <i>Summary MTR Rating by Criteria</i> .....   | 22  |
| 5.2 <i>Lessons Learned</i> .....  | 25  |
| 5.3 <i>Recommendations</i> .....  | 25  |
| Annex 1A: Output Indicator Performance Tracking Table.....  | 28  |
| Annex 1B: Outcome Indicator Tracking Table.....   | 33  |
| Annex 2: List of Individuals Consulted during the MTR Process.....                                  | 38  |
| Annex 3: Project Results Framework.....   | 39  |
| Annex 4: Project Design Quality.....  | 43  |
| Annex 5: Review Terms of Reference.....   | 50  |
| Annex 6: List of Documents Consulted During the Review.....   | 53  |
| Annex 7: Consultant's Curriculum Vitae.....   | 54  |
| Annex 8: Data Collection Tools.....   | 70  |
| Annex 9: GEF Rating Criterion.....  | 72  |

## List of Tables

|  |    |
|--|----|
| Table 1: Partner Roles and Responsibilities .....        | 3  |
| Table 2: Achievements by Outputs .....                   | 9  |
| Table 3: Outcome Achievement Rating.....                 | 9  |
| Table 4: Project budget and expenditure (GEF funds)..... | 12 |
| Table 5: Status of co-financing.....                     | 13 |
| Table 6: Awards to sub-contractors.....                  | 13 |
| Table 7: GEF budget by component .....                   | 16 |
| Table 8: Summary of MTR Rating by Criteria .....         | 22 |
| Table 9: Lessons Learned .....                           | 25 |
| Table 10: Recommendations.....                           | 25 |

## List of Figures

|   |    |
|---|----|
| Figure 1: Some of the FGD participants from Kyela (left) Ludewa (right) districts ..... | 5  |
| Figure 2: Vegetable growing and fish farming Fish farming in Ludewa District .....      | 8  |
| Figure 3: Fish Cage Farming in Ludewa District .....                                    | 10 |

## Acronyms/Abbreviations

|          |  |
|----------|--|
| DSC      | District Steering Committee  |
| FGDs     | Focus Group discussion   |
| FMO      | Fund Management Officer  |
| HRBA     | Human Rights-Based Approach  |
| IGAs     | Income Generating Activities   |
| IA       | Implementing Agency  |
| IWRM     | Integrated Water Resources Management  |
| LGAs     | Local Government Authorities   |
| MoU      | The Memorandum of Understanding  |
| MSP      | Medium Sized Project   |
| MTR      | Mid-Term Review  |
| MTS      | UN Environment Medium Term Strategy  |
| NAWAPO   | National Water Policy  |
| NEMC     | National Environment Management Commission   |
| NEX      | National Execution   |
| NLUPC    | National Land Use Planning Commission  |
| NPFE     | National Portfolio Formulation Exercise  |
| NSGRP    | National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty                                      |
| NWSDS    | National Water Sector Development Strategy   |
| OECD/DAC | Organisation for Economic Co-operation and<br>Development/Development Assistance Committee |
| OFP      | Operational Focal Point  |
| PAC      | Project Advisory Committee   |
| PCA      | Project Cooperation Agreement  |
| PFP      | Project Focal Point  |
| PIR      | Project Implementation Review  |
| PMU      | Project Management Unit  |
| POW      | Programme of Work  |
| PPG      | Project Preparation Grant  |
| PSC      | Project Steering Committee   |
| ROA      | Regional Office for Africa   |
| TM       | Task Manager   |
| ToC      | Project Theory Of Change   |
| UNEP     | United Nations Environment Programme   |
| VES      | Village Environmental Committee  |
| VPO      | Vice President's Office  |

## Project Identification Summary

|   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Identification Table                                | GEF ID.: 5691   | Umoja no.: GFL-11207-14AC-0003-SB-006254 |
| Project Title                                       | Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in Tanzania   |  |
| Duration months                                     | <i>Planned</i>  | 36 Months                                |
|   | <i>Extension(s)</i>   | 24 Months to 31 December 2021            |
|   |   | 24 Months to 31 December 2023            |
| Division(s) Implementing the project                | United Nations Environment Programme, Ecosystems Division, GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit Biodiversity and Land Branch  |  |
| Name of co-implementing Agency                      | United Nations Environment Programme – (UNEP)   |  |
| Executing Agency(ies)                               | Vice President's Office- VPO  |  |
| Names of Other Project Partners                     | Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Water Basin Board Office Land Use Plan Commission, Sokoine University of Agriculture and Five District Authorities (Ludewa, Nyasa, Mbinga, Kyela, And Makete)   |  |
| Project Type  | Medium Size Project   |  |
| Project Scope                                       | National  |  |
| Region  | Africa  |  |
| Countries   | United Republic of Tanzania   |  |
| Programme of Work                                   | Ecosystem Management<br>SP3: EAa (i,iii) and EAb (i,ii)<br>2018-2019 PoW and the 2018-2021 MTS  |  |
| GEF Focal Area(s)                                   | Land degradation  |  |
| UNSDCF / UNDAF linkages                             | This project contributes to achieving the international development goals, the Millennium Declaration and related Millennium Development Goals (MDGs), and national development priorities. UNDAF supports and contributes to the clusters of MKUKUTA and MKUZA II. Cluster 1 will enhance some key drivers of pro-poor economic growth and governance, including productivity enhancement and environmental and climate change mitigation. |  |
| Link to relevant SDG target(s) and SDG indicator(s) | SDG 15:15.1, 15:3, 15.5, 15.6, 15.7<br>SDG 1.5.1, 1.5.2, 1.5.3, 1.5.4, and 1.2.2  |  |
| GEF financing amount                                | 1,298,980 USD   |  |
| Co-financing amount                                 | 4,450,000 USD   |  |
| Date of CEO Endorsement                             | 23 May, 2016  |  |
| Start of Implementation                             | 13 February, 2017   |  |
| Date of first disbursement                          | 27 March 2017   |  |
| Total disbursement as of 30 June 2021               | 629,400 USD   |  |
| Total expenditure as of 30 June 2021                | 629,400 USD   |  |
| Expected Mid-Term Review Date                       | June-July 2022  |  |
| Completion Date                                     | <i>Planned</i>  | 31 December, 2019                        |
|   | <i>Revised</i>  | 31 December, 2021                        |
|   | <i>Revised</i>  | 31 December, 2023                        |
| Expected Terminal Evaluation Date                   | 31 December, 2023   |  |
| Expected Financial Closure Date                     | June, 2024  |  |



## Executive Summary

### Project Overview

- 1 The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is implementing a Global Environment Facility (GEF) project titled "Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in Tanzania, GEF ID Number 5691". The Mid-Term Review (MTR) was undertaken between June and September 2022 to assess whether the project was on track, whether problems or challenges were encountered, and required corrective actions.

### Review Approach and Methodology

- 2 The MTR was conducted through a participatory and consultative approach employing a blend of quantitative and qualitative methods. Key stakeholders were kept informed and consulted throughout the review process during the MTR design, implementation and report compilation. The data collection methods included desk reviews, consultative meetings, key informant interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) among local communities. The results framework and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) /Development Assistance Committee (DAC) - informed the MTR questions, which were used together with the standard UNEP guideline questions to assess the project, particularly the effectiveness, sustainability and likelihood of impact. Data was collected virtually (zoom, WhatsApp and telephone calls).

### Overall Rating of the Project and Main Findings

- 3 The performance rating was based on UNEP Evaluation Criteria per assessment category. For instance, under effectiveness, if less than 20% of the mid-term outputs were fully achieved, then it is rated 'highly unsatisfactory', 21-40% fully achieved is rated 'unsatisfactory', 41-60% fully achieved is rated 'moderately unsatisfactory', 61-80% fully achieved is rated 'moderately satisfactory', 81-99% fully achieved is rated 'satisfactory', while 100% of outputs fully achieved is rated 'highly satisfactory'. The overall project rating was moderately satisfactory. The project performed well under relevance, project design, and sustainability. The low performance was particularly under achievements versus targets, financial management, efficiency and reporting, as discussed below per the evaluation criteria below.

### Review Findings

#### A. Strategic Relevance

- 4 *Relevance was ranked satisfactory.* The project is well aligned to the UNEP's mandate and MTS, POW BD-4: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in production landscapes, seascapes and production sectors, and UN Environment's policies and strategic priorities. The project document presents a clear alignment and relevance to UN Environment /GEF/strategic priorities. The project is consistent with the ecosystem management thematic priorities, the project will specifically contribute to the achievement of Expected Accomplishment (EA): To promote the scaling up of sustainable land management (SLM) practices and securing livelihoods of smallholder farmers in selected districts within Lake Nyasa Basin. The project is consistent and responsive to the GEF strategic long-term objective. The project addresses the environmental concerns and needs of the communities. The project addresses the environmental challenges such as the changes in land use in catchment areas which results in erosion and washing of nutrient inputs to the lake, as well as restoring the forest cover in the Lake Nyasa catchment.

#### B. Quality of Project Design

- 5 The quality of the project design was rated satisfactory. The project document includes a comprehensive analysis of external context, problem statement, project framework and strategic relevance to global, national and local community priorities. The project results framework includes outcomes, indicators, targets, sources of verification and assumptions. The institutional arrangements are laid out, showing supervision and reporting arrangements. The project document lists key stakeholders in the project. The project design included a budget, risk identification and risk mitigation measures. The project had adequate preparatory arrangements before its start, including an inception meeting, although the meeting report or minutes were not provided to the MTR. The project document adequately outlines the institutional and implementation arrangements and roles of all key parties on the project. However, the project document and the CEO endorsement did not include the theory of change (ToC). Although the project design mapped various NGOs operating in L. Nyasa Basin, it did not specify and provide a budget for their respective roles/activities in implementing the project. It was also pointed out that the project design had minimal tangible benefits to enable farmers to adapt to climate-smart agriculture and take up alternative

sources of income such as irrigation equipment, start-up capital for IGAs, apiculture equipment, fingerlings, and fishnets.

### C. Nature of External Context

6 The external context was moderately favourable. Key infrastructure such as internet, telephone and the road networks were generally favourable. The project had strong political support, and this favourable political condition, coupled with favourable economic conditions favoured the project. Several factors occurred in the external context and negatively affected project implementation. These included heavy rains, flood; snow, dry spell and COVID-19 restrictions during 2020 and 2021.

### D. Effectiveness

7 The performance rating was based on UNEP Evaluation Criteria per assessment category. For instance, under effectiveness, if 20% and below of the mid-term outputs were fully achieved, then it is rated 'highly unsatisfactory', 21-40% fully achieved is rated 'unsatisfactory', 41-60% fully achieved is rated 'moderately unsatisfactory', 61-80% fully achieved is rated 'moderately satisfactory', 81-99% fully achieved is rated 'satisfactory', while 100% of outputs fully achieved is rated 'highly satisfactory'. Effectiveness was rated moderately unsatisfactory as per discussion below.

#### *Achievement of Direct Outputs*

8 The project had 14 outputs, of which 6 (43%) had fully achieved the mid-term targets. Four (29%) output achieved 41-60%, 3 (21%) outputs achieved 21-40% while 1 (7%) output achieved 20% and below. Overall, the project had not yet achieved most of the mid-term output targets, which indicates a high likelihood of not achieving them even after the latest no-cost extension ending in December 2023. The lagging behind in performance has been discussed with the PMU, and they have promised to work harder in the remaining part of the project.

#### **Achievements by Outputs**

| Rating Criteria (%) | Achievement of Output Indicator Targets (# & %) | List of Outputs                          |
|---------------------|---|--|
| 100%                | 6 (43%)   | 1.1.2, 1.2.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5 |
| 81-99%              | 0 (0%)  |  |
| 61-80%              | 0 (0%)  |  |
| 41-60%              | 4 (29%)   | 1.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1,2.2.3                |
| 21-40%              | 3 (21%)   | 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3                      |
| 20% and below       | 1 (7%)  | 2.2.2                                    |
|                     | Total = 14                                      |  |

#### *Achievement of Direct Outcomes:*

The rating for the achievement of direct outcomes was moderately unsatisfactory. The project has 4 outcomes, and only 1 (25%) outcome had fully achieved the mid-term target (Outcome 2.1: Improved land productivity and community living standards). The rest of the outcomes achieved below 50% of the mid-term targets.

#### **Outcome Achievement Rating**

| No. | Outcomes  | % Achievement | Rating Criteria (%) |
|-----|---|---------------|---------------------|
| 1.  | Outcome 1.1: Catchment capacity to provide ecosystem services enhanced                                    | 10%           | 20% and below       |
| 2.  | Outcome 2.1: Improved land productivity and community living standards                                    | 20%           | 20% and below       |
| 3.  | Outcome 2.2: Reduced land degradation, improved soil health and increased productivity of agro ecosystems | 100%          | 100%                |
| 4.  | Outcome 3.1 Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework for SLM established                               | 25%           | 21-40%              |

9 The main project achievements at the output/outcome levels were: Increased land area under the SLM project from 10,000ha to 35,000ha. Capacity enhancement of district authorities, primary and secondary school staff, farmer groups and water user associations in SLM practices. Training Farmer Field School Facilitators (FFS) in managing forests as a business activity and crop circulation to improve soil fertility. A

total of 220 farmers (115 females and 105 males) were sensitised. Fifteen (15) farmer groups were established, trained and supported with agricultural inputs such as beehives, planks, fishing nets, and improved seeds. The project supported about 375 members of farmers' groups through training to use appropriate SLM practices within the project areas.

- 10 Farmer groups were sensitised on SLM practices at the household, community and school levels. For instance, primary and secondary school teachers and learners were trained and they, in turn, transferred the knowledge to their communities and households. Tree nurseries were established in the five districts, and over 500 tree seedlings were provided to schools for planting. The project established alternative IGAs in households. The project conducted sensitisation at the community level to empower households to create alternative IGAs. For instance, communities were facilitated to make energy-saving cooking stoves and briquettes, about 290 energy-saving cooking stoves were made and utilised by communities. The project contributed to the rehabilitation of 5,000ha in the Ludewa, Nyasa, and Mbinga districts.

#### *Likelihood of Impact*

- 11 The likelihood of impact is in terms of improved conservation of the environment as a result of increased afforestation, adoption of climate-smart agriculture, and alternative sources of income. There is a likelihood of improved farmers' livelihoods due to increased income from IGAs. The land use plans have reduced conflicts among cultivators and pastoralists.

#### *Internal factors that contributed to delayed project completion.*

- 12 Delayed on boarding of partners in November 2017, yet the VPO had signed the PCA in February 2017 which delayed implementation to start in 2018. The Ministry of Agriculture reported having started implementing project activities in 2020. Delayed disbursements of funds by UNEP to the VPO, with a lapse of nine months of inactivity from 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021 to 16<sup>th</sup> March 2022. However, UNEP could not provide more funds because the VPO had not accounted for previous disbursements. Inadequate resources (personnel and financial) to facilitate project activities at the district level due to delayed receipt of funds. Lack of fuel and vehicles at district level since the project had only allocated one motorcycle making district officials unable to reach communities adequately.

## **E. Efficiency**

#### *Rate of spending*

- 13 The project's financial spending was rated moderately satisfactory. The overall project budget is US\$5,748,980, comprising US\$1,298,980 (23%) from GEF and US\$4,450,000 (77%) from co-financing. The budget is analysed by component and activity and was appended to the PCA. Components 1 and 2 were allocated almost equal proportion of the budget (40% and 39%) respectively, while component 3 was allocated 16% and administration was allocated 5%. The expenditure rate of GEF funds was 48% as of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021. The latest expenditure report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the quarter ending 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Quarterly expenditure reports for (Q2, Q3 2021, and Q1, Q2 2022) were not yet submitted by the VPO at the time of MTR. However, this does not affect the expenditure rate of 48% because the VPO received the 3<sup>rd</sup> instalment of GEF funds of USD 323,261 on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2022.

#### *Quality and consistency of financial reporting*

- 14 There were delays by the VPO in submitting quarterly expenditure reports; the latest report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the quarter ending 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Similarly, the latest co-finance report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020, while the latest inventory report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019.

#### *Efficiency*

- 15 The project was initially planned for 3 years ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019 but has had two no-cost extensions and is expected to end on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2023. GEF approved the project as a Medium sized project on 23<sup>rd</sup> May 2016, and UNEP signed the PCA with VPO on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017 and made the 1<sup>st</sup> disbursement to VPO on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2017. Whereas the PCA was signed in February 2017, implementation of project activities was delayed by one year and started in January 2018 due to internal VPO organisation processes. The project signed an MoU with Implementing Partners (IPs) late in November 2017. These were: Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Water Basin Board Office Land Use Plan Commission, Sokoine University of Agriculture and Five District Authorities (Ludewa, Nyasa, Mbinga, Kyela, and Makete). Implementation was further affected by the delayed transfer of the 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment of GEF funds to the VPO. The VPO submitted the request for funds of USD 442,107 on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2019,

but UNEP approved only USD 150,000 on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2019. According to the expenditure report of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021, the VPO had fully utilized the funds advanced to the project during the quarter that ended in June 2021. However, the VPO submitted the 3<sup>rd</sup> cash advance request of USD 323,261 in January 2022 but this was only approved on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2022 and cash was disbursed on 13<sup>th</sup> April 2022. The multiple delays at each level of approval affected the project implementation period.

- 16 **Value for Money:** *The project is audited annually by the Tanzania Auditor General. The VPO has received clean audit opinions for each of the audited three years ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2018, 2019, and 2020. The audit for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2021 has just been concluded and the audit report was not yet issued. The Tanzania Auditor General's report for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020 pointed out the constraint of inadequate budgets set aside for consultants' work, which affected delivery of activities in the third year of implementation. The VPO has tasked the Directorate of Procurement to ensure the project activities are undertaken within the remaining period of the project. Some activities were combined and carried out in collaboration with technical staff from the VPO and the project team.*
- 17 **Cost-saving strategies:** *The project employed several cost-saving strategies during implementation. For instance, the district provided field cars and at times fuel for activities to continue; and used the government staff instead of hiring technical personnel. The project chose to take only the group leaders for exchange visits as opposed to facilitating all group members, however, this may impact on the quality of project delivery. Additionally, the districts deployed the district extension officers to engage the community in their respective areas for ease of reach, as opposed to inviting them to the district. Some activities were carried out without using project funds; for example, during the construction of fishponds, communities offered labour in kind. Project staff travelled for fieldwork using burses or motorcycles from the district, and not the project vehicle. The project also worked with existing community institutions such as existing CBOs and groups instead of establishing new structures.*

#### **F. Monitoring and Reporting**

*Monitoring and reporting were rated unsatisfactory.*

- 18 *The project had an M&E plan that guided M&E functions. The project document includes a results framework with outcomes and respective indicators and targets. The MTR observed non-compliance to narrative reporting timelines, bi-annual reports for 2021 and 2022 were missing by the start of MTR. According to the Project Advisory Committee (PAC) minutes received by the MTR, only one PAC meeting was held on 11<sup>th</sup> August 2017 and the meeting minutes provided to the MTR were not signed and not approved by the chair. Non-regular PSC meetings impacted negatively on the project monitoring.*

#### **G. Sustainability**

- 19 *The project's sustainability was satisfactory. Social and political factors support the continuation and further achievement of the project's direct outcomes. These factors include the supportive political leaders starting from the VPOs office and parliament to the Local Government Authorities (LGAs) leaders and village governments. The project was embedded within government ministries and establishments. Tanzania has policies, laws, and plans that support the continuation of results. The project interventions are likely to be sustainable since the project utilised existing national and district local government authority structures and other government institutions including universities and commissions and ministries that will continue providing services. The project strengthened the capacity of District Local Government Authorities (DLGAs) on SLM to carry out project interventions. However, there was no standalone and comprehensive project exit strategy.*

#### **Conclusions**

1. *The overall rating of the project was moderately satisfactory. The project had 14 outputs, of which 6 (43%) had fully achieved the mid-term targets, which indicates a high likelihood of not achieving end of project targets even after the latest no-cost extension ending in December 2023, hence necessitating a further no-cost extension. Four (29%) output achieved 41-60%, 3 (21%) outputs achieved 21-40% while 1 (7%) output achieved 20% and below. The technical capacities of partners are adequate to deliver the project results but they were slowed down by several internal and external factors. Internal factors included late on boarding of partners and hence delayed the start of implementation, late project submission of narrative and financial reports hence delayed disbursement of funds, lack of close project monitoring by the PAC and Task Manager (TM), and delayed Auditor General's audit report. External factors which slowed the implementation rate and achievement of results included snow and dry spell in some districts destroying*

tree seedlings and crops, heavy rains and floods, and COVID -19 restrictions on congregation and movement.

2. The project efficiency and financial spending were rated moderately satisfactory. The multiple delays at each level of approval affected the project implementation period. The project interventions are likely to be sustainable since the project utilised existing structures at the national, district and community levels, having a supportive legal and policy framework, and political stability in the country further creates a conducive environment for project implementation. The existing farmer groups at community level supported will continue with joint economic activities. The LGAs reported having the required technical capacity but limited financial resources to enhance continuity.

#### Summary of MTR Rating by Criteria

| Criterion  | Rating                    |
|--|---------------------------|
| A. Strategic Relevance   | Satisfactory              |
| B. Quality of Project Design   | Satisfactory              |
| C. Nature of External Context  | Moderately Favourable     |
| D. Effectiveness   | Moderately Unsatisfactory |
| E. Financial Management  | Moderately Satisfactory   |
| 1. <i>Rate of spending</i>   | Moderately Satisfactory   |
| 2. <i>Quality and consistency of financial reporting</i>             | Moderately Satisfactory   |
| 3. <i>Communication Between Finance and Project Management Staff</i> | Satisfactory              |
| F. Efficiency  | Moderately Satisfactory   |
| G. Monitoring and Reporting  | Unsatisfactory            |
| H. Sustainability  | Satisfactory              |
| I. Factors Affecting Performance                                     | Moderately Satisfactory   |
| Overall Project Rating   | Moderately Satisfactory   |

#### Lessons Learned

- 20 The active involvement of the communities and IPs in project design, implementation and monitoring enhances the achievement of outputs and increases project ownership. A project may be implemented within budget, but not efficient when it is implemented way beyond the planned time. Additionally, timely disbursement of funds and timely financial reporting/accountability improves efficiency. Good political will at national, district and institutional levels fosters sustainability through resource allocation and integration into institutional work plans. The project interventions yield more results if customised or tailored to specific area/village needs as was done under this project. The use of mixed communication platforms and materials by this project such as village meetings, radios and flyers widened the reach of communities. Partnerships and collaborations with other government programs and NGOs potentially reduces duplication and enhance synergies, effectiveness and efficiency. At implementation level, the project had very minimal partnerships with NGOs.

#### Recommendations

| No.                    | Finding/Challenge   | Recommendations   |
|------------------------|---|---|
| <b>Project design</b>  |   |   |
| i.                     | Limited inclusion of NGOs in project implementation as pointed out by district level key stakeholders.  | Increase active participation of NGOs in project implementation, for instance in community mobilisation and sensitisation. This may involve partnerships in implementing interventions or letting them implement some activities.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO (Project Coordinator).<br><b>Timeline:</b> December 2022              |
| ii.                    | Minimal inclusion of tangible benefits to farmers in the project design, such as irrigation equipment, start-up capital for IGAs, apiculture equipment, fingerlings, and fishnets.                                  | Provide more tangible benefits to enable farmers such as irrigation equipment, start-up capital for alternative IGAs, apiculture equipment, fingerlings, and fishnets; as requested by communities.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP, VPO (Project Coordinator) and DLGAs (District Executive Director). <b>Timeline:</b> December 2022 |
| <b>Project results</b> |   |   |
| iii.                   | Limited achievements against targets, only 6 (43%) outputs out of 14, had been fully achieved the mid-term targets, which indicates a high likelihood of not achieving end of project targets even after the latest | Issue a further no-cost extension for one year to enable realisation of project output and outcome targets.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP<br><b>Timeline:</b> June 2023  |

| No.  | Finding/Challenge   | Recommendations  |
|--|---|--|
|  | no-cost extension ending in December 2023, hence necessitating a further no-cost extension.   |  |
| iv.  | Heavy reliance on government officials to supplement the work of the project officers, yet they were pre-occupied with other government responsibilities. The districts had only one project extension officer.   | Revise the budget and provide for more staff fully dedicated to and paid by the project to speed up implementation.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP<br><b>Timeline:</b> December 2022   |
| v.   | Widespread forest and land degradation due to heavy reliance on natural resources for livelihood.   | Strengthen inter-sectoral and inter-project collaboration. Promote alternative IGAs such as fish farming, beekeeping, improved cooking stoves, farming as a business and the like. Provide seed capital to organised community groups and link the farmers to markets. Partner with NGOs to scale-up conservation in communities. Facilitate exchange visits across groups for learning. Support establishment of more tree nursery beds for grafting fruit trees and planting woodlots.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO<br><b>Timeline:</b> ongoing |
| vi.  | Community level respondents pointed out that the FFS groups under Output 2.1.4 mainly focused on creating awareness and training which had no tangible outputs.   | Provide more tangible outputs such as start-up capital and strengthen saving and bulk marketing of products for enhanced cohesion and sustainability.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO (Project Coordinator)<br><b>Timeline:</b> December 2023  |
| vii.   | Only 20 villages (15 new villages, 3 per district and 5 existing ones) out of 96 villages in targeted districts had conducted land use planning ( <i>Output 1.1.2</i> ).  | Scale up land use planning to all 96 villages to strengthen conservation and natural resources and minimise land conflicts.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> DLGAs (District Executive Director).<br><b>Timeline:</b> December 2023   |
| viii.  | Limited access to credit to boost IGAs due to lack of collateral, particularly for women.   | Link farmers to providers of low interest credit services to boost their IGAs and promote group level savings and credit schemes.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> DLGAs (District Executive Director) <b>Timeline:</b> December 2023.  |
| <b>Monitoring and Evaluation, and Compliance</b> |   |  |
| ix.  | Non-regular monitoring of project interventions. Inadequate routine monitoring budget. Non-regular PSC meetings and lack of signed PSC minutes.   | Conduct regular and close project monitoring, including field monitoring visits and participate in PSC meetings.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> Task Manager,<br><b>Timeline:</b> Semi-annually<br><br>Revise the budget and locate funds for routine project monitoring. Hold bi-annual PSC meetings, with the TM in attendance and ensure that minutes are signed.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO (Project Coordinator) and Task Manager.<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediately for the budget; semi-annually for PSC meetings                               |
| x.   | Reporting in the PIR was not consistent with indicator statements (numbers versus percentages).   | The PIR reporting should either be consistent with indicator statements or the project should revise indicators and seek TM approval.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO (Project Coordinator).<br><b>Timeline:</b> On-going  |
| <b>Financial management</b>                      |   |  |
| xi.  | Delayed disbursements of funds by UNEP to the VPO due to the delayed issue of the Audit report by the Auditor General, which affected the smooth implementation of activities.<br><br>The late release of project funds was the most commonly cited challenge, with no implementation for 9 months which derailed project implementation. Financial reports from Q3 2021 up to Q2 2022 were still pending submission despite multiple reminders and follow up meetings. | Make a budget revision and cater for external auditor costs.<br><br>Adhere to the project reporting timelines as specified in the signed Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA).<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO Project Coordinator<br><b>Timelines:</b> Immediately for budget revision; quarterly for reports.   |



| No.    | Finding/Challenge  | Recommendations  |
|--------|--|--|
| xii.   | The VPO did not submit NIL expenditure reports during periods of non-activity (Q3, Q4 of 2021, and Q1 and Q2 of 2022).   | 1. Comply with contractual reporting timelines for narrative and financial reports and submit NIL reports during inactivity times.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO Finance Officer. <b>Timeline:</b> Quarterly<br><br>2. Provide specific training on the project deliverables and expectations.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP Finance Management Officer (FMO),<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediately for training |
| xiii.  | The UNEP expenditure templates are not designed to capture expenditure by component, hence it was not possible to analyse expenditure by component.  | For follow on projects, revise the expenditure reporting templates that are aligned to the budget template for proper capture of data and analysis.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP<br><b>Timeline:</b> At the project design stage   |
| xiv.   | The project experienced periods of inefficiencies. The PCA was signed in February 2017, but the implementation of project activities started in January 2018 due to internal organisational processes. | During project design, factor in the time (six months) for internal organisational processes during the project design. E.g. office setup, contracting, recruitment, etc.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> TM.<br><b>Timeline:</b> At the project design stage and PCA signing stage  |
| xv.    | The MoUs signed between the VPO and various IPs do not specify the amount to be transferred to the respective IPs to implement project activities.   | Develop contract amendments for IPs specifying specific deliverables and the amount due to them. All fund transfers are to be supported by a signed MoU, approved work plan and approved budget.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO Project Coordinator.<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediate  |
| xvi.   | The current increase in fuel prices, which is almost double the amount budgeted is likely to affect project implementation.  | Revise the budgets and factor in the increased fuel prices and submit them to the TM for approval.<br>Increase co-financing to cater for such eventualities.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> Project Coordinator.<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediate  |
|        | <b>Sustainability</b>  |  |
| xvii.  | Some elements require funds to scale them up, such as developing land use plans, training FFSs, scaling-up community sensitisation and monitoring.   | Develop comprehensive plans for environmental conservation and use them to mobilise funds from funding agencies.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> LGAs.<br><b>Timeline:</b> March 2023  |
| xviii. | Limited funds for environmental issues at the ministry and LGA levels.   | Prioritise environmental issues in plans and budgets to co-finance some activities.<br>Lobby and advocate for increased prioritisation of environmental issues in national and LGA budgets.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> LGAs.<br><b>Timeline:</b> Next budgeting cycle   |
| xix.   | Some of the existing farmer groups not formally registered which hinders sustainability and access to other funding opportunities.   | Support formalisation of farmer groups so that they develop constitutions and register as Community Based Organisations (CBOs) at sub-county level.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO Project Coordinator<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediate.   |
|        | <b>Crosscutting issues</b>   |  |
| xx.    | Lack of a gender mainstreaming strategy.   | Develop a comprehensive gender mainstreaming strategy to ensure equity participation.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> Project Coordinator.<br><b>Timeline:</b> December 2022.  |
| xxi.   | Some men do not allow their wives to participate in FFS. Some women have very low esteem and are reluctant to participate in group work and IGAs.  | Scale up community sensitisation of men using model women, cultural and religious leaders.<br>Support families to develop joint family visions and regularly review and discuss progress as couples.<br>Scale-up esteem building for females.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> IPs.<br><b>Timeline:</b> ongoing.  |

## 1.0 Project Overview

### 1.1 Background

The United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) is implementing a Global Environment Facility (GEF) project titled UNEP/GEF Project "Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in Tanzania" "GEF ID Number 5691". The project aims at in supporting national efforts to improve the Lake watershed to improve the lake environment and capacity of the lake to provide ecosystem and social services. The project targeted to reach this goal through supporting the communities to improve alternative income opportunities through activities that promote more sustainable land management and develop alternative income opportunities, thereby reducing pressure on economically important fisheries and direct utilization of catchment forest resources.

Some of the key project interventions are supporting the communities to improve Watershed Management, through improved agricultural, forest management and tourism practices, and related alternative livelihood activities like bee keeping. The project further supports capacity building of smallholder farmers and local institutions to create an enabling environment for SLM uptake. The project is being implemented in 5 districts of Tanzania, Ludewa, Kyela, Lake Nyasa, Makete, Mbinga districts.

The Mid-Term Review (MTR) was undertaken between June and September 2022 to assess whether the project was on track, whether problems or challenges were encountered, and required corrective actions.

### 1.2 Project Rationale

1. According to the project document, the project rationale is derived from the GEF Land Degradation Focal Area Strategy. The goal of the land degradation focal area is to contribute to arresting and reversing current global trends in land degradation, specifically desertification and deforestation. This was be accomplished by promoting and supporting effective policies, legal and regulatory frameworks, capable institutions, knowledge sharing and monitoring mechanisms, together with good practices conducive to sustainable land management (SLM) and that can generate global environmental benefits while supporting local and national, social and economic development. The Land Degradation Strategy promotes system-wide change necessary to control the increasing severity and extent of land degradation. Investing in SLM to control and prevent land degradation in the broader landscape is an essential and cost-effective way to deliver multiple global environmental benefits and national socio-economic benefits.
2. The project envisaged improving natural resources management and livelihoods of communities in Lake Nyasa catchment through sustainable land management systems. In achieving this, the project was to focus on improvements in alternative income opportunities, improvements in Watershed Management and Project Management. The project aimed to support national efforts to improve the Lake watershed that would improve the lake environment and capacity of the lake to provide ecosystem and social services. Specifically, the project targeted to reach this goal by supporting the community to improve alternative income opportunities through activities that promote more sustainable land management and develop alternative income opportunities, thereby reducing pressure on economically important fisheries and direct utilization of catchment forest resources.

### 1.3 Project Objectives and Components

3. The project's development objective is to promote the scaling up of sustainable land management (SLM) practices and securing the livelihoods of smallholder farmers in selected districts within Lake Nyasa Basin. The global environment objective of the project is to reduce land and ecosystem degradation and contribute to climate change mitigation/adaptation in Lake Nyasa basin.



4. Specifically, the project aimed at supporting capacity building of smallholder farmers and local institutions to create an enabling environment for SLM uptake through the following project components:
  - Component 1: Strengthening capacities at catchment level for SLM
  - Component 2: Integrated catchment management through SLM systems
  - Component 3: Enabling policy and institutional framework

### **Component 1: Strengthening capacities at catchment level for SLM**

5. This component aimed at improving planning and investments at catchment and sub-catchment Level. Catchment and sub-catchment planning (broad catchment management plans based on satellite imagery and existing soil, land use and topographic maps and reports to the extent available, and sub-catchments and micro-catchments prioritization for project land conservation and livelihood improvement interventions); Investments at catchment level (fire awareness programs and protection, support for enforcement of by-laws on burning, and gully protection (small check dams, culverts, and road-drains).

### **Component 2: Integrated Catchment management through SLM systems**

6. Under this component, the project aimed at supporting the implementation of appropriate SLM practices. The SLM practices promoted by the project included climate smart agriculture, soil and water conservation, crop land management, soil fertility management, agro-forestry and sustainable forest management. This component also supports alternative income generating activities.

### **Component 3: Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework**

7. Under component 3, the project planned to support the establishment of an inter-ministerial committee on Lake Nyasa to harmonize and promote sustainable development of Lake Nyasa basin specifically addressing the challenges of land and ecosystem degradation.

#### *1.4 Implementing and Executing Arrangements*

#### **Executing Agency**

8. According to the SLM project document, the GEF Implementing Agency (IA) for the project is the UNEP Ecosystem Division ). The project is executed by the Vice President's Office (VPO) as the lead executing agency. The VPO also serves as the GEF Operational Focal Point (OFP) / Project Focal Point (PFP) and is mandated to coordinate the implementation of the project with key project partners made up of key sectorial institutions and local government authorities (LGAs) while UNEP was to provide the technical backstopping and overall project oversight.
9. The project was to be implemented over three years and would adopt a participatory approach bringing on board all the relevant stakeholders. The project entities include the include the UNEP (the Implementing Agency), Vice-President's Office (Executing Agency), the Project Management Unit, Project Advisory Committee, District Steering committee and Community level institutions.

#### **Institutional Arrangements**

10. The project has PAC comprising representatives from the VPO, Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Water (Lake Nyasa Basin Water Board), National Environment Management Commission (NEMC), National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC), Forest Department, Fisheries Department, Mining Department, Local Authorities (Ludewa, Kyela, Lake Nyasa, Makete, and Mbinga), community representatives, UNDP/UNEP- Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) and UNEP Ecosystems Division. The Regional and district authorities as well as special interest groups are also members of the committee. The VPO convenes and chairs the PAC meetings while the Project Coordinator acts as the secretary. PAC was designed to meet twice a year.

11. Project Management Unit (PMU): The PMU is composed of a VPO representative, district focal point persons and the Executing Agency. The PMU reports to the PAC, and its main responsibility is the execution of project implementation as per the agreed work plan and budget. The PMU meets quarterly or as needed.
12. The project implementing partners: The project signed MoUs with Implementing Partners (IPs) late in November 2017. These were: Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Water Basin Board Office Land Use Plan Commission, Sokoine University of Agriculture and Five District Authorities (Ludewa, Nyasa, Mbinga, Kyela, and Makete). Table 1 shows the roles and responsibilities of various IPs.

*Table 1: Partner Roles and Responsibilities*

|   | <b>Partner</b>   | <b>Roles</b>  |
|---|--|---|
| 1 | Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA)                  | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Develop and implement radio and mobile-based extension services on SLM systems and practices within timeframe and budget</li> <li>ii. Proposed mechanisms shall ensure that radio and mobile-based extension programs are reaching the targeted audience within the project area.</li> <li>iii. Prepare and produce radio programs in the Kiswahili language</li> <li>iv. Prepare and submit to the EA the program package and reports</li> </ul>   |
| 2 | National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC)            | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Conduct participatory land use planning, and productive land use plans and maps</li> <li>ii. Develop 15 land use plans that focus on facilitating the implementation of SLM in the Lake Nyasa basin with the aim to rescue and maintain ecosystem services and sustainable productivity of terrestrial and aquatic systems</li> <li>iii. Prepare and submit to the EA financial reports together with final village land use plans and maps.</li> <li>iv. Facilitate the process of gazettelement of the prepared village land use plans in a government notice.</li> </ul>   |
| 3 | District Councils (Kyela, Nyasa, Makete, Mbinga, Ludewa) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>v. Designate Extension Officer for the implementation of the project components relevant to their administrative areas</li> <li>vi. Receive grants, tools, equipment, and properties from the EA strictly to be used to facilitate the project implementation process and not otherwise.</li> <li>vii. Oversee implementation of the project at the district administration level</li> <li>viii. Support NGOs, CBOs, and farmers to organize awareness, community mobilization, training workshops, and advocacy for sustainable land management, where necessary, in collaboration with EA</li> <li>ix. Monitor and evaluate the implementation of the project and maintain records</li> <li>x. Prepare and submit to the EA quarterly project physical and financial reports</li> <li>xi. To facilitate the establishment of community income-generating activities at the catchment level (establishing tree nurseries, small saving and credit schemes, and support for activities with the potential to add value to existing agricultural production, e.g. improved storage, processing, and marketing)</li> <li>xii. To participate during preparation, and thereafter implement the land use plan at the district administrative level to support the realization of sustainable land management practices and improved livelihoods</li> <li>xiii. To facilitate execution of the project as per the agreed work plan and budget</li> <li>xiv. To prepare the progress report on the implementation of the project and report to the project Advisory committee, in accordance with the project document</li> <li>xv. To sensitize the community to participate in the process of preparation of land use plans</li> <li>xvi. To sensitize and encourage the community to follow up on radio and mobile awareness programme broadcast by the SUA.</li> </ul> |

13. District Steering Committee (DSC): At the local government level, the project planned to use the existing structures at the district level to steer the project implementation in the selected sites. The DSC was made up of members of technical and administrative teams that planned to ensure smooth project implementation in their respective districts. The DSC is chaired by the District Administrator and the project focal point person serves as the secretary to ensure ownership. The Project Coordinator represents the PMU on the DSC.

14. Village/Catchment Environmental Committee: The Village Environmental Committees (VECs) are responsible for formulating and foreseeing of various environmental by-laws. The project activities were designed to be undertaken at the village or sub-catchment level which is under the jurisdiction of VECs. The project worked with the VECs as entry points to the villages and community groups.

## 2.0 Mid-Term Review Methods

### 2.1 Review Approach

15. The overall approach to the MTR was highly participatory and consultative. Key stakeholders were kept informed and consulted throughout the review process, both during design, implementation and report compilation. Both quantitative and qualitative MTR methods were used as appropriate to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. Close communication with the project team was maintained to promote information exchange throughout the review in order to increase stakeholder ownership of the review findings.

### 2.2 Methodology

16. The MTR was undertaken using a mixed methodology entailing desk reviews, consultative meetings, key informant interviews and focus group discussions (FGDs) among local communities. The results framework and the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)/Development Assistance Committee (DAC) informed the MTR questions, which were used together with the standard UNEP guideline questions to assess the project, particularly the effectiveness, sustainability and likelihood of impact.

17. The findings of the review are based on the data collection methods discussed below.

#### a) Desk review of key documents

18. The MTR conducted a review of relevant background documentation including, funding agreements, project document, CEO Endorsement Request (ER), programme and financial reports, and the MTR terms of reference. The full list of documents to be reviewed is attached as annex 5.

#### b) Consultative meetings

19. Individual and group consultative meetings were conducted with the UNEP Task Manager (TM); UNEP Fund Management Officer (FMO); and the project team. These meetings aimed at gaining concurrency on approach and methodology, key stakeholders to be engaged in the interviews, obtaining key documents and seeking clarifications. These consultations were held virtually via Microsoft Teams, Zoom, email, and telephone.

#### c) Key Informant Interviews

20. Interviews were conducted among key stakeholders of the project that entailed the project managers, the project implementing partners, relevant sectors and District Local Government Authority (DLGA) staff, the District steering committee members and other key stakeholders. These interviews were individual or group interviews, conducted virtually via Zoom, WhatsApp, MS Teams and telephones. The list of individuals to be interviewed are presented in annex 2.

#### d) Focus Group Discussions among beneficiaries at community level

21. The FGDs were conducted among females and males FGDs in Kyela and Ludewa districts, comprising of group members that were supported by the project. The purpose of the FGDs was to obtain information regarding their participation in the project, benefits accrued from the project, challenges/limitations of the project and suggestions for improvement in the remaining period of the project. An FGD guide was used. The LGAs focal points together with the District Extension

Workers mobilised the groups and availed their smart phones for the WhatsApp calls, which was preferred to Zoom calls by the organisers, being more portable and flexible. The data collection tools are attached in annex 8. Figure 1 presents some of the FGD participants from Kyela and Ludewa districts.



Figure 1: Some of the FGD participants from Kyela (left) Ludewa (right) districts

### **Analysing Findings and Key MTR Principles**

3. The MTR findings were based on sound evidence and analysis of findings from various categories of key stakeholders provided by the project. The MTR employed causal analysis to establish the relationship between implemented activities versus contribution to desired outcomes. Thematic analysis was conducted whereby information generated from the KIIs were organised into re-occurring themes, which informed development of the different sections. Systematic analysis was conducted to get a deeper understanding of the contextual factors affecting the project. To the greatest extent possible, information was triangulated with existing data sources. To catalyse learning for future programming, the evaluator went beyond the assessment of “what” the project performance was and made serious effort to provide a deeper understanding of “why” the performance was as it was.

### **Rating of Evaluation Performance**

The performance rating was based on UNEP Evaluation Criteria per assessment category. For instance, under effectiveness, if 20% and below of the mid-term outputs were fully achieved, then it is rated 'highly unsatisfactory', 21-40% fully achieved is rated 'unsatisfactory', 41-60% fully achieved is rated 'moderately unsatisfactory', 61-80% fully achieved is rated 'moderately satisfactory', 81-99% fully achieved is rated 'satisfactory', while 100% of outputs fully achieved is rated 'highly satisfactory'.

### **Limitations**

4. The evaluator did not conduct physical site visits. Virtual means were therefore employed which could have limited on sight observations. This was partly overcome by interviewing representatives of the local communities through a virtual group interviews and asking them to meet near their projects to enable cite view and taking pictures.

### **Ethics and human rights issues**

5. Ethics and human rights were ensured by the evaluator through maintaining anonymity and confidentiality by not directly mentioning the names of respondents while making quotes. In addition, all responses were reported as aggregate findings with no mention of the source of information. The views of all respondents were included and protected irrespective of sex, age or position.

### 3.0 Review Findings

6. The findings are presented according to the evaluation criteria. Ratings are provided at the beginning of each evaluation criterion and the complete rating table is included in Table 7, under the conclusions section. The performance rating was based on UNEP Evaluation Criteria per assessment category. For instance, under effectiveness, if less than 20% of the mid-term targets were fully achieved then it is rated 'highly unsatisfactory', 21-40% fully achieved is rated 'unsatisfactory', 41-60% fully achieved is rated 'moderately unsatisfactory', 61-80% fully achieved is rated 'moderately satisfactory', 81-99% fully achieved is rated 'satisfactory', while 100% of targets fully achieved is rated 'highly satisfactory'.

#### A. Strategic Relevance

*The project's strategic relevance was ranked satisfactory.*

1. *Alignment of UNEP Medium Term Strategy, Programme Work and GEF Strategic Priorities*
7. The project is aligned to the UNEP mandate, UNEP Medium Term Strategy (MTS), Programme of Work (POW) BD-4: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in production landscapes and seascapes and production sectors and UNEP's policies and strategic priorities. The project is consistent with the ecosystem management thematic priorities, and specifically contributes to the achievement of Expected Accomplishment (EA): To promote the scaling-up of sustainable land management (SLM) practices and securing livelihoods of smallholder farmers in selected districts within Lake Nyasa Basin.
2. *Alignment of UNEP/GEF Strategic Priorities*
8. The project is consistent and responsive to the GEF strategic long-term objective particularly LD1 Agriculture and Rangeland Systems (Outcome 1.2 and 1.3) and the strategic programme for GEF IV: LD3 Integrated Landscapes (Outcome 3.2).
3. *Relevance Regional, Sub-Regional and National Environmental Priorities*
9. The SLM project broadly aligns with the National Strategy for Growth and Reduction of Poverty (NSGRP) (MKUKUTA II)-2010-2015, through which the government prioritizes environmentally friendly agriculture as the driver of national development. Also, the project is in line with the priorities identified in the National Portfolio Formulation Exercise (NPFE, 2012). The project is directly in line with the strategy of urgent actions to combat land degradation as stated in the Tanzania United Nations Convention on Combat Desertification (UNCCD) National Action Programme (NAP) and in line with the Strategy on Urgent Actions on Land Degradation and Water Catchment (2006) and Strategy on Urgent Actions for the Conservation of Marine and Coastal Environment, Lakes and Rivers (2008). The project contributes to the main objective of the country's National Environmental Policy (1997), which identified the degradation of land and water catchment areas as one of the major environmental challenges in the country. It is also in line with the National Water Policy (NAWAPO-2002) and the National Water Sector Development Strategy (NWSDS-2005) through which the government is implementing Integrated Water Resources Management (IWRM).
10. The project addresses the environmental concerns and needs of the communities such as the changes in land use in catchment areas which results in erosion and washing of nutrient inputs to the lake. The project contributes to the restoration of the forest cover in the Lake Nyasa catchment which has decreased from 64% to 51% between 1967 and 1990. Similarly, the project addresses the issue of increased pressure by farmers on Lake Nyasa shore which has increased deforestation of the upper catchment. The project also addresses the Land degradation challenges that affect the quality of land resources used by smallholder farmers. Land degradation induces land shortages resulting in shortened fallow periods, increased continuous cultivation, and increased pressure on the immediately accessible land. Additionally, the project addresses the land shortage challenge,



especially in the previously sparsely populated parts of Ludewa District, the land shortage is attributed to the villagization programme of the 1970s.

#### *4. Complementarity with Existing Interventions*

11. The project works with various stakeholders in different capacities, at different levels, including National, District Local Government Authorities (DLGAs) and communities. The project complements existing interventions such as the Climate Smart Agriculture (CSA) interventions by the Ministry of Agriculture. The CSA guidelines were disseminated to LGAs and training was conducted at the district level but was not done at the community/farmer level, thus the SLM project provided an opportunity to reach the farmers. Other interventions include the Timber Rush Project whose interventions were in environment and forest management, Forestry and Value Chains Development programme (FORVAC) which was working with the upper stream of L. Nyasa Basin, with supplementary activities such as beekeeping.

### **B. Quality of Project Design**

***The quality of the project design was rated satisfactory***

12. The quality of the project design was rated satisfactory. The project document includes a comprehensive analysis of external context, problem statement, project framework and strategic relevance to global, national and local community priorities. The project results framework includes outcomes, indicators, targets, sources of verification and assumptions. The institutional arrangements are laid out showing supervision and reporting arrangements. The project document lists key stakeholders in the project. The project design included a budget, risk identification and risk mitigation measures. The project had adequate preparatory arrangements before its start, including an inception meeting, although the inception meeting report or minutes were not provided to the MTR. The project document adequately outlines the institutional and implementation arrangements as well as the specific roles of all key parties on the project. The project document and the CEO ER did not include the theory of change (ToC), but the consultant has developed it as part of MTR deliverables.

Although the project design mapped various NGOs operating in L. Nyasa Basin, it did not specify respective roles/activities in the implementation of the project, particularly where they have a niche for instance in community mobilisation and sensitisation. It was also pointed out that the project design had minimal tangible benefits to enable farmers to adapt climate smart agriculture and take up alternative sources of income such as irrigation equipment, start-up capital for income generating activities (IGAs), apiculture equipment, fingerlings, and fishnets.

Figure 2 shows a sample of a vegetable garden that provides alternative source of income.



Figure 2: Vegetable growing and fish farming in Ludewa District

13. The results framework elaborated the outcomes under each component and the outputs and linked directly to the outcomes. There was no standalone and comprehensive project exit strategy in the project document. Annex 4 presents a detailed assessment of the quality of the project design.

***The external context was moderately favourable.***

### C. Nature of External Context

14. The external context was moderately favourable. There were severe climatic events that affected project operations. There were heavy rains that made it hard to reach communities due to slippery roads. In Kyela district, there was flooding near L. Nyasa in 2022. Additionally, the snow in some areas negatively affected the planted avocado trees. In some areas, there was a dry spell between May and November in the 1<sup>st</sup> year of the project which affected project implementation by drying up trees in nursery beds. The prolonged drought was addressed by purchasing water pumps to facilitate irrigation during the dry season.
15. The security situation was favourable and stable and thus did not affect project operations. Infrastructure (roads, power, and telecoms) was partly robust and stable to facilitate efficient project operations. However, during the rainy season, some roads would not be passable, which affected movement to communities.
16. The economic conditions were favourable and stable allowing efficient project operations. The project supported communities to establish income generating activities (IGAs) such as beekeeping, fish farming and fruit tree growing. However, it was reported that the current increase in fuel prices, which is almost double the amount budgeted is likely to affect project implementation.
17. The political context is favourable and stable allowing efficient project operations. There were no political interferences and conflicts. The COVID-19 pandemic moderately affected the project implementation, especially in 2020 and 2021 since there was no complete lock-down in Tanzania. Some activities were not implemented on time due to COVID-19 restrictions on people's movement and gathering.

## D. Effectiveness

18. The performance rating was based on GEF MTR Rating Criterion (Annex 9). For instance, under effectiveness, if 20% and below of the mid-term outputs were fully achieved, then it is rated 'highly unsatisfactory', 21-40% fully achieved is rated 'unsatisfactory', 41-60% fully achieved is rated 'moderately unsatisfactory', 61-80% fully achieved is rated 'moderately satisfactory', 81-99% fully achieved is rated 'satisfactory', while 100% of outputs fully achieved is rated 'highly satisfactory'.

### 1. Achievement of Direct Outputs

- 21 The project had 14 outputs, of which 6 (43%) had fully achieved the mid-term targets. Four (29%) output achieved 41-60%, 3 (21%) outputs achieved 21-40% while 1 (7%) output achieved 20% and below as shown in Table 2. Overall, the project had not yet achieved most of the mid-term output targets, which indicates a high likelihood of not achieving them even after the latest no-cost extension ending in December 2023. The lagging behind in performance has been discussed with the PMU and they have promised to work harder in the remaining part of the project.

*It was noted with concern that reporting in the PIR was not consistent with indicator statements. For instance where an indicator is a number, the project reports a percentage*

Table 2: Achievements by Outputs

| Rating Criteria (%) | Achievement of Output Indicator Targets (# & %) | List of Outputs                          |
|---------------------|---|--|
| 100%                | 6 (43%)   | 1.1.2, 1.2.2, 2.1.1, 2.1.3, 2.1.4, 2.1.5 |
| 81-99%              | 0 (0%)  |  |
| 61-80%              | 0 (0%)  |  |
| 41-60%              | 4 (29%)   | 1.1.1, 2.1.2, 2.2.1,2.2.3                |
| 21-40%              | 3 (21%)   | 3.1.1, 3.1.2, 3.1.3                      |
| 20% and below       | 1 (7%)  | 2.2.2                                    |
|                     | Total = 14                                      |  |

19. Component 1: Strengthening capacities at the catchment level for SLM is very likely to be achieved where 3 out of 5 mid-term output indicator targets had been fully achieved. Component 2: Integrated Catchment Management through SLM systems, is not likely to be achieved, since none of the 8 mid-term output indicator targets had been fully achieved, while Component 3: Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework, is not likely to be achieved, since all the 3 had not achieved 50% of the mid-term output indicator targets. The lagging behind in performance has been discussed with the PMU and they have promised to work harder in the remaining part of the project.

### 2. Achievement of Direct Outcomes:

The rating for achievement of direct outcomes was moderately unsatisfactory. The project has 4 outcomes, and only 1 (25%) outcome had fully achieved the mid-term target (Outcome 2.1: Improved land productivity and community living standards). The rest of the outcomes achieved below 50% of the mid-term targets as presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Outcome Achievement Rating

| No. | Outcomes  | % Achievement | Rating Criteria (%) |
|-----|---|---------------|---------------------|
| 1.  | Outcome 1.1: Catchment capacity to provide ecosystem services enhanced                                    | 10%           | 20% and below       |
| 2.  | Outcome 2.1: Improved land productivity and community living standards                                    | 20%           | 20% and below       |
| 3.  | Outcome 2.2: Reduced land degradation, improved soil health and increased productivity of agro ecosystems | 100%          | 100%                |



| No. | Outcomes  | % Achievement | Rating Criteria (%) |
|-----|---|---------------|---------------------|
| 4.  | Outcome 3.1 Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework for SLM established | 25%           | 21-40%              |

The main project achievements at the output/outcome levels were:

20. The land area under the SLM project has increased from 10,000 ha to 35,000ha in the districts of Kyela, Mbinga, Makete, Ludewa and Nyasa. This was attributed to SLM practices among farmers promoted by the project. In addition, the formation of water user associations such as the water user association in Ludewa District enhanced the sustainable use of water resources around the water catchment areas.
21. Capacity enhancement of district authorities, primary and secondary school staff, farmer groups and water user associations in SLM practices. Additionally, Farmer Field School Facilitators were trained in managing forests as a business activity and crop circulation to improve soil fertility in Kihuru, Lituhi, Lundo and Mtupale, Mbiga District. Facilitators involved both men and women. A total of 220 farmers (115 females, and 105 males) were sensitised. Fifteen Farmers groups were established, trained and supported with agricultural inputs such as beehives, plank, fishing nets, and improved seeds.



*Figure 3: Fish Cage Farming in Ludewa District*

22. According to the PIR 2022, the project supported about 375 members of farmers' groups through training to use appropriate SLM practices within the project areas. Farmer groups (15) were sensitised on SLM practices at the household, community and school levels. For instance, primary and secondary school teachers and learners were trained who in turn transferred the knowledge to their communities and households where they come from.
23. The project established tree nurseries in the five districts. The tree nurseries served as demonstration sites and provided farmers with tree seedlings. Over 500 tree seedlings were provided to schools to be planted.
24. The project established alternative income generating activities (IGA) in households. The project conducted sensitisation at the community level, to empower households to create alternative IGAs. In each district, factors such as geographical location, the environment, social, physical and household opinions were considered through village meetings to identify appropriate alternative IGAs. For instance, communities were facilitated to make energy saving cooking stoves and

briquettes in Mbinga and Nyasa districts, about 290 energy saving cooking stoves were made and utilised by communities; tree nurseries were established in Makete District; farmers were supported to produce avocado and add value to cocoa and palm oil in Kyela district. Other IGAs included beekeeping and using climate smart agriculture during cashew-nut production in Ludewa, Kyela and Makete districts.

25. The project conducted a needs assessment to ensure appropriate provision of awareness creation in all five Districts. The stakeholders assessed included Itete Prison in Ludewa, farmers in all districts, schools, district officials, and artisans for coal and sand miners in Mbinga, Nyasa and Makete districts, paddy farmers in Kyela, and fishermen groups in Kyela, Ludewa and Nyasa districts.
26. The project implemented reforestation programs through the establishment of tree nurseries in all the districts for restoration of tree cover and rehabilitation of land. According to the PIR 2022, the project contributed to rehabilitation of 5,000ha in Ludewa, Nyasa, and Mbinga districts. This was achieved through the establishment of exotic and indigenous tree nurseries for tree seedlings. Additionally, 50 (35 male, 15 female) farmers and miners were trained in sustainable land use in Nyasa and Mbinga districts. The areas which were used by artisanal miners were restored by planting trees. As a result, the project registered a 5% reduction in soil erosion in Makete and Kyela districts as well as a 5% reduction of sediment load in Kyela, Ludewa and Nyasa districts.
27. However, the FGD participants pointed out that although they realised far more benefits than challenges, some people don't practice the education, because they depend on natural resources for survival and some village natural environment committees are not actively educating members on how to preserve the environment.

### 3. *Likelihood of Impact*

28. The likelihood of impact is in terms of improved conservation of the environment as a result of increased afforestation, adoption of climate-smart agriculture, and alternative sources of income. There is a likelihood of improved livelihoods of farmers due to increased income from IGAs. The 15 project supported land use plans are likely to reduce conflicts among cultivators and pastoralists.

### 29. ***Internal factors that contributed to delayed project completion included were:***

- Delayed on-boarding of partners. The memorandum of understanding (MoU) with IPs were signed in November 2017 yet the VPO had signed in February 2017 which delayed implementation to start in 2018. The Ministry of Agriculture reported having started implementing project activities in 2020.
- Delayed disbursements of funds by UNEP to the VPO. There was a lapse of a nine months period of inactivity from 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021 to 16<sup>th</sup> March 2022 with no disbursement of funds to the project made, which meant no implementation of activities. The reasons for the delay are discussed in the financial management section E.
- Inadequate resources (personnel and financial) to facilitate project activities, this was mainly reported at the district level. For instance, districts reported lack of fuel and vehicles, since the project had only allocated one motorcycle per district making district officials unable to adequately reach communities. The districts had only one project extension officer and relied on government officials to supplement the work of the project officers, yet they were pre-occupied with other government responsibilities.

30. **External factors that affected the project included:**

- Climatic conditions such as heavy rains that made it hard to reach communities due to slippery roads. Flooding in Kyela District in areas near L. Nyasa in 2022. Additionally, the snow in some areas affected avocado tree growing while in other areas, there was a dry spell between May and November 2017 which negatively affected project implementation.
- To a smaller extent, the COVID-19 pandemic affected the project implementation, particularly in 2020 and 2021. The COVID-19 restrictions on people's movements, and gathering slowed down the implementation of activities.

**E. Efficiency**

**The project's financial spending was rated moderately satisfactory.**

**Financial Management**

31. **Financial** management was assessed under two themes: completeness of financial information and communication between financial and project management staff as detailed in GEF MTR Rating Criterion (Annex 9).

*Rate of spending*

32. **The** overall project budget is US\$5,748,980, comprising US\$1,298,980 (23%) from GEF and US\$4,450,000 (77%) from co-financing. The budget is analysed by component and by activity and was appended to the PCA. Components 1 and 2 were allocated almost equal proportion of the budget (40% and 39%) respectively, while component 3 was allocated 16% and administration was allocated 5%.

**GEF Funds**

33. The expenditure rate of GEF funds was 48% as of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021. The latest expenditure report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the quarter ending 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Quarterly expenditure reports for (Q2, Q3 2021; and Q1, Q2 2022) were not yet submitted by the VPO at the time of MTR. However, this does not affect the expenditure rate of 48% because the VPO received the 3<sup>rd</sup> instalment of GEF funds of USD 323,261 on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2022. The 3<sup>rd</sup> instalment is not yet fully utilized/accounted for. This implies that there was a nine months period of inactivity from the time the last accountability was made (30.06.2021) to 16.03.2022 when the next disbursement was made. Table 4 shows the project budget and expenditure for GEF funds.

**Table 4: Project budget and expenditure (GEF funds)**

| Activity   | Budget  | Budget % allocation | Expenditure 30.06.2021 | Expenditure % allocation | Expenditure as % of budget |
|--|---------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Project personnel                                      | 162,800 | 13%                 | 130,200                | 21%                      | 80%                        |
| Consultants  | 31,000  | 2%                  | 15,233                 | 2%                       | 49%                        |
| Administrative support                                 | 34,780  | 3%                  | 26,693                 | 4%                       | 77%                        |
| Travel on official business                            | 80,000  | 6%                  | 64,901                 | 10%                      | 81%                        |
| Sub-contracts (MOUs/LOAs for supporting organizations) | 389,978 | 30%                 | 181,104                | 29%                      | 46%                        |
| Training   | 255,000 | 20%                 | 100,000                | 16%                      | 39%                        |
| Meetings/Conferences                                   | 95,995  | 7%                  | 11,025                 | 2%                       | 11%                        |
| Expendable equipment                                   | 9,000   | 1%                  | 3,642                  | 1%                       | 40%                        |
| Non - expendable equipment                             | 151,427 | 12%                 | 75,261                 | 12%                      | 50%                        |
| Operation and maintenance of equipment                 | 24,000  | 2%                  | 8,791                  | 1%                       | 37%                        |
| Reporting costs  | 10,000  | 1%                  | 4,000                  | 1%                       | 40%                        |

| Activity   | Budget           | Budget % allocation | Expenditure 30.06.2021 | Expenditure % allocation | Expenditure as % of budget |
|------------|------------------|---------------------|------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------------|
| Evaluation | 55,000           | 4%                  | 8,537                  | 1%                       | 16%                        |
|            | <b>1,298,980</b> | <b>100%</b>         | <b>629,387</b>         | <b>100%</b>              | <b>48%</b>                 |

Source: Approved budget 2016, VPO expenditure report 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021

### Co-financing

34. Project co-financing realised 48% as of 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020. The latest co-finance reports submitted and approved by UNEP are for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020. Co-finance reports for 31<sup>st</sup> December 2021 were not yet submitted by the respective co-finance partners to the VPO at the time of the MTR. Table 5 shows the status of co-financing.

Table 5: Status of co-financing

| Co-finance – In-kind    |           |                 |         |             |
|-------------------------|-----------|-----------------|---------|-------------|
| Activity                | VPO       | UNDP/UNEP - PEI | UNEP    | Total - USD |
| Budget                  | 2,900,000 | 1,200,000       | 350,000 | 4,450,000   |
| Actual                  | 1,450,000 | 511,667         | 155,000 | 2,116,667   |
| % co-financing realised | 50%       | 43%             | 44%     | 48%         |

Source: Prodoc, approved co-finance reports 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020

### Awards to Sub-contractors

35. The GEF budget included USD 389,978 (30% of the total GEF budget) as an allocation to the sub-contractors to support the implementation of the project activities. The VPO sub-contracted signed MoUs with seven partners and transferred funds worth USD 265,495 to the partners as shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Awards to sub-contractors

| Subcontractor                                   | Date MOU signed | Amount transferred | Expenditure 30.06.2021 | % Expenditure |
|---|-----------------|--------------------|------------------------|---------------|
| 1 The Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA)   | 28.04.2018      | 79,982.22          | 79,982.22              | 100%          |
| 2 National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC) | 20.04.2018      | 80,000.00          | 80,000.00              | 100%          |
| 3 Kyela District Council                        | 14.11.2017      | 21,102.65          | 4,226.00               | 20%           |
| 4 Nyasa District Council                        | 14.11.2017      | 21,102.65          | 4,224.00               | 20%           |
| 5 Makete District Council                       | 14.11.2017      | 21,102.65          | 4,224.00               | 20%           |
| 6 Mbinga District Council                       | 14.11.2017      | 21,102.65          | 4,224.00               | 20%           |
| 7 Ludewa District Council                       | 14.11.2017      | 21,102.65          | 4,224.00               | 20%           |
|   |                 | <b>265,495.47</b>  | <b>181,104.22</b>      | <b>68%</b>    |

Source: Auditor General Report 31<sup>st</sup> December 2018, Approved expenditure report 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021

36. The MoUs signed between the VPO and SUA, and VPO and NLUPC indicate that the transfer of funds between the parties will be according to the agreed terms of the MoU and that the VPO will issue lump sum payments to the project implementing partner in advance, based on the approved budget and work plan. However, the approved budget and work plan, and activity reports from the partners were not availed to the consultant for review.

37. In 2018, the VPO made funds transfer to the five District Commissions (DC) as indicated in table 5. The MOUs signed between the VPO and the DCs do not specify the amount to be transferred to the DC for the implementation of project activities. The VPO assumed that each district would implement similar activities and therefore divided the entire training budget funds and transferred them to the five districts in equal proportions. Table 5 shows that the DCs had not yet accounted for the amounts received as of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021.

### *Quality and consistency of financial reporting*

38. There have been delays from the VPO in submitting quarterly expenditure reports; the latest expenditure report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the quarter ending 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Similarly, the latest co-finance report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2020 while the latest inventory report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the year ending 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019.
39. There are Partner agreements at all levels of the project; UNEP signed a PCA with VPO Tanzania as the Executing Agency and the VPO Tanzania also signed MoUs with various Implementing Partners (IPs), as indicated in Table 5.
40. Cash disbursements from UNEP to VPO were made against an approved 'Cash Advance' request form and fund transfers from VPO to IPs were made against signed MoUs.
41. The Executing Agency (VPO) is audited annually by the Tanzania Office of the Auditor General, however, the audits are not timely. The audit reports for the years ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2018, 2019, and 2020 were issued on 30<sup>th</sup> September 2019, 31<sup>st</sup> March 2021, and 31<sup>st</sup> August 2021 respectively. The delayed issuing of the audited reports by the Auditor General's office has negatively impacted on the timely disbursement of cash requests and the timely implementation of project activities.

### *Communication between Finance and Project Management Staff*

42. The TM receives, reviews, and approves quarterly financial and technical reports from the VPO and has a strong awareness of the current financial status of the project. The FMO and TM offices are within reach, of each other and are always in touch via telephone, email, and face-to-face interactions.
43. The UNEP finance office provides guidance on reporting and training on financial management tools and templates to the Executing Agency. However, there were delays in financial reporting caused by delays by the Tanzania office of the Auditor General to execute the financial audit.

### ***Efficiency***

#### **Timeliness**

44. The project was initially planned for 3 years to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019, but has had two no-cost extensions and is expected to end on 31<sup>st</sup> December 2023. GEF approved the project as a medium sized project on May 23<sup>rd</sup>, 2016, and UNEP signed the PCA with VPO on 13<sup>th</sup> February 2017 and made the 1<sup>st</sup> disbursement to VPO on 27<sup>th</sup> April 2017.
45. Whereas the PCA was signed in February 2017, implementation of project activities was delayed by one year and started in January 2018 due to internal organisation processes. The project signed MoUs with IPs late in the implementation period (November 2017), which in turn delayed the transfer of funds to IPs.
46. Implementation was further affected by the delayed transfer of the 2<sup>nd</sup> instalment of GEF funds to the VPO. The VPO submitted the request for funds of USD 442,107 on 18<sup>th</sup> March 2019, but UNEP approved only USD 150,000 on 29<sup>th</sup> July 2019. The delayed approval and reduction in the funds requested were due to the delayed issue of the audited report by the Auditor General's office which further affected the implementation of activities.
47. The late release of project funds was the most commonly cited challenge, with no implementation for 9 months which derailed project implementation. Financial reports from Q3 2021 up to Q2 2022 were still pending submission to UNEP, despite multiple reminders and follow up meetings.

48. According to the expenditure report of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021, the VPO had fully utilized the funds advanced to the project during the quarter that ended in June 2021. However, the VPO submitted the 3<sup>rd</sup> cash advance request of USD 323,261 in January 2022 which was approved on 10<sup>th</sup> March 2022 and cash was disbursed on 13<sup>th</sup> April 2022. The delay of submission of the cash advance request was due to the delay by the VPO's office to respond to the comments raised on the reports they had submitted to UNEP. The multiple delays at each level of approval affected the project implementation period.
49. The delayed start and the delayed Auditor General's report called for the 1<sup>st</sup> no-cost extension from 31<sup>st</sup> December 2019 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2021. The project received a 2<sup>nd</sup> no-cost extension from 31<sup>st</sup> December 2021 to 31<sup>st</sup> December 2023 because implementation was further affected by the COVID-19 period.

### **1. Cost-effectiveness**

50. The EA put several strategies in place to reduce administrative costs. The project made use of existing structures at the district level working closely with the District Agricultural Offices and their extension staff in training and dissemination of project activities. Further, the project worked with existing community institutions as opposed to the establishment of new structures such existing CBOs for the sake of the project. It is these community groups that were used to provide input during the evaluation exercise.
51. The project coordination unit comprised the project coordinator, five project extension officers, a project accountant, and a project assistant who were all approved among the VPOs employees. Further, the project has five district extension officers; one in each district that was appointed by the respective District Executive Directors (DEDs). All project staff was approved by UNEP after submitting their curriculum vitae.
52. The project engaged Sokoine Agricultural University to provide radio and mobile telephone extension services in the dissemination of new technologies and responding to farmers' constraints.
53. The project has built the capacity of stakeholders based on capacity needs assessment, as such, project resources were based on targeted support to avoid duplication of services that are already provided by the government and other partners but rather focus on complimenting and building synergies. The project formed strategic partnerships with ongoing SLM-related programs such as UNDP/UNEP Poverty and Environment Initiative, WWF program on conservation of Lake Nyasa, and others.
54. The project further used existing community groups as entry points for the project to reduce the costs of community mobilisation which also strengthened community groups to ensure the sustainability of the project activities at the end of the project.

### **Value for Money**

55. The project is audited annually by the Tanzania office of the Auditor General. The VPOs office has received clean audit opinions for each of the audited three years ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2018, 2019, and 2020. The audit for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2021 has just been concluded but the Office of the Auditor General has not yet issued the audit report.
56. The Tanzania Auditor Generals' report for the year ended 31<sup>st</sup> December 2022 pointed out the constraint of inadequate budgets set aside for consultants' work, as a result of under budgeting by VPO, which affected delivery of activities in the third year of implementation, The VPO has tasked the Directorate of Procurement to ensure the project activities are undertaken within the

remaining period of the project. Some activities will be combined and carried out in collaboration with technical staff from the VPO and the project team.

## Translation of inputs into outputs

### *Budget allocation by component*

57. Components 1 and 2 were allocated 40% and 39% of the total budget of GEF funds. Component 3 was allocated 16% of the GEF funds and 5% was allocated to project management, as presented in Table 7. However, the expenditure reporting templates provided by UNEP were not designed to capture expenditure by component and hence the consultant was not able to analyse expenditure by component.

**Table 7: GEF budget by component**

| Component   | UNEP Budget line  | GEF funding      | % allocation |
|-------------|---|------------------|--------------|
| Component 1 | Strengthening capacities at the catchment level for SLM | 514,000          | 40%          |
| Component 2 | Integrated Catchment management through SLM systems     | 510,600          | 39%          |
| Component 3 | Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework             | 204,380          | 16%          |
|             | Project management                                      | 70,000           | 5%           |
|             |   | <b>1,298,980</b> | <b>100%</b>  |

### *Budget and expenditure by activity*

58. GEF funds expenditure as of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021 was USD 629,387 (48%) of GEF funds as presented in Table 5. The award to sub-contractors (IPs) accounted for the highest expenditure (29%), followed by personnel costs (21%), training (16%), and travel on official business (10%). These four activities are the main contributors to the achievement of results and all combined form 76% of the total expenditure of GEF funds.

59. The project started in January 2017 and will go on for seven years to 31st December 2023. The project had 14 outputs, of which 6 (43%) had fully achieved the mid-term targets. Four (29%) output achieved 41-60%, 3 (21%) outputs achieved 21-40% while 1 (7%) output achieved 20% and below. It is unlikely that the project will achieve its targets by December, 2023.

60. With two years remaining until the closure of the project, project personnel, administrative support, and travel on official business have already spent 80%, 77%, and 81% of their budget respectively. This is slightly above the average expenditure compared to the activities that are directly related to the project results such as training and sub-contractors. However, the project coordination unit is confident that the project expenditure will not go beyond the budget by the time the project ends, as shown in Table 5.

61. The VPO signed an MoU with the National Land Use Planning Commission (NLUPC) for the development of village land use plans in each of the 5 districts. The activity was planned for the first year of the project and the entire budget amount of USD 80,000 was advanced to NLUPC. Accordingly, the activity was concluded by December 2018.

62. The VPO signed an MoU with the Sokoine University of Agriculture (SUA) for the development and implementation of radio and mobile-based extension services. The activity was planned for the first year of the project and the entire budget amount of USD 80,000 was advanced to SUA. The activity was concluded by December 2018.

63. The VPO further signed MoUs with each of the five District councils of Kyela, Nyasa, Makete, Mbinga and Ludewa for the administration of the project components relevant to their respective administrative areas. According to the expenditure report of 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021, the district councils accounted for only 20% of the funds advanced to them in 2018 (Table 6).



### **Cost saving strategies**

64. The project employed several cost saving strategies during implementation. For instance, the district provided field cars and at times fuel for activities to continue; and used the government staff instead of hiring technical personnel. The project chose to take only the group leaders for exchange visits as opposed to facilitating all group members, however, this may have an implication on the quality of project delivery.
65. Further, the districts deployed the district extension officers to engage the community in their respective areas for ease of reach, as opposed to inviting them to the district. Some activities were carried out without using project funds; for example, during construction of fishponds, communities offered labour in kind.
66. Project staff travelled for fieldwork using burses or motorcycles from the district, and not the project vehicle.

### **F. Monitoring and Reporting**

**Monitoring and reporting were rated unsatisfactory.**

#### *1. Monitoring Design and Budgeting*

67. The project had an M&E plan that guided the overall M&E processes from design to evaluation. The project had a results framework with outcome indicators and targets. Project data for some indicators were not disaggregated by sex and by vulnerable groups of people. Additionally, some of the reported data was inconsistent with indicator statements. For instance, percentages were reported for indicators that were stated as numbers.
68. The mechanisms put in place to monitor project achievements included half-yearly technical reporting, quarterly financial reporting, periodic partner meetings, Project Implementation Review (PIR) report, steering committee meetings as well as annual co-financing reporting. At the district level, quarterly District Steering Committee (DSC) meetings were held regularly to review activity implementation. However, some partners reported not being involved in project monitoring activities due to inadequate resources such as fuel and vehicles to conduct site visits.

*"...We have not participated in monitoring yet, however, VPO was always going to the field to monitor progress, and we were preparing weekly progress reports",* reported one partner KI respondent.

69. The MTR also noted that the overall Project Advisory Committee (PAC) had met only once and there were no signed minutes of the PAC meeting.
70. The CEO ER and the project document did not have a Theory of Change (ToC), a reconstructed ToC has been included. The M&E budget was embedded in the program budget, the itemised budget only included the mid-term and terminal evaluation budget. It was pointed out that partners did not have adequate financial resources to facilitate routine monitoring of project activities. The project has an M&E focal person at VPO, who is in charge of recording data, data quality control, processing, analysis and reporting.

#### *2. Monitoring of Implementation*

71. Data flows from DLGAs to the VPO M&E focal person for aggregation and collation and is submitted to UNEP. Monitoring activities performed included, the preparation of technical and financial reports. The project also performed data cleaning, field monitoring by DLGA staff and organised partner (technical) meetings and district steering committee meetings.



### *3. Project Reporting*

#### *Technical Reporting*

72. The VPO submitted technical reports such as the Project Implementation Review (PIR) Reports and half-yearly technical reports to UNEP. However, reports for 2021 and 2022 were missing. The MTR also observed that the half yearly technical template by UNEP does not include a provision for gender disaggregation, thus need for UNEP to revise the reporting templates to capture gender-disaggregated data. The PIR reports for some relevant indicators also missed gender-disaggregated data.

#### *Financial Reporting*

73. The project manager submits partner reports to the UNEP Finance Assistant who reviews the reports and submits them to the task manager, after which reports are submitted to the FMO. The MTR observed delays from VPO in submitting quarterly expenditure reports; the latest expenditure report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the quarter ending 30<sup>th</sup> June 2021. Similarly, the latest co-finance report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the year ending 31 December 2020 while the latest inventory report submitted and approved by UNEP was for the year ending 31 December 2019.

#### *4. Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meetings*

74. According to the project document, the PAC was meant to meet at least twice a year within the project area to review project progress. The duties of the PAC were to:

- Provide high-level orientation and guidance for the project (institutional, political and operational);
- Ensure collaboration between implementing institutions;
- Reassess the progress and ensure that the project process is on track
- Endorse progress and other technical reports
- Review initial project outputs and project progress and address constraints;
- Ensure the integration and coordination of project activities with other related government and donor-funded initiatives;
- Explore opportunities for resource mobilization to ensure the sustainability of project initiatives.

75. According to the PAC minutes received by the MTR, only one meeting was held on 11<sup>th</sup> August 2017 and the meeting minutes provided to the MTR were not signed and not approved by the meeting Chair. It is through regular PAC meetings that project implementation is effectively monitored, and all partners are well coordinated and updated/informed of project management issues. Non-regular PSC meetings meant non-regular monitoring of project interventions by the PAC members.

#### **Data Use**

76. Project performance data was used for decision making. For instance, the project conducted the farmer household survey and the data obtained was used to benchmark climate-smart activities practised by farmers and prioritised income generating activities for households. The DLGAs further used project data to determine challenges faced by different implementation area and come up remedies for varying issues.

## G. Sustainability

**The project sustainability was satisfactory.**

### Socio-political Sustainability

77. Social or political factors support the continuation and further development of the project's direct outcomes. These factors include the supportive political leaders starting from the VPOs office to the Parliament, LGA leaders and village governments. These political leaders convinced local communities to embrace the project, which has led to increased community involvement and ownership. For instance, communities were heavily engaged during land use planning to define and demarcate land for grazing and that for cultivation. Political stability in the country further creates a conducive environment for project implementation. Several registered groups supported by the project will continue since they established joint economic activities that they earn from, such as tree nursery beds and beehives.
78. The government and other stakeholders exhibited a high level of ownership, interest and commitment, which are likely to take the project achievements forward. The farmers and LGAs demonstrated project ownership and interest through high-level voluntary participation and knowing the project's objectives, interventions and expected outcomes. The LGs, village leaders and community members further demonstrated their interest in the project by scaling up the project independently.
79. The Lake Nyasa Board is very committed to implementing the project, the board actively participated in providing the necessary guidance. The board provided technical oversight and guidance to the project.
80. The LGAs reported having the required technical capacity to continue project interventions. The district strengthened their capacity to conduct FFS activities. However, they pointed out that the financial resources are limited since the budgets are insufficient to fuel cars and produce materials, since environmental issues are not prioritised within LGAs.

*"Environmental issues are not prioritised within the government and LGAs. The national priorities are education and health", lamented one LGA respondent, Ludewa District.*

### Financial Sustainability

81. Respondents were asked to identify results that require financial resources to sustain them, and they pointed out the formation of more water user associations to conserve and protect the water sources, starting up alternative sources of income as people wait for trees to mature, capacity strengthening, implementing activities with tangible results, equipment such as bee hives and packaging materials.
82. Some of the mentioned financial resources that could continue the project work included the women's and special groups fund at the district level and the availability of low-interest rate funds from financial institutions of about 9% per annum.

### Institutional Sustainability

83. The project is embedded within government ministries and establishments. Tanzania has supportive policies, laws, and plans that favour the continuation of results. These include the Integrated Water Resource Management Plan (2015-2035), which has similar activities. The Environmental Act prohibits any activities within 60 meters of the water sources. The Forest Policy Implementation Strategy, the Ministry of Environment Strategic Plan and the Water Act of 2009 are also in place. However, limited funding was said to be curtailing the implementation these policies, laws, and plans.

84. The LGAs reported having the technical capacity to support these interventions. The personnel on the ground, such as project extension officers, were reported to possess the relevant technical capacity, although they did not have enough financial resources to do their jobs. At the village level, village teams were also trained in environmental conservation, though not all villages and people were covered.
85. However, it was mentioned that capacity strengthening and changing practices take time; hence there should be continuous scaling up capacity building at the community level. Stakeholders also pointed out the need for more awareness creation for high-level stakeholders such as a members of the Parliament, commissioners and ministers who make the decisions.
86. The MTR also noted that the project does not have a standalone and comprehensive project exit strategy. A comprehensive project exit strategy is essential in elaborating systematic and phased exit interventions and should be disseminated to all key stakeholders to prepare them for the project exit.

#### 4.0 Factors Affecting Performance

**Factors affecting performance were ranked moderately satisfactory.**

##### 1. Preparation Readiness

87. All necessary preparatory processes and procedures were in place. Essential project documents was prepared such as the Project Document and the CEO ER. An inception meeting was held, although an inception report or minutes of the inception meeting were not availed to the consultant. The costed work plan was developed with appropriate detail. The project established a PAC to provide overall project oversight, although the PAC meetings were not regular.
88. Measures were taken to implement proposal review committee recommendations or respond to contextual changes between project approval, securing of funds and project mobilisation, resulting in approval of the CEO ER.

##### 2. Quality of Project Management and Supervision

89. The project had a steering committee in place know as PAC to provide overall oversight of the project. However, according to the project document, the PAC was supposed to meet at least twice a year within the project area, but only one meeting has been held so far and the minutes shared were not signed by the committee chairperson and thus not approved. This, therefore, indicates that irregular meetings, which limited regular project monitoring.
90. The VPO reported that the project management worked well with the TM and had continuous consultations and interaction. The MoUs were signed between the VPO and implementing partners specifying clear roles in the implementation of project activities. There was no reported staff turnover other than in one district, where one extension officer was on study leave and the project recruited a new officer, the transition was managed well.
91. The VPO signed an MoU with partner institutions stipulating their roles and responsibilities. The MoUs ensured clarity of roles and eliminated duplication of efforts.
92. Although the MTR did not conduct a staff capacity assessment for partners, the project management team reported that all project staff had adequate capacity aligned with project requirements and assigned roles and responsibilities. Project staff were appropriately located in different localities, and would move to support where needed.

### 3. Stakeholder's Participation Cooperation

93. Analysis of stakeholder groups was done before implementation began at the project design stage. The district technical staff, as well as project beneficiaries, were consulted through district and village council meetings. The communities reported receiving adequate information on project progress.
94. The project had direct linkages to poverty alleviation that aimed at improving household income, for instance, IGAs such as beekeeping, and fish farming have boosted the incomes of households.

*"Our families' well-being is changing, for instance, our incomes have increased, and we can take our children to school" reported an FGD participant Kyela District.*

### 4. Responsiveness to Human Rights and Gender Equity

95. The project design, implementation and monitoring took into consideration possible gender inequalities and human rights in access to, and control over, natural resources. The project targeted a 50% balance of females and males, such as in farmer group membership and leadership composition.

*"They (males and females) got the equal opportunity, our group secretary is a lady, and our group it has 13 females and 12 males. Ladies are more active in the group, because men want quick money", remarked one FGD respondent, Kyela District.*

96. It was however pointed out by FGD respondents that although the project encouraged males and female to join, some men were reluctant to release their wives to join as indicated in the quote below:

*"Some men stop them (wives) from being involved in project activities. They think they will be engaged in the project and get rich and stop being submissive to the husbands", reported one male FGD respondent, Ludewa District.*

### 5. Country Ownership Driven-ness

97. There was evidence that essential implementing partners took a leadership role through the provision of in-kind and cash co-financing contributions such as personnel, office space, salaries, stationery, utilities, communication and travel expenses. The DLGAs often provided vehicles to take staff to the field and at times some fuel to facilitate continuity of implementation.

### 6. Communication and Public Awareness

98. The project conducted public awareness through village council meetings, and periodic partner meetings, although no meeting minutes were shared as evidence if these meetings happened. Communication channels such as the use of information, education and communication (IEC) materials such as fliers were used. Additionally radios, telephone calls, SMSs and door to door mobilisation by community leaders were used as knowledge dissemination channels to various stakeholders.

*"We get information through village meetings and radio announcements. The information reaches everyone in the village," noted an FGD respondent.*

## 5.0 Conclusions, Lessons Learnt and Recommendations

### 5.1 Conclusions

99. The overall rating of the project was moderately satisfactory. The project had 14 outputs, of which 6 (43%) had fully achieved the mid-term targets. This indicates a high likelihood of not achieving some of the outputs even after the extension, hence necessitating a further no-cost extension. The technical capacities of partners seem to be adequate to deliver the project results but they were slowed down by several internal and external factors. Internal factors included late on-boarding of partners hence delayed start of implementation, lack of timely submission of narrative and financial reports by the project resulting into delayed disbursement of funds, lack of close project monitoring by the PAC and TM, and delayed Auditor General’s audit report. External factors which slowed down the implementation rate and achievement of results included snow and dry spell in some districts destroying tree seedlings and crops, heavy rains and floods, and COVID-19 related restrictions on congregation and movement.
100. The project efficiency and financial spending were rated moderately satisfactory. The delayed project start, release of funds and lack of timely submission of reports negatively affected the project’s efficiency. The multiple delays at each level of approval affected the project implementation period.
101. The project interventions are likely to be sustainable since the project utilised existing structures at the national, district and community levels. The country has a supportive legal and policy framework. Social or political factors support the continuation and further development of the project’s direct outcomes. Tanzania has supportive political leaders starting from the VPOs office to the Parliament, LGA leaders and village governments. Political stability in the country further creates a conducive environment for project implementation.
102. The registered groups that were supported by the project established joint economic activities which will keep them together. The government and communities exhibited a high level of ownership, interest and commitment, through active participation at all stages and scaling up the project independently. The LGAs reported having the required technical capacity to continue project interventions, though financial resources are minimal, hence limited continuity.

#### 5.1.1 Summary MTR Rating by Criteria

103. The overall project rating was moderately satisfactory. The low performance was particularly under output delivery, financial management, efficiency and monitoring and Reporting, as summarised in Table 8.

Table 8: Summary of MTR Rating by Criteria

| Criterion              | Summary Assessment   | Rating       |
|------------------------|--|--------------|
| A. Strategic Relevance | <p>The project is well aligned to the UNEP’s mandate and MTS, POW BD-4: Mainstream biodiversity conservation and sustainable use in production landscapes and seascapes and production sectors and UN Environment’s policies and strategic priorities. The project document presents a clear alignment and relevance to UN Environment /GEF/strategic priorities. The project is consistent with the ecosystem management thematic priorities, the project will specifically contribute to the achievement of Expected Accomplishment (EA): To promote the scaling up of sustainable land management (SLM) practices and securing livelihoods of smallholder farmers in selected districts within Lake Nyasa Basin. The project is consistent and responsive to the GEF strategic long-term objective</p> <p>The project addresses the environmental concerns and needs of the communities. The project addresses the environmental challenges such as the changes in land use in catchment areas which results in erosion and washing</p> | Satisfactory |

| Criterion  | Summary Assessment   | Rating                           |
|--|--|----------------------------------|
|  | of nutrient inputs to the lake, as well as restoring the forest cover in the Lake Nyasa catchment  |                                  |
| <b>B. Quality of Project Design</b>                                  | Key project documents were prepared such as the Prodoc and CEO ER. The project document includes a logical framework, work plan analysis of external context, and problem statement. However, the project document did not include the theory of change.   | <b>Satisfactory</b>              |
| <b>C. Nature of External Context</b>                                 | Key infrastructure such as internet, telephone and the road network were generally favourable, and the project had strong political support. Several factors occurred in the external context and negatively affected project implementation. These included heavy rains, floods; snow, and COVID-19 restrictions on movement and gathering during 2020 and 2021.  | <b>Moderately Favourable</b>     |
| <b>D. Effectiveness</b>  | The project had 14 outputs, of which 6 (43%) had fully achieved the mid-term targets. Four (29%) output achieved 41-60%, 3 (21%) outputs achieved 21-40% while 1 (7%) output achieved 20% and below.   | <b>Moderately Unsatisfactory</b> |
| <b>E. Financial Management</b>                                       |  |                                  |
| 1. <i>Rate of spending</i>   | The overall project budget is US\$5,748,980, comprising US\$1,298,980 (23%) from GEF and US\$4,450,000 (77%) from co-financing. The budget is analysed by component and activity and was appended to the PCA. Components 1 and 2 were allocated almost equal proportions of the budget (40% and 39% respectively), while component 3 was allocated 16% and 5% was allocated to administration. The expenditure rate of GEF funds was 48% as of 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2021.   | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>   |
| 2. <i>Quality and consistency of financial reporting</i>             | There were several delays in submitting quarterly expenditure reports by the VPO; the latest expenditure report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the quarter ending 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2021. Similarly, the latest co-finance report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the year ending 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2020 while the latest inventory report submitted and approved by UNEP is for the year ending 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2019. The Executing Agency (VPO) is audited annually by the Tanzania Office of the Auditor General, however, the audits are not timely. The latest audit was for the year ended 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2019 and the report was issued on 31 March 2021.   | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>   |
| 3. <i>Communication Between Finance and Project Management Staff</i> | The PM receives, reviews and approves quarterly financial and technical reports from the VPO and has strong awareness of the current financial status of project. The FMO and TM offices are within reach to each other and are always in touch via telephone, email and face to face interactions. The UNEP Finance office provides guidance on reporting and training and financial management tools and templates to the Executing Agency. There were however some delays in financial reporting caused by delays by the Tanzania office of Auditor General to execute the financial audit.   | <b>Satisfactory</b>              |
| <b>F. Efficiency</b>   | The project was initially planned for 3 years ending 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2019 but has had two no-cost extensions and is expected to end on 31 <sup>st</sup> December 2023. GEF approved the project as a Medium sized project on May 23, 2016, and UNEP signed the PCA with VPO on 13 <sup>th</sup> February 2017 and made the 1 <sup>st</sup> disbursement to VPO on 27 <sup>th</sup> April 2017. Whereas the PCA was signed in February 2017, implementation of project activities was delayed by one year and started in January 2018 due to internal VPO organisation processes. The project signed an MoU with IPs late in November 2017. Implementation was further affected by the delayed transfer of the 2 <sup>nd</sup> instalment of GEF funds to the VPO. The VPO submitted the request for funds of USD 442,107 on 18 <sup>th</sup> March 2019, but UNEP approved only USD 150,000 on 29 <sup>th</sup> July 2019. According to the expenditure report of 30 <sup>th</sup> June 2021, the VPO had fully utilized the funds advanced to the project during the quarter that ended in June 2021. However, the VPO submitted the 3 <sup>rd</sup> cash advance request of USD 323,261 in January 2022 but this was only approved on 10 <sup>th</sup> March 2022 and cash was disbursed on 13 <sup>th</sup> April 2022. The multiple delays at each level of approval affected the project implementation period. | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b>   |
| <b>G. Monitoring and Reporting</b>                                   | The project document includes a results framework with outcomes and respective indicators and targets. The MTR observed non-compliance to narrative reporting timelines, bi-annual reports for 2021 and 2022 were missing. According to the PAC minutes received by the MTR, only one PAC meeting was held on 11 <sup>th</sup> August 2017 and the meeting minutes provided to the MTR were not signed and not approved by the chair. It is through regular PAC  | <b>Unsatisfactory</b>            |

| Criterion                               | Summary Assessment   | Rating                         |
|---|--|--------------------------------|
|   | meetings that project implementation is effectively monitored, and all partners are well coordinated and updated/informed of project management issues. Non-regular PSC meetings impacted negatively on the project monitoring.  |                                |
| <b>H. Sustainability</b>                | <p>Social or political factors support the continuation and further development of the project's direct outcomes. These factors include the supportive political leaders starting from the VPOs office, parliament to LGA leaders and village governments. The project was embedded within government ministries and establishments. Tanzania has supportive policies, laws, and plans that support the continuation of results.</p> <p>The project interventions are likely to be sustainable since the project utilised existing national and district local government authority structures and other government institutions including universities and commissions and ministries that will continue providing services. The project strengthened the capacity of DLGAs, on SLM to carry out project interventions. However, there was no standalone and comprehensive project exit strategy.</p> | <b>Satisfactory</b>            |
| <b>I. Factors Affecting Performance</b> | All necessary preparatory processes and procedures were in place. However, the project was affected by several factors including delayed release of funds, non-regular project monitoring, and supervision, external factors and COVID-19 lockdown.  | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b> |
| <b>Overall Project Rating</b>           | <b>Average of the ratings above</b>  | <b>Moderately Satisfactory</b> |



## 5.2 Lessons Learned

6.0 The lessons learnt and the context within which they were learnt are presented in Table 9.

Table 9: Lessons Learned

| No. | Lessons Learned  | The Context in which the Lesson was Learned or Can be Applied  |
|-----|--|--|
| 1.  | The active involvement of the communities and IPs in project design, implementation and monitoring enhances the achievement of outputs and increases project ownership.  | Communities are ready to accept changes and own the project if involved in project activities  |
| 2.  | A project may be implemented within budget, but not efficient when it is implemented way beyond the planned time. Additionally, timely disbursement of funds and timely financial reporting/accountability improve efficiency.             | When a project takes longer than planned, unanticipated changes happen to the different resources such as changes in personnel and finances. Delayed implementation negatively affects the realisation of expected project benefits. The project manager should ensure adherence to project timelines for improved efficiency. |
| 3.  | Good political will at national, district and institutional levels fosters sustainability through resource allocation and integration into institutional work plans.   | The political will is key in creating an enabling environment and the political buy-in is critical for all project implementers to foster not only the involvement of government officials and key institutions in their interventions but spearheading project activities and incorporating them into their work plans.       |
| 4.  | Project interventions yield more results if customised or tailored to specific area/village needs as was done under this project.  | Interventions should vary since different communities have landscapes and different water resources.   |
| 5.  | The use of mixed communication platforms and materials by this project such as village meetings, radios and flyers widened the reach of communities.   | Mixed communication platforms and materials ensure that different audience segments are targeted differently which leads to effective communication.   |
| 6.  | Partnerships and collaborations with other government programs and NGOs potentially reduces duplication and enhance synergies, effectiveness and efficiency. At implementation level, the project had very minimal partnerships with NGOs. | The MTR established that there are other existing SLM initiatives for instance along Songwe River Basin, and other government initiations that were not closely collaborating with this project at implementation level.   |

## 5.3 Recommendations

7.0 Based on the MTR findings of after coupled with the analysis of the information provided, challenges, gaps and suggestions for improvements made by key stakeholders, the following recommendations were arrived at. The consultant further used knowledge of evaluating similar projects in the region to make actionable recommendations. The recommendations made are towards improving project design, achievement of project results, improving compliance and reporting, financial management as well as management and communication, as reflected in Table 10.

Table 10: Recommendations

| No.                    | Finding/Challenge  | Recommendations  |
|------------------------|--|--|
| <b>Project design</b>  |  |  |
| i.                     | Limited inclusion of NGOs in project implementation as pointed out by district level key stakeholders.   | Increase active participation of NGOs in project implementation, for instance in community mobilisation and sensitisation. This may involve partnerships in implementing interventions or letting them implement some activities. <b>Responsibility:</b> VPO (Project Coordinator). <b>Timeline:</b> December 2022 |
| ii.                    | Minimal inclusion of tangible benefits to farmers in the project design, such as irrigation equipment, start-up capital for IGAs, apiculture equipment, fingerlings, and fishnets. | Provide more tangible benefits to enable farmers such as irrigation equipment, start-up capital for alternative IGAs, apiculture equipment, fingerlings, and fishnets. <b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP, VPO (Project Coordinator) and DLGAs (District Executive Director). <b>Timeline:</b> December 2022              |
| <b>Project results</b> |  |  |



| No.  | Finding/Challenge   | Recommendations  |
|--|---|--|
| iii.   | Limited achievements against targets, only 6 (43%) outputs had fully achieved the mid-term targets, which indicates a high likelihood of not achieving end of project targets even after the latest no-cost extension ending in December 2023, hence necessitating a further no-cost extension.   | Issue a further no-cost extension for one year to enable realisation of project output and outcome targets.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP<br><b>Timeline:</b> June 2023   |
| iv.  | Heavy reliance on government officials to supplement the work of the project officers, yet they were pre-occupied with other government responsibilities. The districts had only one project extension officer.   | Revise the budget and provide for more staff fully dedicated to and paid by the project to speed up implementation.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP<br><b>Timeline:</b> December 2022   |
| v.   | Widespread forest and land degradation due to heavy reliance on natural resources for livelihood.   | Strengthen inter-sectoral and inter-project collaboration. Promote alternative IGAs such as fish farming, beekeeping, improved cooking stoves, farming as a business and the like. Provide seed capital to organised community groups and link the farmers to markets. Partner with NGOs to scale-up conservation in communities. Facilitate exchange visits across groups for learning. Support establishment of more tree nursery beds for grafting fruit trees and planting woodlots.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO<br><b>Timeline:</b> ongoing |
| vi.  | Community level respondents pointed out that the FFS groups under Output 2.1.4 mainly focused on creating awareness and training which had no tangible outputs.   | Provide more tangible outputs such as start-up capital and strengthen saving and bulk marketing of products for enhanced cohesion and sustainability.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO (Project Coordinator)<br><b>Timeline:</b> December 2023  |
| vii.   | Only 20 villages (15 new villages, 3 per district and 5 existing ones) out of 96 villages in targeted districts had conducted land use planning ( <i>Output 1.1.2</i> ).  | Scale up land use planning to all 96 villages to strengthen conservation and natural resources and minimise land conflicts.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> DLGAs (District Executive Director).<br><b>Timeline:</b> December 2023   |
| viii.  | Limited access to credit to boost IGAs due to lack of collateral, particularly for women.   | Link farmers to providers of low interest credit services to boost their IGAs and promote group level savings and credit schemes.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> DLGAs (District Executive Director) <b>Timeline:</b> December 2023.  |
| <b>Monitoring and Evaluation, and Compliance</b> |   |  |
| ix.  | Non-regular monitoring of project interventions. Inadequate routine monitoring budget. Non-regular PSC meetings and lack of signed PSC minutes.   | Conduct regular and close project monitoring, including field monitoring visits and participate in PSC meetings.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> Task Manager,<br><b>Timeline:</b> Semi-annually<br><br>Revise the budget and locate funds for routine project monitoring. Hold bi-annual PSC meetings, with the TM in attendance and ensure that minutes are signed.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO (Project Coordinator) and Task Manager.<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediately for the budget; semi-annually for PSC meetings                           |
| x.   | Reporting in the PIR was not consistent with indicator statements (numbers versus percentages).   | The PIR reporting should either be consistent with indicator statements or the project should revise indicators and seek TM approval.<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO (Project Coordinator).<br><b>Timeline:</b> On-going  |
| <b>Financial management</b>                      |   |  |
| xi.  | Delayed disbursements of funds by UNEP to the VPO due to the delayed issue of the Audit report by the Auditor General, which affected the smooth implementation of activities.<br><br>The late release of project funds was the most commonly cited challenge, with no implementation for 9 months which derailed project implementation. | Make a budget revision and cater for external auditor costs.<br><br>Adhere to the project reporting timelines as specified in the signed Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA).<br><br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO Project Coordinator<br><b>Timelines:</b> Immediately for budget revision; quarterly for reports.   |

| No.                        | Finding/Challenge  | Recommendations  |
|----------------------------|--|--|
|                            | Financial reports from Q3 2021 up to Q2 2022 were still pending submission despite multiple reminders and follow up meetings.  |  |
| xii.                       | The VPO did not submit expenditure reports during periods of non-activity (Q3, Q4 of 2021, and Q1 and Q2 of 2022).   | Provide specific training on the project deliverables and expectations.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP Finance Management Officer (FMO),<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediately for training<br><br>Comply with contractual reporting timelines for narrative and financial reports and submit a NIL reports during inactivity times.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO Finance Officer. <b>Timeline:</b> Quarterly |
| xiii.                      | The UNEP expenditure templates are not designed to capture expenditure by component, hence it was not possible to analyse expenditure by component.  | For follow on projects, revise the expenditure reporting templates that are aligned to the budget template for proper capture of data and analysis.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> UNEP<br><b>Timeline:</b> At the project design stage   |
| xiv.                       | The project experienced periods of inefficiencies. The PCA was signed in February 2017, but the implementation of project activities started in January 2018 due to internal organisational processes. | During project design, factor in the time (six months) for internal organisational processes during the project design. E.g. office setup, contracting, recruitment, etc.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> TM.<br><b>Timeline:</b> At the project design stage and PCA signing stage  |
| xv.                        | The MoUs signed between the VPO and various IPs do not specify the amount to be transferred to the respective IPs to implement project activities.   | Develop contract amendments for IPs specifying specific deliverables and the amount due to them. All fund transfers are to be supported by a signed MoU, approved work plan and approved budget.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO Project Coordinator.<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediate  |
| xvi.                       | The current increase in fuel prices, which is almost double the amount budgeted is likely to affect project implementation.  | Revise the budgets and factor in the increased fuel prices and submit them to the TM for approval.<br>Increase co-financing to cater for such eventualities.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> Project Coordinator.<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediate  |
| <b>Sustainability</b>      |  |  |
| xvii.                      | Some elements require funds to scale them up, such as developing land use plans, training FFSs, scaling-up community sensitisation and monitoring.   | Develop comprehensive plans for environmental conservation and use them to mobilise funds from funding agencies.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> LGAs.<br><b>Timeline:</b> March 2023  |
| xviii.                     | Limited funds for environmental issues at the ministry and LGA levels.   | Prioritise environmental issues in plans and budgets to co-finance some activities.<br>Lobby and advocate for increased prioritisation of environmental issues in national and LGA budgets.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> LGAs.<br><b>Timeline:</b> Next budgeting cycle   |
| xix.                       | Some of the existing farmer groups not formally registered which hinders sustainability and access to other funding opportunities.   | Support formalisation of farmer groups so that they develop constitutions and register as Community Based Organisations (CBOs) at sub-county level.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> VPO Project Coordinator<br><b>Timeline:</b> Immediate.   |
| <b>Crosscutting issues</b> |  |  |
| xx.                        | Lack of a gender mainstreaming strategy.   | Develop a comprehensive gender mainstreaming strategy to ensure equity participation.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> Project Coordinator.<br><b>Timeline:</b> December 2022.  |
| xxi.                       | Some men do not allow their wives to participate in FFS. Some women have very low esteem and are reluctant to participate in group work and IGAs.  | Scale up community sensitisation of men using model women, cultural and religious leaders.<br>Support families to develop joint family visions and regularly review and discuss progress as couples.<br>Scale-up esteem building for females.<br><b>Responsibility:</b> IPs.<br><b>Timeline:</b> ongoing.  |

Annex 1A: Output Indicator Performance Tracking Table

| Project objective and Outcomes   | Indicator   | Baseline level | Mid-term target                          | End-of-project target                   | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022   | Percentage achievement of midterm target | Progress rating <sup>1</sup> |
|--|---|----------------|--|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| <b>Objective: To promote the scaling up of sustainable land management (SLM) practices and securing livelihoods of smallholder farmers in selected districts within Lake Nyasa Basin</b> | Increase in proportion of farmers using appropriate SLM practices | 0%             | 20%                                      | 30%                                     | About 375 members of farmers groups are using appropriate SLM practices within the project areas. However, there many people who are not part of the group who adopting SLM practices due to efforts of the project in Secondary and Primary Schools. This include teachers and pupils who are transferring the knowledge in their areas where they come from. |  | S                            |
|  | Increase in the area put under SLM                                | 10,000 ha      | 30,000 ha                                | 60,000 ha                               | The Land area under SLM has increased to 35,000ha in Kyela, Mbinga, Makete, Ludewa and Nyasa Districts.  | 50%                                      | S                            |
| <b>Outcome 1: Catchment capacity to provide ecosystem services enhanced</b>  | Increase in water catchment area (ha) under SLM                   | 10,000         | 30,000                                   | 60,000                                  | Consultant is in place to undertake the assignment   | 10%                                      | S                            |
| Output 1.1.1: Conduct baseline mapping and assessment of land use activities in targeted districts   | Number of water catchments mapped                                 | 0              | 5 critical sub-catchments mapped         | 12 critical sub-catchments mapped       | 3 water user association will be established in critical sub-catchments, one (1) water user association already functioning in Ludewa District. Two water users will be strengthened in Mbinga and Nyasa Districts   | 60%                                      | S                            |
| 1.1.2 Catchment and Village Land Use plans developed   | No of village land use plans developed within the project         | 5 VLUPs        | 20 VLUPs (15 new VLUPs / 3 per district) | New 15 VLUPs developed / 3 per district | The assignment is Completed  | 100%                                     | HS                           |

<sup>1</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

| Project objective and Outcomes  | Indicator  | Baseline level | Mid-term target                             | End-of-project target  | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022   | Percentage achievement of midterm target | Progress rating <sup>1</sup> |
|---|--|----------------|---|--|--|--|------------------------------|
| <b>Output 1.2:</b><br>Enhanced capacity of local and national stakeholders, including communities and institutions, to sustainably manage natural resources and to resolve land use conflicts | Number of key stakeholders facilitated                         | 1%             | 5 key stakeholders facilitated              | 4 key stakeholders facilitated   | The District Authorities from five Districts, Primary and Secondary schools, Farmers groups and water user associations have been facilitated for SLM of their respective areas. For instance, Tree Nurseries has been established in all five District authorities to be planted in their areas of jurisdictions. Five Schools in each district have been provided 500 tree seedlings to be planted in their areas. | 100%                                     | S                            |
|   | No of key stakeholders assessed                                | 0              | 5 key stakeholders assessed                 | 8 key stakeholders assessed  | <i>Need Assessment for appropriate provision of Awareness training conducted to all five Districts. For instance, stakeholders assessed included Itete Prison in Ludewa, Farmers in all districts, Schools in all districts, Artisanal for coal and sand miners in Mbinga, Nyasa and Makete, Paddy farmers in Kyela, and Fishers groups in Kyela, Ludewa and Nyasa.</i>  | 100%                                     | S                            |
|   | No. of farmers reached with the project (disaggregated by sex) | 0              | 10,000 people (5,000 male and 5,000 female) | 10,000 people (5,000 male and 5,000 female)  | Men and women Facilitators for Farmers Field Schools trained on forest as business activity and Crops circulation to improve soil fertility in Kihuru, Lituhi, Lundo and Mtupale   | 100%                                     | HS                           |
| No. of School reached in environmental awareness  | 0  | 100 Schools    | 100 Schools                                 | <i>At least 20 schools from each 5 districts implementing the projects are involved in environmental awareness. Total of 220 farmers were reached on which 115 were female and 105 were male</i> |  | HS                                       |                              |

| Project objective and Outcomes  | Indicator   | Baseline level  | Mid-term target                              | End-of-project target  | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022   | Percentage achievement of midterm target | Progress rating <sup>1</sup> |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|--|------------------------------|
|   | No of staff trained (disaggregated by sex)  | 20  | 40 District staff trained                    | 80 District staff trained (60 additional staff trained: 30 male and 30 female) | 15 Farmers groups established trained and supported with agricultural implements such as beehives, Plank, fishing net, and improved seeds.<br><br>(60 additional staff trained: 30 male and 30 female)   | 150%                                     | HS                           |
| <b>Outcome 2.1: Improved land productivity and community living standards</b> | Percent increase in land productivity   | 0   | 10%  | 30%  | Group training on forest as business and crops circulation in order to improve soil fertility. The land productivity will result due to proper practices and training received by groups   | 20%                                      | HS                           |
| <b>Output 2.1.1</b>   | No of alternative income generating activities (IGA) opportunities created in the project | 0 Income generating activities created by the Project | 5 Income generating activities created (IGA) | 9 Income generating activities created (IGA)                                   | Considering each district geographical location, its environment, social, physical and people's opinions the following IGAs were practiced and facilitated by the project. For instance, making of efficient cooking stoves and briquette in Mbinga and Nyasa Districts of which about 290 Cooking Stoves were made and utilised by communities in those areas; Establishment of tree nurseries in Makete Districts on which farmers now are realising the avocado production; Cocoa and palm oil value addition in Kyela district; Beekeeping and Climate Smart Agriculture in Cashew-nut production in Ludewa, Kyela and Makete. | 100%                                     | S                            |

| Project objective and Outcomes  | Indicator  | Baseline level  | Mid-term target   | End-of-project target   | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022   | Percentage achievement of midterm target | Progress rating <sup>1</sup> |
|---|--|---|---|---|--|--|------------------------------|
| Output 2.1.2<br><br>Output 2.1.3  | Acreage of land under SLM<br><br>Acreage of catchment area rehabilitated/conserved in the project  | 10,000 ha at baseline<br><br>0ha at the baseline        | 30,000 ha of cultivated land under SLM<br><br>25,000 ha of degraded lake catchment area rehabilitated | 60,000 ha of cultivated land under SLM<br><br>50,000 ha of degraded lake catchment area rehabilitated / conserved | Reforestation programs through establishment of ten 12 tree nurseries conducted in five Districts on which the project is implemented 20, 000 ha of cultivated land is under SLM<br><br>Baseline survey has identified and five districts have rehabilitated/conserved 25,000 ha   | 60%<br><br>100%                          | S                            |
| Output 2.1.4<br><br>Output 2.1.5  | Area of arable land under the implementation of conservation agriculture (agroforestry practices)<br><br>No. of artisanal miners trained in sustainable practices<br><br>Acreage of land rehabilitated | 0 ha at the baseline<br><br>0 miners trained<br><br>0ha | 25,000 ha<br><br>50 artisanal miners trained<br><br>5,000ha   | 50,000 ha<br><br>100 artisanal miners trained in sustainable practices<br><br>10,000ha                            | Exotic and Indigenous tree nursery has been established and managed. The total of 25,000 ha area of arable land is in some form of SLM Practices within the project area<br><br>Areas in Nyasa and Mbinga Districts have trained 50 (35 male, 15 female) miners and rehabilitated the areas which were used by artisanal miners by planting trees on abandoned land.<br><br>The total land area of 5,000ha in Ludewa, Nyasa, and Mbinga Districts were rehabilitated | 100%<br><br>100%<br><br>100%             | S                            |
| Outcome 2.2. Reduced land degradation, improved soil health and increased productivity of agro-ecosystems | % Reduction in soil erosion in pilot areas<br><br>% Reduction in sediment load in pilot areas  | 0% reduction<br><br>0 % reduction                       | 5 % reduction<br><br>5 % reduction  | 10 % reduction<br><br>10 % reduction  | 5% of reduction of soil erosion has been implemented in Makete and Kyela by applying SLM techniques in the areas<br><br>5% of reduction of sediment load in Kyela, Ludewa and Nyasa Districts has been reduced by applying SLM techniques as well as conducting river training in Luhekei and Ruhuhu rivers.   | 100%<br><br>100%                         | S                            |



| Project objective and Outcomes   | Indicator  | Baseline level   | Mid-term target   | End-of-project target   | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022  | Percentage achievement of midterm target | Progress rating <sup>1</sup> |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|--|------------------------------|
| <b>Output 2.2.1</b>  | No. of guidelines developed and implemented                            | 1 guideline developed                                  | 2 guidelines developed  | 3 guidelines developed  | Consultant is finalising the guidelines   | 50%                                      | S                            |
| <b>Output 2.2.2</b>  | No of farmers adopting indigenous crops                                | 0 farmers  | 5,000 farmers   | 1,000 farmers   | 375 farmers   | 8%                                       |                              |
| <b>Output 2.2.3</b>  | No of Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) trained on monitoring and evaluation | 0 FFSs trained   |   | 25 FFSs trained (5 FFSs per district)                                 | 15 FFSs group trained (3 FFSs groups per district)  | 60%                                      |                              |
| <b>Outcome 3.1 Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework for SLM established</b> | frameworks at district and basin level                                 | No Cross-sectoral Institutional frameworks established | Multi-sectoral Institutional frameworks established by end of project | Multi-sectoral Institutional frameworks established by end of project | Consultant is finalising the assignment of establishment of Multi-sectoral Institutional frameworks, Policy analysis, and conducting policy dialogue. The cross-sectoral or Multi-sectoral institutions frameworks will oversee the ongoing activities even after the end of the project. | 25%                                      | S                            |
| <b>Output 3.1.1</b>  | Regional MoU   | Sectoral policies                                      | Policy analysis report with recommendations                           | Policy analysis report with recommendations                           |   |  |                              |
| <b>Output 3.1.2</b>  | Policy analysis report in place  |  | 5 LGAs facilitated  | 5 LGAs facilitated  |   | 25%                                      |                              |
| <b>Output 3.1.3</b>  | No of LGAs facilitated in the project                                  | 0 LGAs facilitated                                     | 5 policy dialogues undertaken   | 5 policy dialogues undertaken   |   | 25%                                      |                              |
|  | No. of policy dialogues in the project                                 | 1 policy dialogues undertaken                          |   |   |   | 25%                                      |                              |

**Annex 1B: Outcome Indicator Tracking Table**

| Project objective and Outcomes   | Indicator   | Baseline level | Mid-term target                          | End-of-project target                   | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022   | Progress rating <sup>2</sup> |
|--|---|----------------|--|---|--|------------------------------|
| <b>Objective: To promote the scaling up of sustainable land management (SLM) practices and securing livelihoods of smallholder farmers in selected districts within Lake Nyasa Basin</b> | Increase in proportion of farmers using appropriate SLM practices | 0%             | 20%                                      | 30%                                     | About 375 members of farmers groups are using appropriate SLM practices within the project areas. However, there many people who are not part of the group who adopting SLM practices due to efforts of the project in Secondary and Primary Schools. This include teachers and pupils who are transferring the knowledge in their areas where they come from. | S                            |
|  | Increase in the area put under SLM                                | 10,000 ha      | 30,000 ha                                | 60,000 ha                               | The Land area under SLM has increased to 35,000ha in Kyela, Mbinga, Makete, Ludewa and Nyasa Districts.  | S                            |
| <b>Outcome 1.: Catchment capacity to provide ecosystem services enhanced</b>   | Increase in water catchment area (ha) under SLM                   | 10,000         | 30,000                                   | 60,000                                  | Consultant is in place to undertake the assignment   | US                           |
| Output 1.1.1: Conduct baseline mapping and assessment of land use activities in targeted districts   | Number of water catchments mapped                                 | 0              | 5 critical sub-catchments mapped         | 12 critical sub-catchments mapped       | 3 water user association will be established in critical sub-catchments, one (1) water user association already functioning in Ludewa District. Two water users will be strengthened in Mbinga and Nyasa Districts   | MS                           |
| 1.1.2 Catchment and Village Land Use plans developed   | No of village land use plans developed within the project         | 5 VLUPs        | 20 VLUPs (15 new VLUPs / 3 per district) | New 15 VLUPs developed / 3 per district | The assignment is Completed  | HS                           |

<sup>2</sup> Use GEF Secretariat required six-point scale system: Highly Satisfactory (HS), Satisfactory (S), Marginally Satisfactory (MS), Marginally Unsatisfactory (MU), Unsatisfactory (U), and Highly Unsatisfactory (HU).

| Project objective and Outcomes   | Indicator  | Baseline level            | Mid-term target  | End-of-project target  | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022   | Progress rating <sup>2</sup> |
|--|--|---------------------------|--|--|--|------------------------------|
| <b>Output 1.2: Enhanced capacity of local and national stakeholders, including communities and institutions, to sustainably manage natural resources and to resolve land use conflicts</b> | Number of key stakeholders facilitated   | 1%                        | 5 key stakeholders facilitated   | 4 key stakeholders facilitated   | The District Authorities from five Districts, Primary and Secondary schools, Farmers groups and water user associations have been facilitated for SLM of their respective areas. For instance, Tree Nurseries has been established in all five District authorities to be planted in their areas of jurisdictions. five Schools in each district have been provided 500 tree seedlings to be planted in their areas. | S                            |
|  | No of key stakeholders assessed  | 0                         | 5 key stakeholders assessed  | 8 key stakeholders assessed  | <i>Need Assessment for appropriate provision of Awareness training conducted to all five Districts. For instance, stakeholders assessed included Itete Prison in Ludewa, Farmers in all districts, Schools in all districts, Artisanal for coal and sand miners in Mbinga, Nyasa and Makete, Paddy farmers in Kyela, and Fishers groups min Kyela, Ludewa and Nyasa.</i>   | S                            |
|  | No. of farmers reached with the project (disaggregated by sex)<br><br>No. of School reached in environmental awareness | 0<br><br>0                | 10,000 people (5,000 male and 5,000 female)<br><br>100 Schools                 | 10,000 people (5,000 male and 5,000 female)<br><br>100 Schools   | Men and women Facilitators for Farmers Field Schools trained on forest as business activity and Crops circulation to improve soil fertility in Kihuru, Lituhi, Lundo and Mtupale<br><br><i>At least 20 schools from each 5 districts implementing the projects are involved in environmental awareness. Total of 220 farmers were reached on which 115 were female and 105 were male</i>                             | S<br><br>S                   |
| No of staff trained (disaggregated by sex)   | 20   | 40 District staff trained | 80 District staff trained (60 additional staff trained: 30 male and 30 female) | 15 Farmers groups established trained and supported with agricultural implements such as beehives, Plank, fishing net, and improved seeds.<br><br>(60 additional staff trained: 30 male and 30 female) | HS   |                              |
| <b>Outcome 2.1: Improved land productivity and community living standards</b>  | Percent increase in land productivity  | 0                         | 10%  | 30%  | Group training on forest as business and crops circulation in order to improve soil fertility. The land productivity will result due to proper practices and training received by groups   | HS                           |

| Project objective and Outcomes | Indicator   | Baseline level  | Mid-term target   | End-of-project target   | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022   | Progress rating <sup>2</sup> |
|--------------------------------|---|---|---|---|--|------------------------------|
|                                | No of alternative income generating activities (IGA) opportunities created in the project         | 0 Income generating activities created by the Project | 5 Income generating activities created (IGA)  | 9 Income generating activities created (IGA)  | Considering each district geographical location, its environment, social, physical and people's opinions the following IGAs were practiced and facilitated by the project. For instance, making of efficient cooking stoves and briquette in Mbinga and Nyasa Districts of which about 290 Cooking Stoves were made and utilised by communities in those areas; Establishment of tree nurseries in Makete Districts on which farmers now are realising the avocado production; Cocoa and palm oil value addition in Kyela district; Beekeeping and Climate Smart Agriculture in Cashew-nut production in Ludewa, Kyela and Makete. | S                            |
|                                | Acreage of land under SLM<br><br>Acreage of catchment area rehabilitated/conserved in the project | 10,000 ha at baseline<br><br>0ha at the baseline      | 30,000 ha of cultivated land under SLM<br><br>25,000 ha of degraded lake catchment area rehabilitated | 60,000 ha of cultivated land under SLM<br><br>50,000 ha of degraded lake catchment area rehabilitated / conserved | Reforestation programs through establishment of ten 12 tree nurseries conducted in five Districts on which the project is implemented 20, 000 ha of cultivated land is under SLM.<br><br>Baseline survey has identified and five districts have rehabilitated/conserved 25,000 ha  | S                            |

| Project objective and Outcomes   | Indicator   | Baseline level  | Mid-term target  | End-of-project target   | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022   | Progress rating <sup>2</sup> |
|--|---|---|--|---|--|------------------------------|
|  | <p>Area of arable land under the implementation of conservation agriculture (agroforestry practices)</p> <p>No. of artisanal miners trained in sustainable practices</p> <p>Acreage of land rehabilitated</p> | <p>0 ha at the baseline</p> <p>0 miners trained</p> <p>0ha</p>      | <p>25,000 ha</p> <p>50 artisanal miners trained</p> <p>5,000ha</p> | <p>50,000 ha</p> <p>100 artisanal miners trained in sustainable practices</p> <p>10,000ha</p>   | <p>Exotic and Indigenous tree nursery has been established and managed. The total of 25,000 ha area of arable land is in some form of SLM Practices within the project area</p> <p>Areas in Nyasa and Mbinga Districts have trained 50 (35 male, 15 female) miners and rehabilitated the areas which were used by artisanal miners by planting trees on abandoned land. The total land area of 5,000ha in Ludewa, Nyasa, and Mbinga Districts were rehabilitated</p> | S                            |
| <b>Outcome 2.2. Reduced land degradation, improved soil health and increased productivity of agro-ecosystems</b> | <p>% Reduction in soil erosion in pilot areas</p> <p>% Reduction in sediment load in pilot areas</p>  | <p>0% reduction</p> <p>0 % reduction</p>                            | <p>5 % reduction</p> <p>5 % reduction</p>                          | <p>10 % reduction</p> <p>10 % reduction</p>   | <p>5% of reduction of soil erosion has been implemented in Makete and Kyela by applying SLM techniques in the areas</p> <p>5% of reduction of sediment load in Kyela, Ludewa and Nyasa Districts has been reduced by applying SLM techniques as well as conducting river training in Luhekei and Ruhuhu rivers.</p>  | S                            |
|  | <p>No. of guidelines developed and implemented</p> <p>No of farmers adopting indigenous crops</p> <p>No of Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) trained on monitoring and evaluation</p>                               | <p>1 guideline developed</p> <p>0 farmers</p> <p>0 FFSs trained</p> | <p>2 guidelines developed</p> <p>5,000 farmers</p>                 | <p>3 guidelines developed</p> <p>1,000 farmers</p> <p>25 FFSs trained (5 FFSs per district)</p> | <p>Consultant is finalising the guidelines</p> <p>15 FFSs group trained (3 FFSs groups per district)</p>   | MS                           |

| Project objective and Outcomes   | Indicator  | Baseline level   | Mid-term target   | End-of-project target   | Summary by the EA of attainment of the indicator & target as of 30 June 2022  | Progress rating <sup>2</sup> |
|--|--|--|---|---|---|------------------------------|
| <b>Outcome 3.1<br/>Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework for SLM established</b> | frameworks at district and basin level<br><br>Regional MoU<br><br>Policy analysis report in place<br><br>No of LGAs facilitated in the project<br><br>No. of policy dialogues in the project | No Cross-sectoral Institutional frameworks established<br><br>Sectoral policies<br><br>0 LGAs facilitated<br><br>1 policy dialogues undertaken | Multi-sectoral Institutional frameworks established by end of project<br><br>Policy analysis report with recommendations<br>5 LGAs facilitated<br><br>5 policy dialogues undertaken | Multi-sectoral Institutional frameworks established by end of project<br><br>Policy analysis report with recommendations<br>5 LGAs facilitated<br><br>5 policy dialogues undertaken | Consultant is finalising the assignment of establishment of Multi-sectoral Institutional frameworks, Policy analysis, and conducting policy dialogue. The cross-sectoral or Multi-sectoral institutions frameworks will oversee the ongoing activities even after the end of the project. | MS                           |



## Annex 2: List of Individuals Consulted during the MTR Process

| No. | Institution                                     | Name (s)                 | Designation               |
|-----|---|--------------------------|---------------------------|
| 1.  | Vice President's Office (VPO)                   | Paul E. Deogratus Nyangu | Project Coordinator (PC)  |
| 2.  | Ministry of Agriculture                         | Kamwesige Mujuni Mtembei | Focal Person              |
| 3.  | Ministry of Water/ Lake Nyasa Basin Water Board | Heri Zuberi              | Focal Person              |
| 4.  | Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism       | Seleboni Mushi           | Focal Person              |
| 5.  | Sokoine University of Agriculture               | Dr. Dino Owiso           | Focal Person              |
| 6.  | National Land Use Planning Commission           | Eugen Cyrilo             | Focal Person              |
| 7.  | Kyela District Authority                        | Michael Mwankupili       | Project Extension Officer |
|     | Kyela District FGDs                             | 8 participants           |                           |
| 8.  | Makete District Authority                       | Alfred Gideon Mwakamele  | Project Extension Officer |
| 9.  | Ludewa District Authority                       | Lucas Domician Makonope  | Project Extension Officer |
|     | Ludewa District FGDs                            | 12 participants          |                           |
| 10. | Nyasa District Authority                        | Dennis Mroki William     | Project Extension Officer |
| 11. | Mbinga District Council                         | Sosteness Jerome Nakamo  | Project Extension Officer |
| 12. | Project Steering Committee (PSC)                | Ms. Faraja G. Ngerageza  | Assistant Director        |
|     | <b>UNEP GEF</b>                                 |                          |                           |
| 13. | UNEP  | Jane Nimpamya            | Task Manager (TM)         |
| 14. | UNEP Fund Management Officer (FMO)              | George Saddimbah         |                           |
| 15. | UNEP Finance assistant                          | Weldon Lemein            |                           |
| 16. | District Steering Committee Chairs              | Sunday Deogratus         | LUDEWA Dc. DSC Chair      |

### Annex 3: Project Results Framework

| Project Goal: To improve natural resources management and livelihoods of communities in Lake Nyasa catchment through sustainable land management systems                             |   |   |  |  |   |
|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| Project Objective  | Objective level Indicators  | Baseline  | Targets and Monitoring Milestones        | Means of Verification                                  | Assumptions & Risks                           |
| To promote the scaling up of sustainable land management (SLM) practices and securing livelihoods of smallholder farmers in selected districts within Lake Nyasa Basin               | Increase in proportion of farmers using appropriate SLM practices | 0%  | 30%                                      | Project reports<br>County reports<br>M&E reports       | Favourable weather conditions                 |
|  | Increase in the area put under SLM                                | 10,000 ha   | 60,000 ha                                | Project reports<br>County reports<br>M&E reports       | Incentives for SLM uptake sustained           |
| <b>Component 1</b>   | <b>Strengthening capacities at catchment level for SLM</b>        |   |  |  |   |
| Project Outcome  | Outcome Indicators  | Baseline  | Targets and Monitoring Milestones        | Means of Verification                                  | Assumptions & Risks                           |
| Outcome 1.1: Catchment capacity to provide ecosystem services enhanced   | Increase in water catchment area (ha) under SLM                   | 10,000  | 60,000                                   | Project reports<br>M&E reports                         | Enabling political environment                |
| Output 1.1.1: Conduct baseline mapping and assessment of land use activities in targeted districts   | Number of water catchments mapped                                 | 0   | 5 critical sub-catchments mapped         | Water catchment maps<br>Land use assessment reports    | Accurate information provided by stakeholders |
| 1.1.2 Catchment and Village Land Use plans developed   | No of village land use plans developed within the project         | 5 VLUPs   | 20 VLUPs (15 new VLUPs / 3 per district) | Project progress reports                               |   |
| Outcome 1.2. Enhanced capacity of local and national stakeholders, including communities and institutions, to sustainably manage natural resources and to resolve land use conflicts | Number of key stakeholders facilitated                            | 1 key stakeholders (Lake Nyasa Water Basin Board) | 5 key stakeholders facilitated           | Project progress reports<br>End Term Evaluation        |   |
| Output 1.2.1: Capacity needs assesment of farmer groups and other key stakeholder undertaken   | No of key stakeholders assessed                                   | 0 key stakeholders assessed                       | 5 key stakeholders assessed              | Capacity Assessment report<br>Project progress reports | Availability of secondary data                |

| <b>Project Goal: To improve natural resources management and livelihoods of communities in Lake Nyasa catchment through sustainable land management systems</b> |   |   |  |  |  |
|---|---|---|--|--|--|
| <b>Project Objective</b>  | <b>Objective level Indicators</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>                                       | <b>Targets and Monitoring Milestones</b>                                       | <b>Means of Verification</b>                         | <b>Assumptions &amp; Risks</b>   |
| Output 1.2.2: Awareness programme on sustainable land management practices developed and communities mobilized  | No. of farmers reached with the project (disaggregated by sex)                                    | 0 farmers   | 10,000 people (5,000 male and 5,000 female)                                    | Project progress reports                             |  |
|   | No. of School reached in environmental awareness  | 0 schools   | 100 schools  |  |  |
| Output 1.2.3: Capacity building and strengthening of district council on planning and catchment management  | No of staff trained (disaggregated by sex)  | 20 staff  | 80 District staff trained (60 additional staff trained: 30 male and 30 female) | Training Report<br>Project progress reports          |  |
| <b>Component 2</b>  | <b>Integrated Catchment management through SLM systems</b>  |   |  |  |  |
| Outcome 2.1: Improved land productivity and community living standards  | Percent increase in land productivity   | 0 %   | 30 %   | Household farmer survey                              | Local policies provide incentives for farmers to adopt the SLM practices |
|   | No of alternative income generating activities (IGA) opportunities created in the project         | 0 Income generating activities created by the Project | 5 Income generating activities created (IGA)                                   | Household farmer survey (mid-way and end of project) | Market prices are favourable to farmers                                  |
| Output 2.1.1 Land rehabilitation/conservation/ protection measures implemented on cultivated land   | Acreage of land under SLM   | 10,000 ha at baseline                                 | 60,000 ha of cultivated land under SLM   | Project progress reports                             |  |
| Output 2.1.2 Degraded lake catchment areas and water sources rehabilitated/conserved  | Acreage of catchment area rehabilitated/conserved in the project                                  | 0 ha at the baseline                                  | 50,000 ha of degraded lake catchment area rehabilitated / conserved            | Project progress reports                             |  |
| Output 2.1.3. Techniques on conservation agriculture implemented on arable land   | Area of arable land under the implementation of conservation agriculture (agroforestry practices) | 0 ha at the baseline                                  | 50,000 ha  |  |  |
| Output 2.1.4 Alternative income generating activities identified and implemented  | No of alternative income generating activities (IGA) opportunities created                        | 0 Income generating activities                        | 5 Income generating activities created (IGA)                                   | Household farmer survey                              |  |

| <b>Project Goal: To improve natural resources management and livelihoods of communities in Lake Nyasa catchment through sustainable land management systems</b> |   |  |  |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|--|--|
| <b>Project Objective</b>  | <b>Objective level Indicators</b>   | <b>Baseline</b>  | <b>Targets and Monitoring Milestones</b>                               | <b>Means of Verification</b>           | <b>Assumptions &amp; Risks</b>                         |
|   | No of people adopted alternative income generating activities (disaggregated by sex)          | 0 people   | 600 people (300 male and 300 female)                                   |  |  |
| Output 2.1.5. Degraded Mined land rehabilitated through reforestation   | No. of artisanal miners trained in sustainable practices<br><br>Acreage of land rehabilitated | 0 miners trained<br><br>0 ha                           | 100 artisanal miners trained in sustainable practices<br><br>10,000 ha | Project progress reports               |  |
| 2.2. Reduced land degradation, improved soil health and increased productivity of agro ecosystems   | % Reduction in soil erosion in pilot areas<br><br>% Reduction in sediment load in pilot areas | 0% reduction<br><br>0 % reduction                      | 10 % reduction<br><br>10 % reduction                                   | Project technical progress reports     |  |
| Output 2.2.1. Best practice guidelines for SLM for small scale agriculture developed and demonstrated   | No. of guidelines developed and implemented   | 1 guideline developed                                  | 3 guidelines developed   | Project progress reports               |  |
| Output 2.2.2. Adoption of SLM practices and conservation of indigenous food crop varieties increased  | No of farmers adopting indigenous crops   | 0 farmers  | 1,000 farmers  | Project progress reports               |  |
| Output 2.2.3. Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation system for SLM developed  | No of Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) trained on monitoring and evaluation                        | 0 FFSs trained   | 25 FFSs trained (5 FFSs per district)                                  | Project progress reports               |  |
| <b>Component 3</b>  | <b>Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework</b>  |  |  |  |  |
| Outcome 3.1 Enabling Policy and Institutional Framework for SLM established   | No. of SLM related frameworks at district and basin level<br><br>Regional MoU                 | No Cross-sectoral Institutional frameworks established | Cross-sectoral Institutional frameworks established by end of project  | Project Progress reports<br>M&E report | Political will from national and District institutions |

| <b>Project Goal: To improve natural resources management and livelihoods of communities in Lake Nyasa catchment through sustainable land management systems</b> |  |                               |   |  |  |
|---|--|-------------------------------|---|--|--|
| <b>Project Objective</b>  | <b>Objective level Indicators</b>      | <b>Baseline</b>               | <b>Targets and Monitoring Milestones</b>    | <b>Means of Verification</b>               | <b>Assumptions &amp; Risks</b>         |
| Output 3.1.1 Policy and development analysis in Lake Nyasa basin undertaken   | Policy analysis report in place        | Sectoral policies             | Policy analysis report with recommendations | Project progress reports                   |  |
| Output 3.1.2: Enforcement on bylaws for catchment management by local authorities   | No. of LGAs facilitated in the project | 0 LGAs facilitated            | 5 LGAs facilitated                          | Policy reports<br>Project Progress reports | Political will from county governments |
| Output 3.1.3. Inter-ministerial committee on Lake Nyasa established   | No. of policy dialogues in the project | 1 policy dialogues undertaken | 5 policy dialogues undertaken               | Policy reports<br>Project Progress reports | Political will from county governments |

## Annex 4: Project Design Quality

| A. | Nature of the External Context <sup>3</sup>   |  | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating:                     |
|----|---|--|--------|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1  | Does the project document identify any unusually challenging operational factors that are likely to negatively affect project performance?  | i) Ongoing/high likelihood of conflict?  | YES    | Page 44 of the SLM Project document Section 3.5 Risk analysis and risk management measures   | 5                                   |
|    |   | ii) Ongoing /high likelihood of natural disaster?                                      | No     |  |                                     |
|    |   | iii) Ongoing /high likelihood of change in national government?                        | No     |  |                                     |
| B. | Project Preparation   |  | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating:<br>(see footnote 2) |
| 2  | Does the project document entail a clear and adequate problem analysis?   |  | YES    | Section 2: Background and Situation Analysis presents a clear problem analysis   | 6                                   |
| 3  | Does the project document entail a clear and adequate situation analysis?   |  | YES    | Section 2: Background and Situation Analysis presents a clear situation analysis   |                                     |
| 4  | Does the project document include a clear and adequate stakeholder analysis, including by gender/minority groupings?  |  | YES    | Section 2.5 Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis entails a description of stakeholder analysis   |                                     |
| 5  | <i>If yes to Q4:</i> Does the project document provide a description of stakeholder consultation during project design process? ( <i>If yes, were any key groups overlooked: government, private sector, civil society, gendered groups and those who will potentially be negatively affected</i> ) |  | YES    | Section 2.5 Stakeholder Mapping and Analysis entails a description of stakeholder analysis   |                                     |
| 6  | Does the project document identify concerns with respect to human rights, including in relation to sustainable development?   | i) Sustainable development in terms of an integrated approach to human/natural systems | YES    | Paragraph 114 of the SLM Project Document includes pro-poor Economic Growth and Environmentally Sustainable Development Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI) and elaborates on sustainable development in terms of an integrated approach to human/natural systems |                                     |
|    |   | ii) Gender   | YES    | Paragraph 101 under the sub-section Gender and Youth Mainstreaming gives a clear description of the gender concerns  |                                     |
|    |   | iii) Indigenous peoples  | YES    | The project document describes engagement of indigenous people under Outcome 1.2: Enhanced awareness capacity of local and national  |                                     |

<sup>3</sup> For Nature of External Context the 6-point rating scale is changed to: Highly Favourable = 1, Favourable = 2, Moderately Favourable = 3, Moderately Unfavourable = 4, Unfavourable = 5 and highly Unfavourable = 6. (Note that this is a reversed scale).



|    |  |  |        |  |                 |
|----|--|--|--------|--|-----------------|
| A. | Nature of the External Context <sup>3</sup>                            |  | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
|    |  |  |        | stakeholders, including communities and institutions, to sustainably manage natural resources and to resolve land use conflicts  |                 |
| C  | Strategic Relevance  |  |        | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 7  | Is the project document clear in terms of its alignment and relevance? | i) UNEP MTS and PoW  | YES    | The Prodoc states alignment to the MTS and PoW   | 6               |
|    |  | ii) UNEP /GEF/Donor strategic priorities (including Bali Strategic Plan and South-South Cooperation) | YES    |  |                 |
|    |  | iii) Regional, sub-regional and national environmental priorities?                                   | YES    | Aligned to Tanzania's National Action Plan to the 10-Year with the UNCCD's 10-Year Strategic Framework and Support National Reporting. Directly contributes to the UNCCD COP decisions<br>Tanzania Integrated and Investment Framework (IIF) For SLM<br>The Lake Victoria Environmental Management Project Phase II (LVEMP II)<br>Lake Nyasa Basin Water Board Development Plan<br>Project to Support the Lake Tanganyika Integrated Regional Development Programme (PRODAP)<br>Pro-poor Economic Growth and Environmentally Sustainable Development Poverty and Environment Initiative (PEI)<br>The National Climate Change Strategy (2012)<br>The Tanzania Agriculture Sector Development Programme (ASDP)<br>The Agriculture and Livestock Policy (1997)<br>National Environmental Policy (1997)<br>The Constitution of the United Republic of Tanzania (1977)<br>The National Land Policy (1997) |                 |
|    |  | iv) Complementarity with other interventions   | YES    | Paragraph 168 states complementarity to projects under the CBD, UNFCCC and UNCCD. The linkages between the Conventions and potential projects were also recognized by the National Capacity Self-Assessment (NCSA) and National Biodiversity Action Plan (NBSAP).  |                 |
| D  | Intended Results and Causality   |  | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 8  | Is there a clearly presented Theory of Change?                         |  | NO     | On page 3 of the Project Document, a statement reads “the project’s theory of change is premised on the fact that despite the constraints and problems   | 6               |

| A. | Nature of the External Context <sup>3</sup>  | YES/NO   | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating:   |   |
|----|--|--|--|---|---|
|    |  |  | land users face, they are willing to adopt SLM practices if they provide higher net returns, lower risks or a combination of both. Cost efficiency, including short and long-term benefits, is the key issue for adoption of SLM. Land users are more willing to adopt practices that provide rapid and sustained pay-back in terms of food or income”. However, no Theory of Change graphically or otherwise is provided. |   |   |
| 9  | Are the causal pathways from project outputs (goods and services) through outcomes (changes in stakeholder behaviour) towards impacts (long term, collective change of state) clearly and convincingly described in either the log frame or the TOC? | YES  | Appendix 4: Results Framework shows the logical link between outcomes and outputs per component.   |   |   |
| 10 | Are impact drivers and assumptions clearly described for each key causal pathway?  | YES  | Assumptions & Risks are presented in Appendix 4: Results Framework   |   |   |
| 11 | Are the roles of key actors and stakeholders, including gendered/minority groups, clearly described for each key causal pathway?   | YES  | Page 44 of the Project Document under section 4: Institutional Framework And Implementation Arrangements are roles of key actors and stakeholders, including gendered/minority groups, are clearly described.  |   |   |
| 12 | Are the outcomes realistic with respect to the timeframe and scale of the intervention?  | YES  |  |   |   |
| E. | Logical Framework and Monitoring   | YES/NO   |  | Section Rating:   |   |
| 13 | Does the logical framework...  | i) Capture the key elements of the Theory of Change/ intervention logic for the project? | NO   | There is no detailed theory of change   | 5 |
|    |  | ii) Have ‘SMART’ indicators for outputs?   | YES  | Appendix 4: Results Framework includes SMART output indicators that are easy to measure.  |   |
|    |  | iii) Have ‘SMART’ indicators for outcomes?   | YES  | Appendix 4: Results Framework includes SMART outcome indicators that are easy to measure. |   |
|    |  | iv) Reflect the project’s scope of work and ambitions?                                   | YES  |   |   |
| 14 | Is there baseline information in relation to key performance indicators?   | YES  | Baseline information in relation to key performance indicators is provided in Appendix 4: Results Framework  |   |   |
| 15 | Has the desired level of achievement (targets) been specified for indicators of outputs and outcomes?  | YES  | Targets are included in Appendix 4: Results Framework  |   |   |
| 16 | Are the milestones in the monitoring plan appropriate and sufficient to track progress and   | YES  | Milestones are included in Appendix 4: Results Framework   |   |   |

|    |   |        |  |                 |
|----|---|--------|--|-----------------|
| A. | Nature of the External Context <sup>3</sup>   | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
|    | foster management towards outputs and outcomes?   |        |  |                 |
| 17 | Have responsibilities for monitoring activities been made clear?  | YES    | Responsibilities for monitoring activities are indicated in the M&E Work Plan  |                 |
| 18 | Has a budget been allocated for monitoring project progress?  | YES    | The M&E Work Plan is costed  |                 |
| 19 | Is the work plan clear, adequate and realistic? ( <i>E.g., Adequate time between capacity building and take up etc.</i> )   | YES    | The work plan is clear, adequate and realistic   |                 |
| F  | Governance and Supervision Arrangements   | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 20 | Is the project governance and supervision model comprehensive, clear and appropriate? ( <i>Steering Committee, partner consultations etc.</i> )   | YES    | Project governance and supervision model comprehensive, clear under Section 4: Institutional Framework And Implementation Arrangements   | 6               |
| 21 | Are roles and responsibilities within UNEP clearly defined?   | YES    | Project governance and supervision model comprehensive, clear under Section 4: Institutional Framework And Implementation Arrangements   |                 |
| G  | Partnerships  | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 22 | Have the capacities of partners been adequately assessed?   | No     | The project Document does not indicate if capacities of partners were adequately assessed.   | 6               |
| 23 | Are the roles and responsibilities of external partners properly specified and appropriate to their capacities?   | YES    | Roles and responsibilities are specified in the Prodoc Section 5: Stakeholder Participation.   |                 |
| H  | Learning, Communication and Outreach  | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 24 | Does the project have a clear and adequate knowledge management approach?   | YES    | The project document under paragraph 118 presents a knowledge management approach through promoting and supporting effective policies, legal and regulatory frameworks, capable institutions, knowledge sharing and monitoring mechanisms, together with good practices conducive to sustainable land management (SLM) and that are able to generate global environmental benefits while supporting local and national, social and economic development. | 6               |
| 25 | Has the project identified appropriate methods for communication with key stakeholders, including gendered/minority groups, during the project life? <i>If yes, do the plans build on an analysis of existing communication channels and networks used by key stakeholders?</i> | YES    | Paragraph 132 of the Project Document identifies great involvement and awareness creation and dissemination of SLM knowledge to the general public using various communication platforms.  |                 |

|    |   |        |  |                 |
|----|---|--------|--|-----------------|
| A. | Nature of the External Context <sup>3</sup>   | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 26 | Are plans in place for dissemination of results and lesson sharing at the end of the project? <i>If yes, do they build on an analysis of existing communication channels and networks?</i>  | YES    | Subsection 3.10 Public awareness, communications and mainstreaming strategy presents a plan for dissemination of results and lesson sharing at the end of the project  |                 |
| I  | Financial Planning / Budgeting  | YES/NO |  | Section Rating: |
| 27 | Are the budgets / financial planning adequate at design stage? ( <i>Coherence of the budget, do figures add up etc.</i> )   | YES    | The budget adds up and is adequate   | 6               |
| 28 | Is the resource mobilization strategy reasonable/realistic? ( <i>E.g., If the expectations are over-ambitious the delivery of the project outcomes may be undermined or if under-ambitious may lead to no cost extensions</i> )             | TBD    |  |                 |
| J  | Efficiency  | YES/NO |  | Section Rating: |
| 29 | Has the project been appropriately designed/adapted in relation to the duration and/or levels of secured funding?   | NO     | The project has had 2 no-cost extensions. The initial planned project end was 31 December 2019, this has been extended to 31 December 2023.  | 5               |
| 30 | Does the project design make use of / build upon pre-existing institutions, agreements and partnerships, data sources, synergies and complementarities with other initiatives, programmes and projects etc. to increase project efficiency? | YES    | The project planned to as much as possible use the existing structures at the district level. The project planned to work closely with the District Agricultural Office and use their extension staff in the training and dissemination of project activities.<br>At the community level, the project planned to work with existing community institutions already established and would not directly support the establishment of new CBOs for the sake of the project. |                 |
| 31 | Does the project document refer to any value for money strategies (i.e., increasing economy, efficiency and/or cost-effectiveness)?   | YES    | Under section 7.3 Project cost-effectiveness, the Project Document refer to any value-for-money strategies such as the use of existing institutions and structures, dissemination of new technologies, capacity building of stakeholders based on capacity needs assessment and use of the existing community groups as entry points for the project.  |                 |
| K  | Risk identification and Social Safeguards   | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 33 | Are risks appropriately identified in both the TOC/logic framework and the risk table? ( <i>If no, include key assumptions in reconstructed TOC</i> )   | YES    | Risks are identified in 3.5 Risk analysis and risk management measures and 3.4 Intervention logic and key assumptions  | 5               |
| 34 | Are potentially negative environmental, economic and social impacts of the project identified and is the mitigation strategy adequate? ( <i>consider unintended impacts</i> )   | YES    | Potentially negative environmental, economic and social impacts of the project are identified under 2.3 Threats, Root Causes and Barrier Analysis  |                 |

|    |   |        |  |                 |
|----|---|--------|--|-----------------|
| A. | Nature of the External Context <sup>3</sup>   | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 35 | Does the project have adequate mechanisms to reduce its negative environmental foot-print? ( <i>including in relation to project management</i> )     | YES    | Under section 3.11 Environmental and social safeguard, the project undertook UNEP Environmental, Social and Economic Review. This Framework sets minimum sustainability standards for UNEP and its implementing/executing partners, and enables UNEP to anticipate and manage emerging environmental, social and economic issues (SLM Project Document).   |                 |
| L  | Sustainability / Replication and Catalytic Effects  | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 36 | Was there a credible sustainability strategy at design stage?   | NO     | No separate sustainability strategy is presented in the Project Document   | 3               |
| 37 | Does the project design include an appropriate exit strategy?   | NO     | No separate exit strategy is presented in the Project Document<br>3.8 includes a very brief description a brief write-up on sustainability. It states that with the existence of development plans under the participation of Local Government Authorities, the project interventions will be integrated into their budgets and plans beyond the project lifetime and this will ensure its sustainability. |                 |
| 38 | Does the project design present strategies to promote/support scaling up, replication and/or catalytic action?  | YES    | Paragraph 104 The project design presents strategies that support scaling up, through linkage to GEF and non-GEF Linkages with other GEF and non-GEF interventions with a focus on up scaling SLM practices across the Lake Nyasa basin building on the lessons learned and best practices of past and on-going programmes.  |                 |
| 39 | Did the design address any/all of the following: socio-political, financial, institutional and environmental sustainability issues?                   | YES    | The design addresses socio-political, financial, institutional and environmental sustainability issues.  |                 |
| M  | Identified Project Design Weaknesses/Gaps   | YES/NO | Comments/Implications for the MTR design ( <i>e.g., questions, TOC assumptions and drivers, methods and approaches, key respondents etc.</i> )   | Section Rating: |
| 40 | Were recommendations made by the PRC adopted in the final project design? If no, what were the critical issues raised by PRC that were not addressed. | YES    |  | 5               |
| 41 | Were there any critical issues not flagged by PRC?  | NO     |  |                 |
| N  | Gender Marker Score   | SCORE  | N/A  |                 |

### CALCULATING THE OVERALL PROJECT DESIGN QUALITY SCORE

| No.                           | SECTION  |                             | RATING (1-6)  |
|-------------------------------|--|-----------------------------|---------------|
| A                             | Nature of the External Context                     |                             | 5             |
| B                             | Project Preparation                                |                             | 6             |
| C                             | Strategic Relevance                                |                             | 6             |
| D                             | Intended Results and Causality                     |                             | 6             |
| E                             | Logical Framework and Monitoring                   |                             | 5             |
| F                             | Governance and Supervision Arrangements            |                             | 6             |
| G                             | Partnerships                                       |                             | 6             |
| H                             | Learning, Communication and Outreach               |                             | 6             |
| I                             | Financial Planning / Budgeting                     |                             | 6             |
| J                             | Efficiency   |                             | 5             |
| K                             | Risk identification and Social Safeguards          |                             | 5             |
| L                             | Sustainability / Replication and Catalytic Effects |                             | 3             |
| M                             | Identified Project Design Weaknesses/Gaps          |                             | 5             |
|                               | <b>TOTAL</b>                                       |                             | <b>5.3</b>    |
|                               | <b>AVERAGE</b>                                     |                             |               |
| 1 (Highly Unsatisfactory)     | < 1.83   | 4 (Moderately Satisfactory) | >=3.5 <=4.33  |
| 2 (Unsatisfactory)            | >= 1.83 < 2.66                                     | <b>5 (Satisfactory)</b>     | >4.33 <= 5.16 |
| 3 (Moderately Unsatisfactory) | >=2.66 <3.5  | 6 (Highly Satisfactory)     | > 5.16        |

## Annex 5: Review Terms of Reference



UNITED NATIONS

NATIONS UNIES

### Terms of reference

|                            |   |   |
|----------------------------|---|---|
| <i>Job Opening number</i>  | : | 21-United Nations Environment Programme-169983-Consultant         |
| <i>Job Title</i>           | : | Mid-Term Review Consultant: Lake Nyasa Catchment Tanzania Project |
| <i>General Expertise</i>   | : | Environmental Affairs   |
| <i>Category</i>            | : | Environment Planning and Management                               |
| <i>Department/ Office</i>  | : | United Nations Environment Programme                              |
| <i>Organizational Unit</i> | : | UNEP ODED DEPI BLB GEF BDU  |

### Duties and Responsibilities

#### Organizational Setting

The United Nations Environment Programme is the leading global environmental authority that sets the global environmental agenda, promotes the coherent implementation of the environmental dimension of sustainable development within the United Nations system and serves as an authoritative advocate for the global environment". Its mandate is to coordinate the development of environmental policy consensus by keeping the global environment under review and bringing emerging issues to the attention of governments and the international community for action. UNEP's Ecosystems Division works with international and national partners, providing technical assistance and capacity development for the implementation of environmental policy, and strengthening the environmental management capacity of developing countries and countries with economies in transition. This consultancy post is located in UNEP / Ecosystems Division / GEF Biodiversity and Land Degradation Unit and reports to the respective GEF Task Manager.

UNEP is implementing a GEF project titled "Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in Tanzania" executed by the Vice President's Office (VPO) of the Republic of Tanzania.

UNEP would like to recruit a consultant to conduct a Mid-Term Review of this project. The Mid-Term Review will use a participatory approach whereby key stakeholders are kept informed and consulted throughout the review process. Both quantitative and qualitative evaluation methods will be used as appropriate to determine project achievements against the expected outputs, outcomes and impacts. It is highly recommended that the consultant(s) maintains close communication with the project team and promotes information exchange throughout the review implementation phase in order to increase their (and other stakeholder) ownership of the review findings.

The findings of the review will be based on the following:

- a) A desk review of: Relevant background documentation, inter alia, Project Document and Appendices, Project design documents (including minutes of the project design review meeting at approval); Annual Work Plans and Budgets or equivalent, revisions to the project (Project Document Supplement), the logical framework and its budget; Project reports such as six-monthly progress and financial reports, progress reports from collaborating partners, meeting minutes, relevant correspondence and including the Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool etc.; Evaluations/Reviews of similar projects; relevant policy and strategy documents, particularly when assessing relevance and alignment of the project. The consultant will also review all documentation of the sub grantees including their contracts.
- b) Interviews (individual or group) with: UNEP Task Manager (TM); Project management team; UNEP Fund Management Officer (FMO); All project partners, Vice President's Office (VPO), Ministry of Agriculture, Ministry of Natural Resources and Tourism, Basin Water Board Office Land Use Plan



Commission, Sokoine University of Agriculture and Five District Authorities (Ludewa, Nyasa, Mbinga, Kyela, And Makete), all levels of governance, PSC, local government officials and project management teams through virtual meetings and field visits: Other data collection tools: If needed, to be decided at the inception phase including Focus Group discussion (FGDs) with targeted beneficiaries to bring out community voices.

Duties:

The consultant will prepare:

Inception Report: containing confirmation of the results framework and theory of change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, review framework, quality of project design and a tentative review schedule.

Preliminary Findings Note: the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure all information sources have been accessed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging findings.

Draft and Final Review Reports: containing an executive summary that can act as a stand-alone document; detailed analysis of the review findings organised by review criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table. Come up with findings on the status of the implementation process to date, challenges faced, best practices and make recommendations to support the implementation of the Project.

#### **Ultimate result of service**

Mid-Term Review Report of the "Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in Tanzania". The results are expected to guide the execution of the project in its remaining term.

#### **Title & ID number of programme/project**

GEF ID: 5626

Project Title: UNEP-GEF "Sustainable Land Management of Lake Nyasa Catchment in Tanzania"

**Is any other department or office of the Secretariat or any other organization of the United Nations involved in similar work to the best of your knowledge?**

*No*

#### **Travel Details**

*Applicable*

Travel will be organized if required guided by the agreed work plan.

#### **Outputs/Work Assignment**

Objectives: In line with the UNEP Evaluation Policy and the UNEP Programme Manual, the Mid-Term Review (MTR) is undertaken approximately halfway through project implementation to analyze whether the project is on track, what problems or challenges the project is encountering, and what corrective actions are required. The MTR will assess project performance to date (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine the likelihood of the project achieving its intended outcomes, including their sustainability.

The consultant will be responsible, in close consultation with the Task Manager, for overall management of the review and timely delivery of its outputs, described below. The consultant will ensure that all evaluation criteria and questions are adequately covered.

Specifically, the consultant will be required to complete the following tasks:

Inception Report: will contain confirmation of the results framework and theory of change of the project, project stakeholder analysis, review framework and a tentative review schedule.

Preliminary Findings Note: the sharing of preliminary findings is intended to support the participation of the project team, act as a means to ensure all information sources have been accessed and provide an opportunity to verify emerging findings.

Draft and Final Review Reports: will contain an executive summary that can act as a stand-alone document; detailed analysis of the review findings organised by review criteria and supported with evidence; lessons learned and recommendations and an annotated ratings table.

Review of the draft MTR report. The review team will submit a draft report to the Task Manager and revise the draft in response to their comments and suggestions. Once a draft of adequate quality has been peer-reviewed and accepted, the Task Manager will share the cleared draft report with key project stakeholders for their review and comments. Stakeholders may provide feedback on any errors of fact and may highlight the significance of such errors in any conclusions as well as providing feedback on the proposed recommendations and lessons. Any comments or responses to draft reports will be sent to the Task Manager for consolidation. The Task Manager will provide all comments to the review team for consideration in preparing the final report, along with guidance on areas of contradiction or issues requiring an institutional response.

Expected Outputs (Deliverables):

Inception Report by 15 June 2022

Review Mission by 15 – 30 June 2022

Telephone interviews, surveys etc. by 1 – 15 July 2022

Presentation on preliminary findings and recommendations by 30 July 2022

Draft Report to Task Manager by 5 August 2022

Draft Report shared with the wider group of stakeholders by 15 August 2022

Final Main Review Report by 20 August 2022

Final Main Review Report shared with all respondents by 30 August 2022

Schedule of Payment:

Budget Line: GFL/11207-14AC0003-SB-006254

Schedule of Payment for the [Consultant]:

Deliverable Percentage Payment

Approved Inception Report 30%

Approved Draft Main Evaluation Report 30%

Approved Final Main Evaluation Report 40%

### **Expected Duration**

3 months from 1st June 2022

### **Evaluation Criteria**

Academic Qualifications :Master's degree in Natural sciences, Natural resources Management, Environmental Sciences, monitoring and evaluation, International Development or other relevant political or social sciences area.

### **Experience:**

- A minimum of 10 years of technical/evaluation experience, including of project planning, management, monitoring and evaluation.
- Experience in evaluation of GEF projects is highly desirable.
- Excellent writing skills; team leadership experience and, where possible, knowledge of the UN system, specifically of the work of UNEP and GEF programming is an asset.
- Experience in managing partnerships, knowledge management and communication is desirable for all evaluation consultants.
- Language English and French are the working languages of the United Nations Secretariat.
- For the post advertised, fluency in oral and written English is required

## Annex 6: List of Documents Consulted During the Review

1. Amendment No.1 of the PCA between UNEP and the United Republic of Tanzania Vice President's Office
2. Amendment No.2 of the PCA between UNEP and the United Republic of Tanzania Vice President's Office
3. Approved Cash Advance Request Forms
4. Audit reports Equipment inventory
5. Audited financial statements of the project
6. Evaluations/reviews of similar projects such as the SLM MTR Reports
7. Fixed Asset Report (inventory of project equipment) and/or Comprehensive list on Non-Expendable Equipment using the prescribed format
8. Legal agreements/MoUs with sub grantees/partners (if any)
9. Management letters
10. Minutes of PSC meeting, PMU meetings and District PSC meetings
11. Minutes of the project design review meeting at approval
12. MSP Approval Letter
13. MSP Endorsement Request for CEO Approval with logical framework, Results Framework
14. Original and revised Work plan and Timetable
15. Original budget and Revised Budget
16. Original PCA
17. PIR Reports for Fiscal Years 2019, 2020, 2021
18. Project Document
19. Project half yearly Progress Reports
20. Project Implementation Reviews and Tracking Tool
21. Quarterly Financial reports from 2017 to date
22. Relevant policy and strategy documents particularly when assessing relevance and alignment of the project.
23. Terms of reference of the MTR
24. The approved Project Formulation Form (PFF)
25. The GEF Project approval letter
26. The Project Cooperation Agreement (PCA) between UNEP and the United Republic of Tanzania Vice President's Office

## Annex 7: Consultant's Curriculum Vitae

### CURRICULUM VITAE Julian Kobutungi Bagyendera, PhD

#### BIO DATA

**Nationality:** Ugandan  
**Date of Birth:** 2<sup>nd</sup> October, 1972  
**Sex and Marital Status:** Female, married with 3 children

**ADDRESS:** Provide and Equip Ltd, P.O. Box 32315 Kampala, Uganda. Email: [julian@provide-equip.com](mailto:julian@provide-equip.com)/julianbagye@gmail.com Skype: julian.bagyendera Tel. +256-772-696060, +256-700696060. www.provide-equip.com.

#### SUMMARY

I am a Project Management, Evaluation Specialist with over 26 years of work experience in: climate change (CC), environment, agriculture, HIV/AIDS, population, reproductive health, malaria, socio-economic strengthening, social protection, education, gender mainstreaming and integration, human and child rights, governance, advocacy, private/public partnerships, capacity building and community development. Experienced in managing complex programs with multiple implementers and funding agencies; particularly: the World Bank GEF, UNRCO, UNDP, UNICEF, UNAIDS, UNFPA, UN Women, UNEP Kenya, WHO, CDC, EU, USAID, DoD, US Embassy, Pearce Corps, Iris Group, DFID, DANIDA, SIDA, Italian Corporation, Irish Aid, Makerere School of Public, Uganda AIDS Commission, Welshare, Comic Relief, Danish Aid, Amref Health Africa, and Save the Children International. I have international experience working in Uganda, South Africa, Kenya, Tanzania, Rwanda, P.R. China, Ethiopia, Liberia, Malawi, U.S.A, Thailand, Netherlands and Canada.

As a team leader, I worked a national and international consultant for over 60 related assignments such as International consultant for midterm review of **GEF/UNEP** for evaluating SLM/SFM project in Kenya, End-term evaluation for: **World Bank (WB)/GEF** terminal evaluation for enhancing performance and accountability of social service contracts in Uganda; **WB** Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation (SCCE) in Uganda, as part of 23 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa; Terminal Evaluation (TE) for CBTI capacity strengthening project Conservation International Foundation (‘CI’), **conducted proposal reviews for over 300 CSOs and technical support for developing M&E frameworks and theory of change**, developed the national CC indicators for Uganda and facilitated a series workshops for mainstreaming CC into ministries supported by **USAID/Feed the future**, end-term evaluation for: **WB/GPSA** project evaluation for enhancing performance and **accountability of social service contracts** in Uganda; developed the Country Program for Liberia **EU/UN** Spotlight to address GBV and SRHR issues, International consultant for UNAIDS/Geneva HIV/Social Protection Assessment Malawi. Developed the national climate change indicators and facilitated 38 Feed the Future Districts to develop CC action plans.

I currently work as the **Executive Director/Team Leader Evaluations** for Provide and Equip (P&E) Ltd, an M&E/Management Consultancy Firm headquartered in Uganda. I previously worked in several senior project management positions that include: Chief of Party, M&E Program Director /Deputy Chief of Party, Senior M&E Technical Advisor, M&E Coordinator and M&E Manager. **I hold a PhD in Project Management, majoring in monitoring and evaluation; a Master's Degree in Business Administration (MBA), majoring in project management and Bachelors' degree in Social Sciences.** I am a member of Uganda Evaluation Association (UEA), AFREA and SAMEA, and IDEAS. I am skilled in: MS Office packages, SPSS, STATA, NVIVO, GIS Mapping, PDA, Smart Phone and GPS electronic data collection technologies and SQL /Access databases. I am an experienced team leader with a niche in timely performance excellence and integrity.

#### EDUCATION

2012 Doctorate of Philosophy in **Project Management**, University of Atlanta, USA. Produced a thesis on “Factors influencing data utilization among civil society organizations and its effects on data quality and program effectiveness: A case study of Uganda civil society.”

- 2000 Master of Business Administration (MBA) [**Management**] Central South University of Technology, Changsha, Hunan, P. R. China. Produced a thesis on “The Current Trend of Modern Enterprise Management”.
- 1995 Bachelor of Arts (Social Sciences); **Social Administration** and Sociology - Makerere University, Uganda. Produced a Dissertation on “The Role of NGOs in Assisting Vulnerable Children.”

#### **OTHER CERTIFICATES OBTAINED**

**Good Clinical Practice (GCP) certificate (Oct 2020)**, By NIDA Clinical Trials Network

**Purpose:** Skills in Clinical Research Ethics

**Research Ethics and Training (June 2016)**, By FHI 360.

**Purpose:** Skills in Research Ethics

**Impact evaluation (June 2016)**, International initiative for Impact Evaluation (3ie)

**Purpose:** To obtain basis skills in impact evaluation methods, opportunities and challenges

**Integrity Leadership and Standards of Business Conduct (June 2012)**, by Chemonics International

**Purpose:** To maintain and foster a culture of integrity and responsible business practices

**USAID/CDC Regulations, Policies and Financial Management** (April 2011) by USAID/Center for Development Excellence

**Purpose:** To be conversant with USAID/CDC contract and financial management requirements.

**Programme Evaluation** for USAID Programs (September 2007), by USAID/Monitoring & Evaluation Management Systems (MEMS).

**Purpose:** To acquire practical skills in evaluating programs.

**Performance Monitoring and Evaluation** for USAID Programs (July 2005), by USAID/Monitoring & Evaluation Management Systems (MEMS)

**Purpose:** To acquire skills in managing for results, indicator development, realistic target setting, data collection, data utilization and designing PMPs.

**Basic Course Ethics for Research on Human Subjects** (December 2008), by CITI Collaborative Institutional Training Initiative. **Purpose:** Learn the ethical values to be adhered to during research on human subjects.

**Quality Standards for OVC Programmes** (November 2007), by USAID/CORE Initiative Programme

**Purpose:** To acquire practical skills in defining, setting and measuring national level and service quality standards

**Statistical Training on Practical Data Analysis Using STATA** (February 2005), by Makerere University Institute of Statistics and Applied Economics. **Purpose:** Practical training in data analysis using STATA

**Introduction to Social Marketing Research** (February 2005) and **Dash Board Data Analysis Training** (July 2005), by Population Services International. **Purpose:** Practical skills in measuring outcomes of social marketing interventions and conducting data analysis.

**New Agendas for Poverty Reduction: Integrating Gender and reproductive Health in Poverty Reduction Strategies** (February 2003), by The World Bank Institute. **Purpose:** To revise Uganda's PRSP and incorporate gender and reproductive health in poverty reduction strategies

**Participatory Project Monitoring and Evaluation** (May 2003), by Uganda Management Institute. **Purpose:** To acquire comprehensive participatory project management and evaluation skills.

**Monitoring and Evaluating Population Programmes** (July 2003), **By:** Department of Population Studies, Institute of Statistics and Applied Economics, Makerere University.

**Purpose:** To acquire specific skills in monitoring and evaluating the population programmes, and gender advocacy programmes.

**Public Procurement** (August 2003), by Public Procurement and Disposal of Assets (PPDA)

**Purpose:** To improve credibility of public procurement systems in Uganda and adopt new procurement systems.

**Advocacy and Advocacy Strategy Development** (April 2003), by USAID/ Policy II project

**Purpose:** To acquire essential skills in issue-based advocacy and in drawing up advocacy action plans.

#### **AWARDS OBTAINED**

Best 'Employee of the Month' in May 2005 at Population Services International (PSI) for extra hard work and timely delivery of results as the M&E Manager. Certificate of merit as Head-Girl at Kigezi High School.

#### **WORK EXPERIENCE**

**Jan 2013 to date Executive Director/Team Leader Evaluations, Provide and Equip Limited**

##### **Main Accomplishments**

- Provided overall strategic leadership and project oversight of the company, and overall leadership to the Technical; Finance, HR and Administration Departments.
- Served as Team Leader for evaluations and well as Managing Consultant as the primary project liaison to contractors.
- Performed overall contract management and ensured compliance with all contractual requirements.
- Performed overall management of company finances This entailed; budget development and monitoring, making approvals for all financial transactions and project procurements; signing off checks, reviewing project accountabilities, and ensuring submission on monthly returns to the Uganda Revenue Authority.
- Ensured oversight of HR management functions including; recruitment, performance appraisal, remuneration, staff development, leave approval and tracking and ensuring adherence to the policy and procedures manual.
- Worked as the Lead/Principle investigator of evaluation assignments.

## RECENT CONSULTANCIES/RESEARCHES CONDUCTED AS TEAM LEADER

| No  | Contractor's Name  | Period                | Brief Overview of Accomplishments  |
|-----|--|-----------------------|--|
| 1.  | African Development Bank (AFDB), Africa Climate Change Fund  | 20/9/21 to 19/01/22   | International Consultant to Review Concept Notes and Project Proposals of Applicants for the Third Call of Proposals on Gender Equality and Climate Resilience Projects in Africa.   |
| 2.  | Conservation International Foundation (CI)/GEF   | 1/7/21 to 20/9/21     | Terminal Evaluation (TE) for the "Strengthening the Capacity of Institutions in Uganda to Comply with the Transparency Requirements of the Paris Agreement" program.   |
| 3.  | GEF/UN Environment Programme (UNEP)  | 06/04/2021 – 06/06/21 | As an <b>international consultant</b> , conducted Mid-Term Review of the UNEP/GEF Project "Developing the Microbial Biotechnology Industry from Kenya's Soda Lakes in line with the Nagoya Protocol".  |
| 4.  | GEF/UN Environment Programme (UNEP)  | 01/04/20 to 31/12/20  | As an <b>international consultant</b> , conducted Mid-Term Review of the UN Environment/Global Environment Facility Project "Scaling Up Sustainable Land Management and Agro-Biodiversity Conservation to Reduce Environmental Degradation in Small-Scale Agriculture in Western Kenya   |
| 5.  | World Bank, Independent Evaluation Office of the Global Environment Facility (GEF)                 | 22/3/19 to 30/6/19    | Conduct ex-ante Strategic Country Cluster Evaluation (SCCE) in Uganda, as part of 23 countries in Sub-Saharan Africa, covering 6 GEF projects that closed 10 years before with interventions on conservation of biodiversity in Albertine region, protected areas management and sustainable use, invasive plant management, overcoming land degradation in the cattle corridor, Integrated landscape management                             |
| 6.  | USAID/Uganda Feed the Future, Enabling Environment for Agriculture, Chemonics International.       | 15/3/16 to 29/7/16    | Developed the national climate change indicators. Facilitated a series workshops for <b>38 Feed the Future Districts</b> to develop <b>Climate Change (CC)</b> action plans aligned to the national Output Based Budgeting. Conducted CC technical capacity assessment and facilitated the development of CC strengthening action plans for the Ministry of Water and Environment and Ministry of Agriculture Animal industry and Fisheries. |
| 7.  | USAID/EEA, Chemonics International   | 24/11/14 to 30/4/15   | Facilitated a workshop for District Leaders and <b>Climate Change</b> Focal point persons on mainstreaming Climate Change (CC) into the District Development Plans and developing Climate Change indicators for the national Output Based Budgeting.   |
| 8.  | USAID/EEA, Chemonics International   | 24/11/14 to 30/4/15   | Facilitated a district leader's workshop for mainstreaming <b>Climate Change (CC)</b> into the District Development Plans  |
| 9.  | United Nations Development Program (UNDP)/RCO  | 23/7/18 to 22/10/2018 | Conducted Midterm Review of United Nations Development Assistance Framework ( <b>UNDAF</b> ) for all UN agencies in Uganda, including <b>SDGs, NDP II and new UN reforms</b> covering <b>Governance, Human Capital Development (HCD) and Sustainable and Economic Development. Including all 11 refugee hosting districts.</b>   |
| 10. | USAID/Uganda Feed the Future, Enabling Environment for Agriculture (EEA), Chemonics International. | 21/4/15 to 30/6/15    | Facilitated a workshop for District Technical Planning Committees on mainstreaming <b>Climate Change (CC)</b> into the District Development Plans and developing Climate Change action plans indicators for the national Output Based Budgeting.   |
| 11. | UN Women, Liberia  | 6/8/18 to 20/8/18     | International Results Based Management ( <b>RBM</b> ) Consultant – Country Program Document Development for <b>Liberia EU/UN Spotlight Initiative</b> to address <b>all forms of violence against women and girls</b> ; and aligning it to SDGs.   |
| 12. | USAID/Uganda Feed the Future Commodity Production & Marketing, Chemonics International.            | 5/14/13 - 11/15/13    | Designed and provided <b>technical support</b> to the implementation of Feed the Future (FTF) baseline survey regarding improving the quantity and quality of coffee, maize, and beans produced and marketed by small-holder farmers. Developed the project results framework and <b>performance management Plan (PMP)</b> .   |
| 13. | Civil Society Fund Monitoring and Evaluation Agent   | 20009- 2012           | Conducted proposal <b>reviews for over 300 CSOs</b> implementing HIV/AIDS, OVC, Social Economic Strengthening, education, and <b>crosscutting issues such as CC and gender. Provided technical support for developing M&amp;E frameworks and theory of change.</b>   |



| No  | Contractor's Name   | Period                 | Brief Overview of Accomplishments   |
|-----|---|------------------------|---|
| 14. | UNAIDS Geneva/MoGCW Malawi  | 7/8/2020 to 30/10/2020 | As an <b>international consultant</b> , conducted an <b>HIV and Social Protection Assessment in Malawi</b> .  |
| 15. | Infectious Diseases Institute (IDI)   | 09/03/20 to 31/7/20    | Combined baseline, mid-term and end of term evaluation for West-West Nile and Kampala Regional projects.  |
| 16. | UNHCR   | 10/02/20 to 31/12/20   | Conducted the Education Response Plan for Refugees and Host Communities (ERP) Baseline Survey in all 13 Refugee hosting districts   |
| 17. | American Cancer Society/Clear Outcomes  | 17/01/20 to 31/05/24   | Provided data collection and evaluation support for baseline survey, process and outcome evaluations for ACS Global Patient Navigation Expansion Initiative   |
| 18. | World Bank/ Global Partnership for Social Accountability  | 23/12/19 to 31/12/20   | Conducted end of project evaluation for enhancing performance and accountability of social service contracts in Uganda project  |
| 19. | UNICEF  | 22/11/19 to 30/06/2020 | Developed the National Nutrition Communication Strategy and Plan of Action; and Karamoja Nutrition Communication Campaign   |
| 20. | Uganda AIDS Commission  | 21/12/19 to 30/4/20    | Served as the lead M&E consultant for developing the National HIV/AIDS Strategic Plan 2020/21-2025/26 and Its M&E Plan and indicator handbook; and aligned them to SDGs and NDP III.  |
| 21. | USAID Uganda/Global Health Pro  | 12/8/19 to 02/11/19    | Performed M&E system assessment, support and data verification for <b>DREAMS project (HIV, FP, GBV and IGA) in 7 districts</b> of northern Uganda ( <b>Acholi and Lango Regions</b> ).  |
| 22. | Overseas Development Institute (ODI)/UNDP/ NPA  | 01/4/19 to 30/9/19     | Conducted <b>Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)</b> policy and institutional gap analysis in Uganda.  |
| 23. | UNICEF  | 5/2/19 to 30/5/19      | Conducted the Knowledge, Attitudes and Practices (KAP) assessment on the Key Family Care Practices ( <b>KFCPs</b> ) in <b>30 districts</b> . KFCPs included <b>RMNCH, nutrition, WASH, education and child protection</b> .   |
| 24. | UNAIDS Geneva/MGLSD   | 10/09/18 to 19/01/19   | Conducted an <b>HIV and Social Protection Assessment</b> in Uganda, including interviews with people living with HIV, <b>key populations and sexual minorities</b> such as transgender, commercial sex workers, truck drivers, injectable drug users and men having sex with men.   |
| 25. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning   | 11/6/18 to 15/08/18    | Conducted DO1 ( <b>Socio-economic Strengthening</b> ) data quality Assessments and MEL System Assessment for 4 USAID funded projects ( <i>Power Africa Uganda Electricity Supply Accelerator, Producer Organizations, Send the Cow Uganda, Youth Leadership for Agriculture</i> across 7 districts.   |
| 26. | USAID Regional Health Integration to Enhance Services in the Acholi Region of Northern Uganda (USAID RHITES-N Acholi) | 25/5/18 to 7/7/18      | Conducted <b>gender, youth and social inclusion</b> analysis baseline survey in <b>8 districts</b> of Northern Uganda, Acholi Region (Agago, Amuru, Gulu, Kitgum, Lamwo, Nwoya, Omoro, and Pader).  |
| 27. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning   | 15/5/18 to 15/07/18    | Conducted DO3 (Family Health) data quality Assessments and MEL System Assessment for <b>12 USAID funded health projects</b> 14 districts (RHITES-SW, RHITES-EC, RHITES-E, HIWA, Voucher Plus, MAPD, SITES, Indoor Residual Activity, CHC, UHSC, SMA and Defeat TB) in <b>TB, malaria, family planning, and FP, reproductive health, water and sanitation programs</b> . |
| 28. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning   | 11/12/17 to 31/07/18   | Provided training and data collection management services for the evaluation of USAID/Uganda Private Health Support (PHS) Program.  |
| 29. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning   | 07/11/17 to 15/12/17   | Provided training and data collection management services for the evaluation of 'Obulamu' campaign under Communication for Health Communities/FHI360.   |
| 30. | UNFPA   | 28/9/2017 to 30/11/17  | Conducted a Baseline Survey on Sexual and Reproductive Health Rights (SRHR)/GBV in 16 Selected Drought Affected Districts in Uganda ( <b>including 4 Karamoja districts</b> ; in line with SDGs, NDP II and HSSP).  |
| 31. | UNAIDS  | 28/9/2017 to 30/11/17  | Conducted a Baseline Assessment of SRH/HIV Linkages in Uganda ( <b>including 5 Karamoja districts</b> ); in line with SDGs, NDP II and HSSP.  |

| No  | Contractor's Name   | Period               | Brief Overview of Accomplishments   |
|-----|---|----------------------|---|
| 32. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning                   | 07/8/17 to 30/09/17  | Conducted DO1 (Socio-economic Strengthening) data quality Assessments and MEL System Assessment for 7 USAID funded projects across 6 districts.   |
| 33. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning                   | 15/6/17 to 30/09/17  | Conducted DO3 data quality Assessments and MEL System Assessment for 10 USAID funded <b>health</b> projects ( <i>Uganda Social Marketing Activity (SMA), Maternal and Child Survival program (MCSP), Regional Health Integration to Enhance Services-SW (RHITES-SW), Health Initiatives in Workplace Activity (HIWA) and Uganda Health Supply Chain Program (UHSC), USAID's Malaria Action Program for Districts (MAPD), Procurement and Supply Management (PSA), Voucher Plus, RHITES-EC.</i> ) ( <i>TB, malaria, family planning, and FP, reproductive health, water and sanitation</i> ) |
| 34. | World Health Organisation (WHO)   | 05/6/17 to 15/08/17  | Conducted a meningitis vaccination coverage survey including household listing in 39 districts (including <b>all northern and all Karamoja districts</b> )  |
| 35. | Save the Children International   | 15/5/17 to 31/7/17   | Conducted a mid-term evaluation for the maternal, neo-natal and child health program in Ntoroko district and assessed alignment to NDP II.  |
| 36. | Amref Health Africa   | 24/5/17 to 31/5/17   | Conducted a mid-term evaluation for the <b>maternal, neo-natal and child health</b> program in 2 districts; and assessed alignment to NDP II.   |
| 37. | Danish People's Aid (DPA)   | 01/03/17 to 28/03/17 | Conducted the End of Project Evaluation Report for Improving <b>Environmental Sanitation and Livelihoods</b> in Kampala by Up-scaling the Use of the Community Lead Urban Environmental Sanitation (CLUES II) Approach.   |
| 38. | Aga Khan Foundation Canada (AKFC)   | 17/10/16 to 31/1/17  | Conducted Data Quality Assessment in <b>Kenya</b> (Nairobi and Mombasa), <b>Tanzania</b> (Dar es Salaam and Lindi) and <b>Uganda</b> (Kampala and Arua) for the Strengthening <b>Education</b> Systems in East Africa (SESEA) project.  |
| 39. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning                   | 20/10/16 to 30/07/16 | Conducted DO3 data quality Assessments and MEL System Assessment for 7 USAID funded <b>health</b> projects ( <i>family planning, HIV/AIDS, nutrition and malaria</i> )  |
| 40. | DFID/ECO-Fuel Africa  | 27/5/16 to 20/6/16   | Conducted Midline Evaluation to assess <b>learning outcomes</b> using Early Grade Reading Assessment (EGRA) and Early Grade Mathematics Assessment (EGMA) Assessment tools.   |
| 41. | The Elizabeth Glaser Pediatric AIDS Foundation (EGPAF)/RHITES-SW          | 13/4/16 to 15/5/16   | Conducted a baseline survey USAID Regional Health Integration to Enhance Services Project in 16 districts in South Western Uganda   |
| 42. | Makerere University School of Public Health                               | 20/11/15 to 28/2/16  | Conducted end of Project Evaluation of the Maternal and Neonatal Implementation for Equitable Systems (MANIFEST) study (January 2013 – April 2016)  |
| 43. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning                   | 12/12/15 to 23/12/15 | Conducted DO1 data quality Assessments and MEL System Assessment for 7 USAID funded <b>Agriculture</b> and Socio-Economic Development projects.   |
| 44. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning                   | 23/10/15 to 11/11/15 | Conducted DO3 data quality Assessments and MEL System Assessment for 8 USAID funded <b>health</b> projects ( <i>family planning, HIV/AIDS, nutrition and malaria</i> )  |
| 45. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning                   | 22/10/15 to 1/6/18   | Performed <b>sub contract management</b> for program on M&E systems and frameworks, conducting surveys to support evaluations and research, collecting and analyzing data, and delivering data quality assessments.   |
| 46. | Iris Group  | 14/10/15 to 31/12/15 | Conducted data quality Assessments for <b>socio-economic</b> entrepreneurs  |
| 47. | AMREF   | 15/7/15 to 31/8/15   | Conducted a baseline survey for the maternal, neo-natal and child health program in 2 districts.  |
| 48. | USAID/URC/ASSIST  | 13/7/15 to 31/12/15  | Provided M&E <b>Technical Support</b> to the project including conducting DQAs and MEL System Assessment.   |
| 49. | UNFPA   | 15/6/15 to 30/8/15   | Conducted an end of program evaluation for the UN Joint Population program in Uganda implemented by 10 UN Agencies in 15 districts ( <b>including 7 Karamoja districts</b> ).   |
| 50. | USAID/Monitoring and Evaluation of Emergency Plan Progress (MEEPP) Uganda | 4/6/15 to 30/11/15   | Provided management and technical support supervision services to 13 Senior Consultants for District M&E Capacity Building for Strengthening Health Management Information System (HMIS) and Orphans and Vulnerable Children Management Information System ( <b>OVC MIS</b> ) and DQAs.   |

| No  | Contractor's Name   | Period               | Brief Overview of Accomplishments   |
|-----|---|----------------------|---|
| 51. | DEVINA  | 9/3/2015 to 30/3/15  | Performed technical review of DENIVA <b>M&amp;EL Plan and indicators</b> , designed data collection tools and trained project implementers on M&E.  |
| 52. | Uganda AIDS Commission  | 17/2/2015 to 15/3/15 | Developed the <b>National HIV/AIDS M&amp;E Plan 2015/16—2019/20 and NSP Indicator Handbook</b>  |
| 53. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning                   | 13/1/2015 – 5/2/15   | Conducted End of Term Evaluation using the <b>Client Exit Survey</b> methodology for the End of Project Evaluation for STAR East, STAR South West and STAR East Central and produced reports  |
| 54. | Iris Group, USA   | 5/1/2015 to 27/3/15  | Conducted data quality assessments for Vital Voices Fellows in <b>Uganda, Kenya and Nigeria</b>   |
| 55. | UNAIDS Uganda   | 22/10/14 to 30/12/14 | Designed and conducted the end of term evaluation for the UN Joint Program Support for HIV and AIDS (JUPSA) in Uganda; that entailed a nationwide consultative process across a multi-sectoral spectrum of stakeholders. Developed the January to December 2015 JUPSA work plan <b>(including 5 Karamoja districts)</b> . |
| 56. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning                   | 20/10/14 to 5/11/14  | Conducted a <b>Cost Efficiency Assessment</b> Survey for ‘Save a Mother Give a Life’ project in 40 health facilities, 4 districts. Analysed data and produced data sets per facility, and indicator; developed a comprehensive field report.  |
| 57. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Contract          | 22/9/14 to 15/10/14  | Designed and conducted M&E system assessment as well as <b>data quality assessments</b> for 8 USAID Feed the Future Projects implementing agriculture and climate change (CPM, EEA, Community Connector, Ag-Inputs, Harvest Plus, ABSP 2, ACIDI/VOCA and Mercy Corps).  |
| 58. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Contract          | 1/9/14 to 15/9/14    | Designed and implemented data quality assessments for <b>TB, Malaria and medical</b> procurement projects.  |
| 59. | Uganda AIDS Commission  | 4/8/14 to 10/10/14   | Conducted the <b>midterm review</b> for the National HIV/AIDS Strategic Plan 2011/12- 2014/15 and developed the National Strategic Plan 2015/16—2019/20; and assessed alignment to SDGs and NDP II.   |
| 60. | UN Women/MFPED  | 8/8/14 to 8/10/14    | Developed the gender strategy and indicators for the Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development contracted by UN Women  |
| 61. | USAID/EEA, Chemonics International  | 14/8/14 to 18/8/14   | Facilitated a district leader’s workshop for mainstreaming <b>Climate Change</b> (CC) into the District Development Plans using MFPED Output Budget Tool (OBT) and developed a detailed plan for rolling it out to district technical planning committees in USAID Uganda 19 CC focus districts.                          |
| 62. | Uganda AIDS Commission  | 4/8/14 to 9/9/14     | Designed and conducted <b>capacity assessment</b> for UAC Self Coordinating Entities and developed and capacity building strategy.  |
| 63. | Wellshare International   | 6/6/14 to 2/8/14     | Designed and conducted a <b>baseline survey for the HIV/AIDS and Family Planning</b> Integration Project in Arua District.  |
| 64. | Data Care (U) Ltd   | 27/5/14 to 30/7/14   | Developed <b>Board of Directors’ Guidelines</b> , and board <b>handbook</b> ; and facilitated the board orientation session.  |
| 65. | USAID/EEA, Chemonics International  | 17/4/14 -30/5/14     | Designed and conducted the <b>Climate Change Mapping and Inventory</b> survey in the four regions of Uganda. Performed qualitative and quantitative data analysis and report writing.   |
| 66. | USAID/QED Group LLC, Monitoring Evaluation and Learning Contract          | 15/1/14 - 14/2/14    | Designed and implemented the health facility youth <b>data validation survey in 49 health facilities</b> across 10 districts; performed analysis; produced a comprehensive validation report.   |
| 67. | USAID/Monitoring and Evaluation of Emergency Plan Progress (MEEPP) Uganda | 26/11/13 - 14/12/13  | Designed materials and facilitated the <b>annual review and work plan development</b> workshop and staff retreat. Produced a comprehensive workshop/retreat report with lessons learnt and recommendations.   |
| 68. | USAID/EEA, Chemonics International  | 8/5/13 - 9/30/13     | Designed and conducted baseline surveys on ‘ <b>climate change</b> data for adaptation use by government decision makers at the district level’; and ‘stakeholder perceptions on  |

| No  | Contractor's Name   | Period            | Brief Overview of Accomplishments  |
|-----|---------------------|-------------------|--|
|     |                     |                   | the agricultural policy enabling environment'. Performed data analysis and produced reports for the baseline surveys.  |
| 69. | USAID/ MEEPP Uganda | 7/8/ 13 - 8/30/13 | Coordinated and worked with Medical, Public health and M&E Specialists to conduct <b>PMTCT</b> data quality assessments in <b>19 districts among 103 health facilities</b> . Compiled 19 comprehensive district reports and one aggregate national report. |
| 70. | USAID/ MEEPP Uganda | 2/25/13 - 5/13/13 | Mentored and provided <b>technical support the PEPFAR implementing partners</b> in the use of the upgraded HIBRID partner reporting system. Conducted data analysis and generation of reports using aggregate country PEPFAR semi-annual 2013 report.      |

### July–Dec 2012 Chief of Party, Civil Society Fund, Monitoring and Evaluation Agent (CSFMEA)/Chemonics International

#### Main Accomplishments

- Provided overall strategic leadership and project oversight; produced and submitted quality project deliverables on time. A performance appraisal was carried out and I excelled in my performance ratings.
- Served as primary project liaison to donors, CSF steering committee (governing body), sub-grantees and other key stakeholders
- Provided overall leadership and oversight of managers for M&E Technical; Finance, HR and Administration; Operations and Communication Departments
- Performed overall contract management and ensured compliance with all contractual requirements. Provided overall quality assurance for all project activities and deliverables Performed final reviews of all project deliverables and submitted them to donors and CSF steering committee such as reports annual work plan/ budget and success stories.
- Provided technical support and oversight to the M&E technical staff for the development and management of the CSF web-based service delivery, child status index databases and Geographical Information System (GIS).
- Performed overall management of project finances (8 million dollars) and project other resources. This entailed; budget development and monitoring, making approvals for all financial transactions and project procurements; signing off checks, and reviewing project accountabilities to ensure adherence to USAID/Chemonics regulations.
- Ensured oversight of HR management functions including; recruitment, performance appraisal, remuneration, staff development, leave approval and tracking and ensuring adherence to the policy and procedures manual.
- Designed and managed HIV/AIDS (4) and (1) OVC special studies as well as a lot quality assurance sampling survey (LQAS) study in 10 districts and end of project assessments.
- Provided technical support and oversight to the designing and conducting sub-grantee capacity assessments, decentralized capacity building models and blended learning modules (Communication, Managing People Performance, Managing Change, M&E, and gender)
- Provided oversight and quality assurance for the CSF communication functions that include producing success stories, quarterly e-newsletters, documentaries and dissemination to stakeholders

### December 2010 – June 2012: Acting Chief of Party, CSFMEA /Chemonics International

**Main Accomplishments:** Same as above

**July 2010 – to November 2010 Program Director/Deputy Chief of Party, CSFMEA /Chemonics International**

**Main Accomplishments**

- Deputized the Chief of Party in performing overall project oversight, coordination and management; including representing the project and Chemonics in strategic management meetings with CSF Steering Committee meetings; CSF management, funders; and meetings with line ministries.
- Managed CSF annual work plan and budget development processes and production of annual and quarterly reports and made presentations to the governing structures.
- Performed budget management functions including budget development, monitoring and control (2 million dollars annually)
- Provided technical oversight to M&E technical team, and direct supervision of 4 senior M&E personnel, the Communication Specialist and HR Manager and quality assurance for project outputs, products and deliverables.
- Performed personnel management functions including recruitment, selection, retention, appraisal and rewards
- Produced aggregate CSF joint monitoring and support supervision reports and made presentations to stakeholders
- Provided technical oversight for designing CSO and Local government M&E capacity strengthening interventions that included capacity assessments, trainings, technical support supervision and one on one mentoring and coaching. Performed M&E for institutional and technical capacity strengthening interventions.
- Supervised the performance measurement plan (PMP) revisions and designing of data collection and reporting tools, as well as web-based and offline databases.
- Oversaw the design and implementation of end of project assessments for 98 sub-grantees.
- Provided leadership for technical reviews of sub grantee proposals, selection and award of contracts
- Provided oversight to office administration and procurement processes.

**February 2009 – to June 2010: Senior Monitoring and Evaluation Technical Advisor, CSFMEA/Chemonics Intl.**

**Main Accomplishments**

- Established CSF M&E system both at the central and CSF sub-grantee level (142 CSOs and 80 local governments) at a lower level. These organisations deliver a wide range of HIV/AIDS services including HIV counseling and testing, OVC services, HIV prevention through BCC, PMTCT, Palliative care, Paediatric AIDS care and laboratory infrastructure support. I designed OVC data collection tools for the project that were adopted as national OVC tools.
- Developed CSF MEA project performance management plan (PMP) for the project; involved the development of project key deliverables, outputs and indicators.
- Scaled up data use by designing data use indicators and tracking tools; training as well as providing technical support to CSOs for scaled up data use in programming.

- Conducted and monitored capacity strengthening for CSF funded CSOs and local governments including M&E training, regular technical support, progress report review and feedback, M&E mentoring and coaching
- Provided M&E technical input into CSF request for applications guidelines. Conducted technical reviews for proposals submitted for CSF funding and provided technical assistance for refining M&E frameworks, plans, activities and budgets
- Conducted field monitoring and support supervision for CSF funded CSOs.
- Designed and conducted end of project assessments for CSF sub grantees
- Represented the Chief of Party on various technical committees and meetings
- Performed personnel management tasks through providing technical input into scopes of work for all M&E positions, developing interview questions and scoring tools, conducting interviews and performance appraisals. Directly supervised the project M&E specialist, 2 program assistants and consultants
- Performed budget monitoring, approvals and control for M&E technical activities
- Performed quality assurance of consultancy work through designing clear scope of work and deliverables, support supervision and review of consultant reports

**April 2007 – January 2009: Monitoring & Evaluation Manager**

**International Center for Research on Women (ICRW) under CORE Initiative Project  
(USAID/Ministry of Gender Labor & Social Development bilateral mechanism)**

**Main Accomplishments**

- Strengthened CSO M&E and data quality assurance systems by developing standardized OVC/HIV BCC data collection, reporting, and monitoring tools for the programs and conducting data quality assessments
- Designed a 7-module comprehensive M&E training manual for CSOs.
- Provided M&E technical support to 48 MGLSD/CORE grantees, including facilitating M&E trainings.
- Performed technical and compliance reviews of project proposals and recommended viable one's funding to implement HIV prevention and OVC programs. Managed consultants' procurement processes, contracts and appraisals.
- Performed M&E budget development, monitoring and control (1 million dollars annually)
- Directly supervised the Data Manager, 2 M&E Officers and M&E consultants
- Supervised data aggregation, cleaning, verification and reporting functions of the program.
- Analyzed program data and disseminated information to stakeholders for use in program improvement.
- Conducted reviews of sub-grantee program reports and provided feedback.
- Managed and supervised the development and use of the electronic project Management Information System.
- Organized and streamlined the program data storage system; both hard and soft copies.
- Organized quarterly program review and planning meetings
- Provided regular M&E field monitoring visits to grantees as well as providing timely feedback for improved programming and data quality.

**September 2005 – March 2007: Monitoring & Evaluation Specialist, Social & Scientific Systems Inc, Monitoring and Evaluation of Emergency Plan Progress (MEEPP) Project**

**Main Accomplishments**

- Provided oversight and coordinated M&E activities of all 75 PEPFAR implementing partners in Uganda funded through USAID, CDC, DOD, State, NIH and Peace Corps. PEPFAR implemented programs in HIV prevention through BCC, PMTCT, VCT, ARV, Palliative care, injection safety, blood safety, institutional capacity building, policy development and system strengthening and OVC.
- Provided M&E technical support to PEPFAR partners including: training on specialized M&E fields such as; data quality assurance, data quality assessments, data management, target setting web-based reporting and PEPFAR partners on indicator definitions and reporting requirements.
- Managed on line data entry and output functions; and provided feedback for database upgrades.
- Conducted reviews of partner's performance monitoring plans (PMP) and provided feedback for improvement.
- Supported PEPFAR funded projects in ensuring that they attract M&E personnel with the right skills, sitting on interview panels and providing technical input to M&E staff scope of work.
- Performed M&E budget management: budget development, monitoring and control (1 million dollars annually) and directly supervised the M&E program assistants.
- Managed the coordination processes of the semi-annual and annual reporting processes of PEPFAR HIV/AIDS programs. This involves assessing project reporting readiness, ensuring accuracy of reported data and minimizing duplication of reported data.
- Ensured accurate reporting through data quality checks, data quality through data quality assessment and data validation data cleaning.
- Enhanced data use through dissemination of data to PEPFAR implementing partners, host country institutions and funding bodies for program improvement.
- Implemented special HIV/AIDS program reviews. Initiated performance data analysis through analysis of progress versus targets and analyzing factors behind the trends.
- Organized and facilitated coordination meetings for PEPFAR partners aimed at providing clarity on indicators, reporting requirements and providing reporting guidance.
- Developed timely and action-based reports on PEPFAR Uganda Country Report, data quality assessment and validation, quarterly progress reports and partner performance trends reports.

**June 2003 August 2005: Monitoring & Evaluation Manager, Population Services International (PSI)/USAID**

**Main Accomplishments**

- Managed and directed PSIU M&E department, and was a member of project management team.
- Designed and set up the PSIU M&E system.
- Designed outcome measurement research studies, produced reports, and disseminated results to stakeholders. These included: The Annual National Tracking Surveys and Knowledge and Attitude (KAP) studies for HIV, malaria, family planning, commercial sex workers, UPDF, the IDPs, HIV Basic Care, HIV in Workplace and Cross Generational Sex, and Event Impact Surveys.
- Reviewed and edited consultants' research reports and made approvals for payment.



- Oversaw and managed the implementation of Event Impact Surveys. Trained program implementers and researchers on implementation of Event Impact Surveys. Developed Event Impact Survey Manuals for VCT, PMTCT, Family Planning, High-risk and Blitz programs.
- Designed activity-monitoring tools for various VCT, PMTCT, family planning and BCC programs.
- Prepared consultant's bidding documents (request for proposals) for quantitative and qualitative population-based surveys.
- Managed consultant recruitment and selection processes and contracts.
- Directly supervised 2 M&E Officers and 4 research assistants.
- Together with the Director, managed PSI research and M&E budget (1 million dollars annually).
- Oversaw research activities such as facilitating questionnaire development and field research monitoring.
- Designed and oversaw baseline and follow-up studies for all PSIU programmes.
- Conducted data cleaning and analysis. This entailed creation of dummy tables, cross tabulations, factor analysis, reliability testing, and logistic regression using SPSS.
- Organized and facilitated research dissemination workshops and presentations.

**March 2001-May 2004: National Programme Officer, Population Secretariat: Ministry of Finance, Planning, and Economic Development. Procurement Committee Secretary.**

**Main Accomplishments**

- Managed and coordinated M&E functions of UNFPA and Government of Uganda population development projects
- Participated in revising the national poverty eradication action plan (PEAP) pillars and ensuring gender mainstreaming in all PEAP pillars
- Developed the M&E framework and manual for national population programme. This included drawing the institutional framework, standardizing the data collection and reporting tools.
- Coordinated the 2001 baseline survey for the 5<sup>th</sup> Country Population Programme
- Took lead in producing the annual '*State of Uganda Population Report*, which highlighted salient population indicators and action so far taken or needed
- Organized and facilitated workshops/meetings for various stakeholders in population Programme countrywide.
- Coordinated household poverty-reduction advocacy programmes through advocating for a manageable family size.
- Produced quarterly and annual progress reports as well as work- plans and budgets
- Spearheaded annual population programme reviews and mid-term evaluations
- Organized stakeholder quarterly coordination and review meetings and bi-annual district coordination meetings
- Managed and supervised contracts for consultants
- As procurement committee secretary, handled the executing all procurement requirements of the organization that included pre-qualification of companies, tendering for bids, evaluation of bids and awarding tenders.

**August 2000- November 2000:** Consultant with International Finance Corporation (IFC) and Industrial Promotion Services (IPS) to conduct a project feasibility study for the rural electrification project in Bushenyi and Rukungiri districts together with NRECA International.

### **Accomplishments**

- Worked as a Lead consultant on the research project; supervised and directed the field study.
- Conducted a survey on options for generation, transmission and distribution of power and recommended the most feasible and affordable project to IFC.
- Carried out a load survey to determine potential demand for electricity
- Designed and conducted a rural electrification feasibility study.
- Recruited, selected, trained and supervised research assistants.
- Carried out all logistical planning, budgeting and execution for field researchers
- Produced the study report for the rural electrification feasibility study and made recommendations for the project.

**July 2000: Consultant** with Surenet Consultancy firm contracted by Nature Uganda to conduct a study on the 'Feasibility of Ecotourism and other Potential Micro-Enterprises' in Misambwa Islands and areas adjacent to it, in Rakai district.

**1998-2000:** Teaching English in China

**1995-1997: Assistant Programme Facilitator, Compassion International Uganda**

### **Accomplishments**

- Facilitated child development projects through providing support and acting as a liaison between children and their sponsors.
- Conducted needs assessment and recruitment of vulnerable children into the programme.
- Performed tracking of both sponsors' and children's communication (including translation where necessary).
- Followed up sponsor queries and recommending dispatch of communications between children and their sponsors.
- Performed management of project records
- Updated children's records and processed profiles for new cases

**1993-1994: Research Assistant, Action for Development (ACFODE)**

### **Accomplishments**

- Conducted research on factors that affect girl-child education in Kasese district
- Participated in the design and pretesting of various research instruments
- Facilitated focus group discussions
- Conducted field data collection and analysis
- Performed research report writing

### **Other Consultancies/Researches**

- Designed and conducted a CSF special study on: Factors that influence knowledge levels among the population aged 15 – 54 years regarding identifying ways of preventing sexual transmission of HIV, rejecting major misconceptions and the correct steps for condom use in five selected districts (November 2012).
- Designed and conducted a CSF special study on: Effectiveness of OVC supported interventions towards improvement in food security and economic strengthening among OVC households in five selected districts of Uganda (November 2012).

- Designed and conducted a study on: Factors influencing data utilization among civil society organizations and its effects on data quality and program effectiveness: A case study of Uganda civil society (2012).
- Designed and conducted end of project assessments for 142 CSF sub grantees implementing HIV prevention, care and OVC projects (2010-12).
- Developed M&E training modules and conducted M&E training for Ministry of Finance, Planning and Economic Development; Population Secretariat staff and other implementers of GOU/UNFPA 6<sup>th</sup> country programme (April 2008).
- Developed a UNAIDS five-year (2007-2012) M&E framework for Uganda Joint Programme for HIV/AIDS. The framework was divided into 5 major themes; HIV/AIDS Mainstreaming, HIV/AIDS prevention, HIV/AIDS treatment and Care and programme and activity M&E (Oct-December 2007).
- Evaluated AQUIRE/Engender Health Project and produced an evaluation report (November 2007).
- Conducted the following outcome measurement research studies for PSI (2003-2005): Knowledge and Attitude (KAP) studies for HIV, malaria, family planning, commercial sex workers, UPDF, the IDPs, HIV Basic Care, HIV in Workplace and Cross Generational Sex, and Event Impact Surveys.
- Developed a project proposal on ‘The Community and Church Partnership to Minimize the Effect of HIV/AIDS on the East African Society’, Uganda Lutheran World Foundation, (2000).
- Developed a proposal on ‘Break the Silence’ a domestic violence mitigation proposal for Office of the Vice President (2002).
- Researcher for Improved cooking stoves piloting project under Makerere University (2000).
- Team leader for the rural electrification project feasibility study in Bushenyi and Rukungiri districts (IPS/IFC) (2000).
- Conducted research on Factors Affecting Female Education in Kasese District for ACFODE (1996)

#### PUBLICATIONS MADE

- **Julian K. Bagyendera (September 2018).** Using Evidence to Institutionalise and Scale up Sustainable - Multi-Sectoral Climate Change Interventions at Central and Local Government Level – What worked well in Uganda, Africa Evidence Network, Pretoria, South Africa.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera (September 2017).** Using Evaluations as Learning and Program Improvement Tools – Lessons from Uganda. Global Evidence Network, Cape Town, South Africa.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera (May 2017).** Enhancing Information Use Among Service Providers through Appreciative and Participatory M&E System and Data Quality Assessments – A Case Study of Uganda. The Canadian Evaluation Society. Vancouver, Canada.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera (May 2017).** Simple Low-cost and Scalable Practices that Enhance the Use of Evaluations in Learning and Decision-Making in Uganda. Vancouver, Canada.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera (September 2016).** Evidence-Informed Decision-Making Landscape for Uganda. *The Africa Evidence Network (AEN)*. Pretoria, South Africa.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera (November 2015).** Is the Concept of Gender Mainstreaming ‘Killing its Own Baby’? Reflections about Gender Mainstreaming in District and Project Plans. International Development Evaluation Association. Bangkok, Thailand.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera (November 2014).** Simple and Pocket Friendly Innovations Boosting Climate Change Adaptation Interventions. The 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Evaluating Climate Change and Development, Washington DC. [climate-eval@climate-eval.org](mailto:climate-eval@climate-eval.org).
- **Julian K. Bagyendera (November 2014).** Strong linkages Between Climate Change Data Use and CCA Interventions. The 2<sup>nd</sup> International Conference on Evaluating Climate Change and Development, Washington DC. [climate-eval@climate-eval.org](mailto:climate-eval@climate-eval.org).
- **Yovani A. M. Lubaale, Proscovia M. Namuwenge, Julian K. Bagyendera and Jackson K. Mukonzo.** Low knowledge of human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) service sites and implications for testing among Ugandans. Journal of AIDS and HIV Research, Vol. 5(10), pp. 391-395, October, 2013. <http://www.academicjournals.org/JAHR>
- **Julian K. Bagyendera (September 2012).** Factors influencing data utilization among civil society organizations and its effects on data quality and program effectiveness: A case study of Uganda civil society fund sub- grantees. PHD Thesis, Atlantic International University, Hawaii.

- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (July 2012). Bridging Gender Gaps in Access to HIV/AIDS Services through Improved Data Use by Implementers. XIX International AIDS Conference Abstract Book Abstract Book. Washington DC, USA.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (July 2012). Harnessing SMS technology to Monitor and Scale up Access to Youth Friendly Services. XIX International AIDS Conference Abstract Book Abstract Book. Washington DC, USA.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (July 2012). Strengthening Civil Society Contribution to the National HIV/AIDS Response through a Harmonized and Coordinated Funding Mechanism. XIX International AIDS Conference. Abstract Book. Washington DC, USA.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (June 2008). “M&E Capacity building for CSOs through participatory data quality assessments for PEPFAR HIV implementers meeting”. Uganda PEPFAR Implementer’s Abstract Book. Kampala.
- Suleiman Barry and **Julian Bagyendera** (June 2006) “Determining Factors to Reporting Quality Data under the USG Emergency Plan (EP) in Uganda”. PEPFAR Implementer’s Abstract Book, Durban.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (2004). “Gender and Empowerment in Uganda, Opportunities and Challenges”. State of Uganda Population Report, Population Secretariat, Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (2003). “The Influence of Poverty on Fertility”. State of Uganda Population Report, Population Secretariat, Ministry of Finance Planning and Economic Development, Kampala,
- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (2000). “The role of NGOs in promotion of education in Uganda” DENIVA, Kampala.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (2000). “The Changing Paradigm of Modern Enterprise Management”. Central South University of Science and Technology Management Journal, Changsha, Vol. 224.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (1999). “The Current Trend of Modern Enterprise Management” Master’s Thesis, Central South University of Science and Technology Management Journal, Changsha.
- **Julian K. Bagyendera** (1995). “The Role of NGOs in Assisting Vulnerable Children”. BA Dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala.

#### COMPUTER SKILLS AND KNOWLEDGE

Stata, SPSS, Epi Info, GIS, SQL Server, Ms: Power point, Project Manager Access, Word and Excel.

#### LANGUAGE PROFICIENCY

|                     |                                      |
|---------------------|--------------------------------------|
| English (Excellent) | Runyankole/Rukiga/Rutoro (Excellent) |
| Chinese (Good)      | Luganda (Good)                       |
| French (Fair)       | Kinyarwanda/Lufumbira (good)         |
| Swahili (Good)      |                                      |

#### LEADERSHIP AND MEMBERSHIP TO OTHER ORGANIZATIONS

|   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. Member of Uganda Evaluators Association (UEA)                    | 2. Member, Uganda national HIV/AIDS M&E Technical Working Group   |
| 3. <b>Board Member</b> African Evidence Network (AEN)               | 4. Member, Uganda OVC national Technical Working Group  |
| 5. Member, International Development Evaluation Association (IDEAS) | 6. <b>Former Vice-Chair Board</b> of Directors (Reach One Touch One)  |
| 7. Member, Africa Evaluators Association (AFREA)                    | 8. Leader, Marrieds’ Fellowship, St Francis Chapel, Makerere University, Pre-marital Councilor - <i>Volunteer</i> . |
| 9. Member, European Evaluators Society (EES)                        | 10. Leader, Mother’s Union, St Francis Chapel, Makerere University - <i>Volunteer</i> .                             |
| 11. Member, International HIV/AIDS Society                          | 12. Member, Uganda Management Forum   |

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 13. Member, South African M&E Association (SAMEA)  | 14. Member, Action for Development (ACFODE) – <i>focused on women emancipation</i> |
| 15. Member, International Climate Eval Association | 16. Chair Person, Kikooko Foundation, Uganda (volunteer organizations)             |

### DUTIES HELD IN SCHOOL

Librarian (St. Francis Chapel Makerere University), Vice Chairperson Youth Fellowship (St. Francis Chapel Makerere University), Head Girl (Kigezi High School), Vice Chairperson Scripture Union (Kigezi High School), Head Monitor (Kinyasano Primary School).

### REFEREES

|  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Katie Stauss<br>Founder Scintilla Consult and Former Project Director Chemonics International<br>Relationship: Former Supervisor.<br>Tel. 1-3017932352,<br>Email: <a href="mailto:Katiestauss@gmail.com">Katiestauss@gmail.com</a> , <a href="mailto:kstauss@scintillaconsult.com">kstauss@scintillaconsult.com</a> | 3. Prof. Narathius Asingwiire,<br>Executive Director, Social Economic Data Center/Senior lecturer Makerere University<br>Email: <a href="mailto:asingwiren@yahoo.com">asingwiren@yahoo.com</a><br>Tel. 256-757460250 |
| 2. Andrea Hernandez Tobar<br>Country Director, iDE, Ethiopia<br>Relationship: Former colleague.<br>Tel: (509) 3702-8820, Email: <a href="mailto:ahtoabar@gmail.com">ahtoabar@gmail.com</a>   |  |

## Annex 8: Data Collection Tools



Tool 1 Key  
Informant Interview



Tool 2 Key  
Informant Interview



Tool 3 Key  
Informant Interview



Tool 5 Financial  
Management Assess



Tool 6 Focus  
Group Guide.docx





## Annex 9: GEF Rating Criterion



1\_Criterion\_rating\_de  
scriptions\_matrix\_22 0