



REPORT FOR THE MID- TERM REVIEW (MTR) OF THE

ADDRESSING BARRIERS TO ADOPTION OF IMPROVED CHARCOAL
PRODUCTION TECHNOLOGIES AND SUSTAINABLE LAND MANAGEMENT
PRACTICES THROUGH AN INTEGRATED APPROACH
(PIMS 4493) PROJECT IN UGANDA

NATIONAL EVALUATOR
ROBERT NABANYUMYA

INTERNATIONAL EVALUATOR/REPORT AUTHOR
MARIA ONESTINI

APRIL 28, 2017

I. OPENING PAGE

TITLE OF UNDP SUPPORTED GEF FINANCED PROJECT:

Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach

PROJECT ID#S:

PIMS # 4493

EVALUATION TIME FRAME AND DATE OF EVALUATION REPORT

Time frame: March to April 2017
April 2017

REGION AND COUNTRIES INCLUDED IN THE PROJECT:

- Africa, Uganda

GEF OPERATIONAL PROGRAM/STRATEGIC PROGRAM

GEF 5

IMPLEMENTING PARTNER

Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) of Uganda

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The evaluation team would like to acknowledge and thank all who graciously shared their time, information, and inputs for the interviews and consultations that took place as part of this process.

DISCLAIMER

Be stated that the analysis and recommendations contained in this document only represent the analysis of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the United Nations Development Programme, GEF, any other UN Agency, nor any of the donors or parties involved in the Project.

II. TABLE OF CONTENTS

i. Opening page	2
Title of UNDP supported GEF financed project:	2
Project ID#s:	2
Evaluation time frame and date of evaluation report	2
Region and countries included in the project:	2
GEF Operational Program/Strategic Program	2
Implementing Partner	2
Acknowledgements	3
Disclaimer	3
ii. Table of Contents	4
iii. Acronyms and Abbreviations	6
1. Executive Summary	8
Project Information Table	8
Project Description	9
Project Progress Summary	11
MTR Ratings and Achievement Summary Table	12
Concise summary of conclusions	13
Recommendation Summary	14
Recommendations at the design level for future programming of GEF funded – UNDP implemented projects	14
Recommendations for remaining implementation period of the project	14
Recommendations for an extension request	14
2. Introduction	15
Purpose of the MTR and objectives	15
Scope and Methodology: Principles of Design and Execution of The MTR, MTR Approach and Data Collection Methods, Limitations to The MTR	15
Structure of the MTR Report	17
3. Project Description and Background Context	18
Development context: environmental, socio-economic, institutional, and policy factors relevant to the project objective and scope	18
Problems that the project sought to address: threats and barriers targeted	19
Project Description and Strategy: objective, outcomes and expected results, description of field sites	19

Project Implementation Arrangements: short description of the Project Board, key implementing partner arrangements.....	20
Project timing and milestones	20
Main stakeholders	20
4. Findings	22
4.1 Project Strategy	22
Project Design and Results Framework/Logframe	22
4.2 Progress Towards Results	24
Progress towards outcomes analysis	24
Remaining barriers to achieving the project objective	32
4.3 Project Implementation and Adaptive Management.....	34
Management Arrangements	34
Work planning	36
Finance and co-finance.....	36
Project-level monitoring and evaluation systems.....	37
Stakeholder engagement	37
Reporting.....	38
Communications.....	38
4.4 Sustainability.....	38
Financial risks to sustainability.....	38
Socio-economic RISKS to sustainability.....	39
Institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability	39
Environmental risks to sustainability	39
Extension Request	40
5. Conclusions and Recommendations	41
5.1 Conclusions	41
5.2 Recommendations.....	44
Recommendations at the design level for future programming of GEF funded – UNDP implemented projects.....	44
Recommendations for remaining implementation period of the project	44
Recommendations for an extension request	46
6. Annexes	47

III. ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

APFS	Agro-Pastoral Field Schools
APR	Annual Progress Report
BEST	Biomass Energy Strategy
CAI	Current Annual Increment
CBO	Community Based Organization
CCM	Climate Change Mitigation
CPAP	Country Program Action Plan
CSO	Civil Society Organization
DFS	District Forestry Service
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization
FFS	Farmer Field Schools
FSP	Full-Size Project
FSSD	Forest Sector Support Department
GEF	Global Environmental Facility
GIZ	Deutsche Gesellschaft für Internationale Zusammenarbeit
GOU	Government of Uganda
KPI	Key performance indicators
LC	Local Councils
MAI	Mean Annual Increment
MEMD	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development
MRV	Monitoring Reporting and Verifications
MTE	Mid-Term Evaluation
MWE	Ministry of Water and Environment
NDP	National Development Plan
NGO	Non-Governmental Organization
PIR	Project Implementation Review
PMU	Project Management Unit
PRODOC	Project Document
PSC	Project Steering Committee
REDD+	Reducing Emissions from Deforestation and forest Degradation
SFM	Sustainable Forest Management

SLM	Sustainable Land Management
TOR	Terms of Reference
UNCDF	UN Capital Development Fund
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

PROJECT INFORMATION TABLE

Project Title:	Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach			
Project IDs:	GEF SEC PROJECT ID: 4644		at endorsement (US\$)	at mid – term (US\$) ¹
PIMS	4493	GEF financing:	3,480,000	1,773,563
Country:	Uganda	UNDP	1,860,000	N/A
Region:	Africa	Government of Uganda	6,928,246.00	N/A
Focal Area:		Other partner resources	FAO 1,600,000 UNCDF 1,300,000 GIZ 2,607,562 BTC 290,000	N/A
GEF	Phase 5, System of Transparent Allocation of Resources (GEF-5 STAR)	Total co-financing:	14,585, 808	N/A
Implementing Agency:	UNDP	Total Project Cost:	18,065,808	N/A
Implementing Partner:	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) of Uganda	ProDoc Signature:	May 2014 ²	
		(Operational) Closing Date:	Proposed: May 2018 ³	

¹ Most sections in this column are marked N/A (Not Available) since the Project has not made available information regarding co – financing to this mid-term review.

² The Project start – up date was May 2014 (as indicated in Project Document, PIR and even this mid – term review Terms of Reference), and therefore –based on this—some documents such as the Project Implementation Report (PIR) establish project closure to be May 2018 given that this is a four-year project. Although, these are the dates substantiated by project documentation, some stakeholders perceive that the start of the Project was October 2014 since that was the launching date.

³ Proposed closure as set in the Project Document.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The *Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach Project* in Uganda has as its goal “Improved charcoal production technologies and sustainable land management practices through an integrated approach in Uganda.” Furthermore, the project’s objective is to secure multiple environmental benefits by addressing the twin and linked challenges of unsustainable utilization of fuel wood (including charcoal) and poor land management practices common in Uganda’s woodlands through technology transfer, enhancement of the national policy framework and the promotion of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) practices. The project involves the introduction of technology through piloting low carbon emission sustainable charcoal technologies and broader sustainable land and forest management practices in four districts: Kiboga, Kiryandongo, Mubende and Nakaseke.

The intervention has been organised into three components, each containing several different expected outcomes and outputs.⁴ These are:

- I. *Data collection and improved coordination and enforcement of regulations governing the biomass energy sector, in particular those related to sustainable charcoal.*
 - ❖ Outcome 1: Existing & ongoing policy, regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security integrated with recommendation from the new biomass energy strategy (BEST).
 - ❖ Outcome 2: Improved coordination of institutions managing sustainable charcoal production at district level
 - ❖ Outcome 3: Improved data collection and monitoring of biomass energy and charcoal production and use (integrated into national database)
 - ❖ Outcome 4: Improved charcoal and biomass guidelines and ordinances at district level
 - ❖ Outcome 5: Heightened awareness of new institutional frameworks and ordinances, guidelines and certification schemes at district level
- II. *Dissemination of appropriate technologies for sustainable charcoal production in selected (4) charcoal-producing districts (Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo).*
 - ❖ Outcome 1: Low-carbon charcoal production technologies have successfully replaced inefficient systems in targeted pilot districts leading to:
 - 143,314 metric tons (MT) of wood saved over project lifetime from improved kilns compared to BAU scenario (14,431 hectares of avoided deforestation)
 - Lifetime energy savings (compared to BAU scenario) of:
 - 1,843,200,000 MJ for Casamance kilns (avoided emissions of 210,816 tCO₂eq); and
 - 9,737,142,857 MJ for retort kilns (avoided emissions of 1,113,686 tCO₂eq)
 - additional lifetime avoided methane emissions for all retort kilns introduced of 252,000 tCO₂ eq

⁴ This section regarding expected outcomes, results, components, etc., is based on what is included in the Project Document (ProDoc). Issues regarding these classifications (i.e. products, outcomes, outputs, etc.) are taken up in the section of this report that deals with project design. That is, the programmatic issues with the classifications (whether outputs or outcomes), as well as the sheer quantity of them is analysed in the section that deals with design.

- ❖ Outcome 2: Sustainable charcoal recognized as a viable SME in pilot districts by end of project and for post-project sustainability
- ❖ Outcome 3: Carbon finance is integrated into sustainable charcoal practice in targeted areas
- ❖ Outcome 4: Increased incomes for all charcoal cooperatives involved in project
- ❖ Outcome 5: Technical support for charcoal briquetting producers enhanced

III. Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots.

- ❖ Outcome 1: Improved capacities of stakeholders in targeted districts to establish and manage dedicated sustainable woodlots leading to:
 - Accumulated yields of 368,770 MT of renewable biomass produced over 5,900 hectares under woodlot management by end of project (year 5) and 1,475,083 MT of biomass accumulation over the lifetime.
 - Net avoided lifetime emission reductions of 2,699,402 tCO₂eq of avoided deforestation compared to the BAU scenario from use of this renewable biomass in kilns compared to a BAU scenario
- ❖ Outcome 2: Best practice SLM/SFM knowledge effectively transferred from successful SLM projects in neighboring districts to four pilot districts for this project leading to:
 - 50,000 ha of forestlands across four pilot districts brought under improved multifunctional forest management leading to enhanced carbon sequestration of 2,100,000 tCO₂eq over lifetime
 - At least half of land under improved SFM registers reduction in land degradation by at least 20% as measured by reduction in soil erosion and improvement in soil organic matter
 - Conservation farming practices piloted leading to verified improved soil organic matter and yield increased across 400 hectares.

The Implementing Partner for the Project is the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) of Uganda. The Project is being implemented in a National Implementation Modality (NIM). The Green Charcoal Project has an expected timeline of implementation of four years, beginning on May 2014 with a proposed end date of May 2018. The Project was designed to receive funding and co – funding as follows: GEF US\$ 3,480,000; UNDP US\$ 1,860,000, Government US\$ 6,928,246; FAO US\$ 1,600,000; UNCDF US\$ 1,300,000; GIZ US\$ 2,607,562; BTC US\$ 290,000. It has a total budget of 18,065,808 USD.

PROJECT PROGRESS SUMMARY

Many of the expected objectives /results / products / outputs of the Green Charcoal Project have been achieved. Others have not been achieved to the degree expected at mid – point. Overall, several of the achievements have been positive when they materialized yet there are also several issues with these achieved outputs. National level products (database, survey, database, standards, research, etc.) have been accomplished, laying a baseline for the attainment of policies, norms, financial investments and other products/outcomes sought within the Project and beyond. The implementation and the attainment of products at the district level has been done at a good pace of delivery, notwithstanding issues and challenges encountered at the local level. Capacity building processes have taken place, in particular at the pilot sites, and they have been positive in dissemination of information and in the generation of capabilities, in particular when they were accompanied by demonstration. Extensive awareness raising has taken place, mainly through dissemination of information through media. However, several expected outputs and products are being achieved at a moderate level, yet several barriers, weaknesses, issues, and challenges have been identified which (if acted upon in the remaining implementation period) can positively impact upon the progress toward outcomes and in achieving the Project’s objective in a sustained and sustainable manner.

MTR RATINGS AND ACHIEVEMENT SUMMARY TABLE⁵

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Progress Towards Results	<p>Objective: “Secure multiple environmental benefits by addressing the twin challenges of unsustainable utilization of fuel wood (including charcoal) and poor land management practices common in Uganda’s woodland through technology transfer, enhancement of the national policy framework and the promotion of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) practices.”</p> <p>Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS</p>	As a composite, there are some shortcomings in the achievement of objective. Although some outputs have been achieved in a moderately effective and a moderately efficient manner (particularly those directly involving pilot sites and work with districts and national level data/surveys/etc.), other outputs and outcomes that make up and articulate the objective have not been met at the expected mid-point level. Since the objective seeks effects, and the approach to implementation has mainly centred on products, there is a gap in achieving objective fully. No shortcomings in terms of relevance.
	<p>I. Data collection and improved coordination and enforcement of regulations governing the biomass energy sector, in particular those related to sustainable charcoal.</p> <p>Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS</p>	Some shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness and efficiency. Although data collection has been successfully attained, improved coordination and enforcement of regulations governing sustainable charcoal has not been attained as a result of the Project. There is little emphasis on the latter. No shortcomings in terms of relevance
	<p>II. Dissemination of appropriate technologies for sustainable charcoal production in selected (4) charcoal-producing districts (Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo).</p> <p>Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS</p>	Some shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness. A few shortcomings in terms of efficiency. Dissemination of technologies for charcoal production has taken place, perhaps not at the pace expected, yet several aspects of technology transferred have been ignored such as business aspects in the whole charcoal production as well as other market-related issues and sustainability. No shortcomings in terms of relevance.
	<p>III. Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots.</p> <p>Achievement Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS</p>	Although pilots have been implemented in SFM and SLM, they are not truly linked to best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots. To date, the majority of SFM pilots have dealt almost exclusively with reforestation (i.e. planting of seedlings) and SLM pilots (although highly positive in and of themselves) do not link to sustainable woodlots nor to charcoal production. Therefore, taking into account effectiveness there are shortcomings in this criterion. Delivery indicative that there are no major shortcomings in efficiency. Few shortcomings in relevance.
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	Rating: Moderately Satisfactory MS	Some shortcomings in the achievement of objectives in terms of effectiveness. Few shortcoming in term of efficiency. Roles of partners unclear to some degree. No adaptive management implementation has taken place.
Sustainability	Rating: Moderately Likely ML	At the midpoint, and as a composite assessment, there are some risks that not all key outcomes will carry on after project closure. However, some outputs/activities likely to carry on after closure.

⁵ Reference: The ratings for performance follow a six – point scale (Highly satisfactory (HS); Satisfactory (S); Moderately Satisfactory (MS); Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU); Unsatisfactory (U); Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)). The rating for sustainability follows a four – point scale (Likely (L); Moderately Likely (ML); Moderately Unlikely (MU); Unlikely (U); Highly Unlikely (HU). The ratings explanations are found in annexes (see Annex 5: Rating Scales).

CONCISE SUMMARY OF CONCLUSIONS

The Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach Project in Uganda has as an overarching goal “Improved charcoal production technologies and sustainable land management practices through an integrated approach in Uganda.” The project’s objective is “to secure multiple environmental benefits by addressing the twin challenges of unsustainable utilization of fuel wood (including charcoal) and poor land management practices common in Uganda’s woodland through technology transfer, enhancement of the national policy framework and the promotion of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) practices. “ The Green Charcoal Project, through these objectives/results/components/outcomes/outputs, expects to address the barriers that deter effective sustainable equitable management of the charcoal sector in Uganda. Given the importance of biomass energy in the country, the intervention is highly relevant to Uganda. This is also due to the fact that it is consistent with national and district level policies and priorities as well as with the needs of intended beneficiaries.

The design of the Project was very thorough in its analysis and use of baseline information, drawing upon knowledge within the country and the region on the biomass/charcoal sector, its relation to sustainable development, natural resources and key issues for Uganda such as deforestation and adaptation to climate change. However, it can also be said that design is highly convoluted, overly ambitious, some of the intended processes to be implemented are unfeasible, it is confusing in several of its programmatic aspects, it loses sight that it is a piloting/innovation project, and it is overly complex.

Regarding the Project’s efficiency and effectiveness, these have been varied. Understanding that efficiency (which is determined by how economically resources or inputs such as funds, expertise and time are converted to results) and effectiveness (which is determined by the extent to which the initiative’s intended results have been achieved or the extent to which there has been progress toward achieving outputs or outcomes) are interlinked concepts, the Green Charcoal Project has had an average degree of accomplishment when analysing through these criteria since some products have been achieved and delivered, yet they are in need of further underpinning to be effective, results-based, and truly sustainable. Organisational issues have hindered to some degree timely implementation. Issues such as delays in disbursement, lengthy procurement processes, and to some degree lack of coordination between partners, have resulted in several postponements. Although positive in many respects, the implementation of piloted technologies, innovative approaches, and some of the general activities lack strong business and private sector components. The Green Charcoal Project included gender considerations beginning from its design level. The Project has achieved several key products at the national level. Yet, several expected norms and policies to be obtained within the Project framework (expected outputs/outcomes) are stalled, in part due to existing policy and institutional issues, such as the atomization and dispersion of the charcoal field in Uganda.

The Green Charcoal Project is critical for addressing a crucial energy issue for Uganda. The positive achievements thus far can be underpinned and improved in order to obtain results that are integrated and sustainable. The Project can be redirected to produce lasting effects that deal with charcoal sector issues in a sustainable manner and with benefits for all stakeholders. This Project, if redirected and implemented in a systematic manner and if its aims and objectives are fulfilled, could be a keystone intervention, due to its high replicability, upscaling and catalysing factors, not only for the country but also for the region.

RECOMMENDATION SUMMARY

RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE DESIGN LEVEL FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING OF GEF FUNDED – UNDP IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS

1. Design of these sort of projects should be streamlined, focused in subject and in territory, realistic and not overly dimensioned nor overly ambitious.
2. Indicators are key components of design and log frame and should be set at design with their intention made clear: to determine a project's progress, impacts, and effects.
3. Exit strategies and sustainability factors should be part of the design of a project.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMAINING IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD OF THE PROJECT

4. Streamline organisational issues that hinder timely implementation, such as issues associated with delays in disbursements, lengthy procurement processes, and lack of coordination between partners.
5. Strengthen business and private sector components of the whole value chain of charcoal within the Project outputs and processes. Strengthen private sector engagement in the project, in the whole value chain of charcoal (supply, transport of inputs/biomass, marketing, vending, transporting). Generate and disseminate business plans of introduced technologies.
6. Monitor and follow up the implemented pilots regarding technical issues and other matters that have arisen after piloting interventions or the products achieved with the districts.
7. Strengthen the monitoring of implementation, technologies, outputs and achievements at the results, effects, and impact levels, making certain that monitoring fulfils quality assurance and is based on robust techniques and adequate methodologies.
8. Strengthen project expected outcomes that deal with national existing and ongoing policy, as well as national regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security, and dealing with the mobilization of investments in the charcoal field.
9. Integrate sustainable land management components and sustainable forest management components to charcoal issues within the framework of the Project.
10. Ensure that gender considerations are fully integrated in all aspects of the Project in order to enhance benefit sharing for women from project intervention, taking into account women's participation in the charcoal chain, land ownership, income generation, and meaningful participation.
11. Upgrade the role of UNDP to guide and leverage implementation of Project closely and strengthen relation with partners in order to improve implementation process and ensure quality and results of the intervention.
12. Strengthen technical capacities of the Project, first by incorporating technical advisor and by making certain that products, processes, monitoring, and outputs are of high technical quality.
13. Generate materials that can be used for different processes, for follow-up, upscaling and replication as well as to document the intervention.
14. Begin to generate an exit strategy soonest, including financial and policy/institutional aspects.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN EXTENSION REQUEST

15. It is recommended that a no - cost extension, should one be requested, be granted for the Project considering the delays it had.

2.INTRODUCTION

PURPOSE OF THE MTR AND OBJECTIVES

As indicated in the monitoring and evaluation plan contained in the Project Document (ProDoc), the *Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach* (also known as the Green Charcoal Project) in Uganda is to undergo a mandated independent Mid-Term Evaluation at the mid-point of project implementation. The MTE has as its purpose to determine progress being made toward the achievement of outcomes and to identify course correction if needed. It focuses on the effectiveness, efficiency and timeliness of project implementation; highlights issues requiring decisions and actions; and presents initial lessons learned about project design, implementation, and management. Recommendations for enhanced implementation during the final half of the project's term are also drawn.

SCOPE AND METHODOLOGY: PRINCIPLES OF DESIGN AND EXECUTION OF THE MTR, MTR APPROACH AND DATA COLLECTION METHODS, LIMITATIONS TO THE MTR

This mid-term evaluation has focused primarily on assessing the effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and relevance of the project considering the accomplished outcomes, objectives, and effects. It includes the following scope:

- Assess progress towards achieving project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document.
- Assess signs of project success or failure.
- Review the project's strategy considering its sustainability risks.

The approach for the evaluation of the *Green Charcoal Project* in Uganda is determined mainly by the Terms of Reference (TOR) for this assignment and it follows methods and approach as stated in UNDP manuals, relevant tools, and other relevant UNDP guidance materials, including the *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews Of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* and UNDP's *Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results*. The analysis entails evaluating distinct stages and aspects of the project including design and formulation, implementation, results, and the involvement of stakeholders in the project's processes and activities. It has been carried out following a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, UNDP Country Office, project team, and other key stakeholders.

In order to carry out this evaluation exercise, several data collection tools for analysing information from the principles of results-based evaluation were used. Activities and results were evaluated for their (i) *Relevance*; (ii) *Effectiveness*; (iii) *Efficiency*; and (iv) *Sustainability*. Following UNDP/GEF guidelines, the relevant areas of the project are evaluated according to performance criteria and prospects of sustainability with ratings, as summarized in the tables found in annexes (Annex 5: Rating Scales).

The tools chosen for the evaluation, with a mixture of primary and secondary data as well as a combination of quantitative and qualitative material, were selected in order to provide a spectrum of information and to validate findings. These methods allow for in-depth exploration and yield information that facilitated understanding of observed changes in outcomes and outputs (both intended and unintended) and the factors that contributed to the achievements or lack of accomplishments. Regarding specific methodologies to gather assessment information, the following tools and methods were used:

- *Document analysis.* In depth analysis of available documentation was used as an instrument of analysis. The documentation analysis examined documents formulated during the preparation and implementation phases of the project to which the evaluation had access to (i.e. the Project Document, 2016 PIR, committee meeting minutes, etc.). A list of consulted documents is found in annexes (see Annex 7: List of Documents Reviewed).
- *Key informant interviews:* Interviews were implemented through a series of open and semi-open questions raised to stakeholders directly and indirectly involved with the Project. Key actors (stakeholders) were defined as UN officials, government actors, and local actors. The interviews were carried in person during the evaluation mission. Stakeholders to interview were chosen to be the key stakeholders from every single group directly and tangentially involved in the Project. For indications on the meetings and stakeholders met see Annex 8: Meetings Schedule and Annex 9: List of Stakeholders Engaged with during Mid Term Review). The review engaged with a total of over 172 stakeholders. Access to stakeholders was suitable and therefore access to a representative sample was achieved. The array of stakeholders, therefore, was a representative sample of actors involved such as the implementing agency, donors, national government representatives, local government representatives, project management unit, project staff, and representatives from communities.
- *Site visit/direct observation.* During the mission in Uganda four districts were visited where the Project's sites take place (Kiryandongo, Kiboga, Mubende and Nakaseke). (See Annex 8: Meetings Schedule).
- *Focus groups.* During the site visit focus group discussion as a participatory technique for information gathering were used when dialogue was carried out engaging a cluster of stakeholders.

A first tool developed for the review process was an evaluation matrix (which can be found in Annex 3: MTR evaluative matrix (evaluation criteria with key questions, indicators, sources of data, and methodology). The matrix contains Evaluative Criteria Questions (that is questions and --where relevant sub questions-- related to each of the evaluation criteria contained in the evaluation); Indicators; Sources; and Methodology. This matrix guided data collection process and, as the evaluation proceeded, the matrix was used to collect and display data obtained from various sources that relate to relevant evaluation criteria and questions.

As all evaluations, there are a series of limitations. Although the evaluability was fair given access to some inputs (for instance from stakeholders through interview processes) some limitations can be identified. First, the inherent limitation of time as a resource that presents limits to the evaluation process. Another limitation related to the review process has been the lack of access to documentation/information in a timely manner. Inopportunately, two processes were overlapping in time due to scheduling and re-scheduling issues: the MTR mission and the Project's audit. Although UNDP and MEMD were engaged with the MTR process as a whole, several stakeholders were not fully engaged and/or lacked an understanding of what the MTR process was about. This, in turn, had repercussions in the access to information and programming of the site visits. However, all the limitations were addressed as far as possible by the evaluation team within the midterm review process in order not compromise evaluability.

A joint fifteen-day mission of both evaluators (international and national) took place (with twelve days in-country for the international evaluator), mainly maintaining meetings and interviews with relevant

stakeholders in Uganda, meetings with UN personnel, review of materials with key stakeholders, and interviews with local stakeholders at sites (local stakeholders). The national evaluator also held meetings with relevant stakeholders after the mission ended when they were not available during the joint mission. The findings presented here (See Annex 8: Meetings Schedule and Annex 9: List of Stakeholders Engaged with during Mid Term Review)

STRUCTURE OF THE MTR REPORT

The evaluation report is structured beginning with an executive summary, with project summary and project ratings tables, and with summarized project progress, conclusions, and recommendations. A second section introduces methodologies, scope and information of the execution of the mid-term review. A third section contains an overall project description within a developmental context, including an account of the problems the project sought to address, as well as its initial objectives. A fourth core section of this report deals basically with the evaluation findings, analytically observing the results framework and its reform, as well as linkages with other projects and interventions in the sector, indicators and main stakeholders involved in the projects are described, as well as what were the expected results. Furthermore, this section also deals with findings relating to the actual implementation of the project, including strategic issues such as adaptive management and partnership agreements, and monitoring. This fifth section of the present report entails overall conclusions as well as forward looking issues. Recommendations for future actions and future projects. Lastly, an annex section includes project and evaluation support documentation.

3. PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND BACKGROUND CONTEXT

DEVELOPMENT CONTEXT: ENVIRONMENTAL, SOCIO-ECONOMIC, INSTITUTIONAL, AND POLICY FACTORS RELEVANT TO THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE AND SCOPE

In Uganda, biomass is the most widely used source of energy. Although data on biomass resources is inadequate and scattered among various government agencies, it is clear that biomass sources are key in the country. For instance, 93 per cent of rural population rely on biomass for cooking, and wood supplies over 75 percent of total energy consumption at the country level. Traditional biomass fuels account for more than 90 percent of total energy consumption. Charcoal is preferred to firewood because of its higher energy density than wood. Due to this high-energy content per unit weight, it is easier to transport than wood and it is transported to markets far away from forests. When used for cooking it is substantially more efficient than wood and burns with little smoke.

The charcoal sector is beleaguered by inefficient production practices and unsustainable wood biomass supply as well as inadequate, often conflicting, policy. Policy and institutions related to the charcoal field are scattered and fragmented. The institutional and policy framework for charcoal in broad terms include matters related to tree planting, research, extension, production, marketing, as well as utilisation. This framework expands among a substantial number of institutions without any coordination mechanisms.⁶

The primary issues linked to charcoal-related problems in Uganda are varied. First, from a production point of view, most of the charcoal is from natural forests located in private land with consumption being high and growing. Thirty-four million cubic meters of firewood are consumed annually.⁷ Increased consumption is associated to population growth, the latter being the highest in arid zones where charcoal production and consumption is even more widespread than at the national levels.

Environmental factors, plainly, are linked to biomass-based energy issues. Harvesting of natural resources, including wood, is done in an unsustainable manner. Deforestation is the principal problem faced in Uganda's woodlands (mainly in forested areas and in savannahs). Although deforestation data varies and is not fully agreed upon between various sources, it is estimated that forest cover has halved over the last one hundred years. Estimates of land clearance rates range from 55,000 hectares to 200,000 hectares per year. Over-harvesting for timber, for firewood used for industrial as well as household consumption, and encroachment into forests are some of the key causes of land clearance of forested areas. This is linked to other root causes for deforestation, such as weak regulations and other policy deficits, market failures, deficiency of sustainable land management (SLM) and of sustainable forest management (SFM) practices, as well as a lack of appropriate technologies.

One of the most important environmental issues related to deforestation and lack of sustainable land and forest management practices is desertification. Although desertification (with its associated impacts of soil erosion and nutrients loading bodies of water) is associated to droughts, overgrazing and other such deficient farming practices, it is also clearly linked to unsustainable use of biomass for fuel wood and charcoal.

⁶ BEST, 2013.

⁷ Consumption increasing since the planning of the Green Charcoal Project. The ProDoc estimates this consumption at thirty-three million and the data indicated here originates in the Biomass Energy Strategy (BEST) of 2013.

PROBLEMS THAT THE PROJECT SOUGHT TO ADDRESS: THREATS AND BARRIERS TARGETED

The Project has sought to address threats and barriers to improve charcoal production technologies and establish sustainable land and forestry management practices. Several key barriers were identified, including the lack of a biomass energy research agenda driven from Uganda together with a lack of relevant charcoal data along the charcoal value chain; lack of standards for the biomass sector; lack of relevant business and technical skills; socio – economic factors; and social perception of the charcoal sector. Some specific barriers identified, within the framework of Green Charcoal Project, are the use of inefficient kilns and other inefficient processes and technologies in the production of charcoal, as well as the deficiencies in the affordability of technological conversion. Considering these threats and barriers, the Green Charcoal Project was designed within a development context as well as acknowledging the significance (at the global and national levels) of environmental benefits that such an intervention can pose.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND STRATEGY: OBJECTIVE, OUTCOMES AND EXPECTED RESULTS, DESCRIPTION OF FIELD SITES

The above is a contextual introduction to the *Green Charcoal Project*. It is with this framework that the Project was designed and is now being implemented. The goal of the Project is to develop “improved charcoal production technologies and sustainable land management practices through an integrated approach in Uganda”. And its objective is to secure multiple environmental benefits by addressing the twin and interlinked challenges of unsustainable utilization of biomass for charcoal and poor land management practices in Uganda’s woodlands. The project also involves piloting low carbon emission sustainable charcoal technologies and broader sustainable land and sustainable forest management practices in four districts: Kiboga, Kiryandongo, Mubende and Nakaseke.

The intervention has been organised into three broad areas of expected results with respective outcomes. In a summarized form, these are as follows:

- II. *Data collection and improved coordination and enforcement of regulations governing the biomass energy sector, in particular those related to sustainable charcoal.*
 - ❖ Outcome 1: Existing & ongoing policy, regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security integrated with recommendation from the new biomass energy strategy (BEST).
 - ❖ Outcome 2: Improved coordination of institutions managing sustainable charcoal production at district level
 - ❖ Outcome 3: Improved data collection and monitoring of biomass energy and charcoal production and use (integrated into national database)
 - ❖ Outcome 4: Improved charcoal and biomass guidelines and ordinances at district level
 - ❖ Outcome 5: Heightened awareness of new institutional frameworks and ordinances, guidelines and certification schemes at district level
- II. *Dissemination of appropriate technologies for sustainable charcoal production in selected (4) charcoal-producing districts (Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo).*
 - ❖ Outcome 1: Low-carbon charcoal production technologies have successfully replaced inefficient systems in targeted pilot districts leading to:
 - ❖ Outcome 2: Sustainable charcoal recognized as a viable SME in pilot districts by end of project and for post-project sustainability
 - ❖ Outcome 3: Carbon finance is integrated into sustainable charcoal practice in targeted areas

- ❖ Outcome 4: Increased incomes for all charcoal cooperatives involved in project
- ❖ Outcome 5: Technical support for charcoal briquetting producers enhanced

III. *Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots.*

- ❖ Outcome 1: Improved capacities of stakeholders in targeted districts to establish and manage dedicated sustainable woodlots leading to:
- ❖ Outcome 2: Best practice SLM/SFM knowledge effectively transferred from successful.

PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION ARRANGEMENTS: SHORT DESCRIPTION OF THE PROJECT BOARD, KEY IMPLEMENTING PARTNER ARRANGEMENTS

The Project's formal Executing Entity/Implementing Partner is the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) (as indicated in the Project Document). In addition to this implementation arrangement a series of other partners are either referred to in the planning documents and/or brought about the implementation stage of the Green Charcoal Project.⁸ These are, the National Forestry Authority (NFA) and four district Local Governments where the project's pilot sites are implemented (Kiboga, Kiryandongo, Mubende, and Nakaseke). Other responsible partners, integrated due to their roles in the Project outputs, include: Uganda National Bureau of Standards (UNBS), Ministry of Agriculture Animal Industry & Fisheries (MAAIF), Nyabyeya Forestry College and Ministry of Water & Environment (MWE/FSSD).

Related to management and governance, the Project has a Project Steering Committee (PSC) that serves as the Project Board. The PSC is charged with oversight of project activities and it is responsible for providing overall guidance and direction to the Green Charcoal Project. It is also responsible for making management decisions for the project as a whole. The project also has a Technical Committee that generates specialist direction and presents these inputs to the PSC for its final decision – making processes.

PROJECT TIMING AND MILESTONES

The Green Charcoal Project has an expected timeline of implementation of four years, beginning at project signing in May 2014.⁹ Therefore the expected conclusion of the Project is May 2018.

MAIN STAKEHOLDERS

At the design level, a definition of who the main stakeholders of the Project would be is set in the Project Document. It is stated there that "The main stakeholders and beneficiaries of the project will be the land users, local communities, local government agencies, biomass energy entrepreneurs and the private sector in the four pilot districts." However, stakeholder analysis and actual implementation indicates that the range of stakeholders of the Green Charcoal Project was actually broader than this definition. Apart from the implementing institution (Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) of Uganda), there is a whole series of stakeholders with distinct roles. These are stakeholders

⁸ Their roles are expanded upon in the stakeholder analysis sections as well as in the implementation sections of this report.

⁹ Although this is the official beginning of the Project, with implementation starting in July 2014, some stakeholders, however, perceive that implementation began in October 2014 since that was the time of project launch.

from national government that participate as implementing partners of some of the components and / or outputs (such as the Ministry of Water and Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries and their dependencies), the four district governments, as well as a series of other stakeholders from academia.

4. FINDINGS

4.1 PROJECT STRATEGY

PROJECT DESIGN AND RESULTS FRAMEWORK/LOGFRAME

The design of the Project is outlined with expected results outcomes and outputs within the framework of the Project's aim and objective. Moreover, the formal logic of the Green Charcoal Project identifies barriers and plans to endeavour to act upon them to obtain products, processes and results.

The conceptual design of the Project is based on thorough background, base information, research findings as well as experiences from other projects and programs dealing with charcoal, sustainable forest management, and sustainable land management in Uganda. A very complete conceptual design describes at an excellent level of detail the issue of unsustainable use and production of charcoal in Uganda, with data, information, and lessons from other relevant projects imbedded into the project design. Furthermore, it identifies the barriers that the country needs to overcome in order to improve charcoal production technologies and establish sustainable land management practices.

Conceptually the design is also sound given that the Project considers the problem and the interventions from a multi-level approach (that is, from the national to district levels) and because it not only deals with environmental issues per se but also considers livelihood issues. Regarding the extent to which relevant gender questions were raised in the project design, there are several key gender issues mentioned in the Project Document. For instance, as they relate to the absence of research that captures and analyses information as to gender related concerns in biomass energy production, as well as the lack of incorporation of information as to the participation of women in the charcoal production system, and regarding the differential impact that deforestation has on women in Uganda. Furthermore, there is an acknowledgement in the design regarding limited efforts to mainstream gender in the charcoal sector, which in turn emphasises the inequitable participation of men and women in the charcoal value chain.

The design of the project fully addresses country priorities and key stakeholders specify categorically that the design was country-driven and participatory. Concerning country priorities (i.e. relevance) the design abundantly acknowledges these given:

- (a) the role that charcoal and related forestry issues has in the country; and,
- (b) the significance of charcoal – related issues in district and in national development priorities as well as its explicit presence in formal development plans for Uganda.

Although the design is quite positive in the terms stated above and the overall approach is satisfactory in the sense that barriers are identified at all three relevant levels for charcoal – related issues in Uganda (political/policy/technological barriers) and ways to overcome these barriers are recognised, there are several issues in the design of the Green Charcoal Project that can be addressed. First, the programmatic language used is unclear and even causes confusion to key actors, even to those stakeholders in charge of implementation and reporting. The three main expected outcomes are considered as components and what should be outputs are considered outcomes (which if these were to be truly outcomes it is still too large a number to feasibly implement). This not only has caused confusion in understanding how to implement a results-based framework, it has also confused reporting.

Second, the design loses sight that the Project deals with innovation and with piloting, formulating assertions that are much too ambitious for this sort of intervention, attempts to cover an area of Uganda much too broad to have solid effects with many sites and subsites, and attempts to deal with too many

issues. Although it is understood that in order to tap different funding focal areas (sustainable forest management, sustainable land management, and climate change) the Project is to deal with these different matters, it is not clear in the design (and therefore in implementation) how to deal with these issues in an integrated manner as they pertain to charcoal issues in Uganda. That is, the assertion that the

“project will remove the barriers to biomass technology development through national and district level approaches described in the previous sections that involve mobilizing investment (from financial institutions and carbon markets), capacity building and technology dissemination; promoting conservation of carbon stocks; and addressing the management of competing land uses and resulting changes in land-ecosystem dynamics. At the district level the project will strengthen SFM & SLM . . .”

is too broad a mission statement and too broad an expected overall outcome for a project of this type. Therefore, the design is not as streamlined as can be expected.

In line with these assessments, that is that the design is highly positive in terms of conceptualization but weak in terms of programming, the indicators merit a closer look and analysis since they are revealing of the overall programmatic design.¹⁰ Several of the indicators do have critical issues, not only because they are not expressed in standard format for these sort of projects¹¹, but also because they are not able to express success or failure attributable to the Project in some cases. In some instances, they cannot provide guidance for determining early signs of success or failure, and in several cases, they do not contribute to guiding the implementation process for assuring the quality control that a UNDP – implemented GEF – funded project is expected to have. For instance, some baseline indicators are missing in several of the expected outputs. That is, expressions of facts are made but they are not expressed as indicators in specific measurable language in some cases. When, in the log frame statements, there are instances where indicators are expressed as “Inadequate and uncoordinated individual /NGO driven and project based programs” or “Biomass measurement guidelines and technical manual are not in use. The technical manual is outdated”, or “Degraded forests and agricultural land in the four districts” --for instance-- although acceptable as statements of fact, they are not baseline indicators in and of themselves. Since these and several other factual statements are not specific nor measurable, they cannot be specified in relation to expected output. Target indicators, in several cases as can be seen in the Log Frame in annexes, are in some instances also non-specific nor measurable. And since several of the baseline indicators are not measured nor measurable, in those particular cases target indicators cannot efficiently be used to tally effect or impact attributable to the Green Charcoal Project. The log frame has no gender disaggregated indicators. No midterm targets/indicators are established. Other indicators / products are entirely unachievable within the framework of the Project. An example of this is the section where it indicates that the Green Charcoal Project would undertake the “Dissemination of over 17.4 million tree seedlings to woodlot owners” covering 5800 hectares. Key stakeholders are fully aware of the unfeasibility of meeting with this indicator, even calculating that if this single indicator would be met with specific target species it would absorb half of the total project budget.

Therefore, the design of the Green Charcoal Project has positive and negative aspects. The design of the Project deals with a highly relevant and crucial issue for Uganda, from different points of view with

¹⁰ The log frame for the Green Charcoal Project is found in annexes.

¹¹ That is, several of them are not fully expressed as SMART indicators (Specific, Measurable, Achievable, Relevant, and Time Bound).

a positive general project strategy. It incorporates several levels of intervention (local and national level policies, transfer of technology, demonstration, training, capacity building) and includes gender issues from the start. Furthermore, the design is based upon and draws from very good analysis of the issue in Uganda. Nevertheless, it is highly convoluted and at times unclear in a programmatic sense. It attempts to, at least cursorily, to deal with too many issues and is too spread out in a territorial sense. The indicators, moreover, in several cases are not specific nor measurable and some are not achievable within the framework of the Project.

4.2 PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS

PROGRESS TOWARDS OUTCOMES ANALYSIS

Following is the Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis in chart form. This chart reviews the indicator-level progress as reported in the most recent PIR (2016) as well as information from other sources. The PIR has been updated where relevant since nine months had elapsed from the time it was drafted and further accomplishments had been achieved. After the chart a narrative analysis on progress towards results at mid-term of the Green Charcoal Project is included.

FIGURE 1: PROGRESS TOWARDS RESULTS MATRIX (ACHIEVEMENT OF OUTCOMES AGAINST END-OF-PROJECT TARGETS)

Objective/ Outcome	Description	Description of Indicator	Baseline Level	Target Level at end of project	Level at 30 June 2016 with 31 March 2017 updates ¹²	Mid-term Level & Assessment ¹³	Achievement Rating ¹⁴	Justification for Rating
Outcome 1	Outcome 1.1 Existing & ongoing policy, regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security integrated with new biomass energy strategy (BEST) under development Outcome 1.2 Improved coordination of institutions managing sustainable charcoal production at pilot district level Outcome 1.3 Improved data collection and monitoring of biomass energy and charcoal production and use (integrated into national database and for use as baseline information in a possible NAMA) Outcome 1.4 Improved charcoal and biomass guidelines and	(1.1) Biomass Energy Strategy (BEST) developed, validated, approved and in use. National charcoal survey and updated standardized baseline reports completed based on current data (1.2) Framework for institutional coordination and resource mobilization developed between MEMD, local government authorities and the National Forest Authority to manage charcoal trade at district level (1.2) Charcoal by-laws including licensing procedures standardized and strengthened (1.3) Baseline report and functional biomass database established and hosted at MEMD and published in Uganda Bureau of Standards reports (1.4) Local guidelines and standards for certification schemes	(1.1) BEST still in design form (1.2) Biomass energy mandate is distributed across many government agency with no focal point (1.2) License fees not standardized (1.3) Current database is uncoordinated, inadequate and unreliable (1.4) Guidelines and standards non-existent (1.5) Inadequate and uncoordinated individual /NGO driven and project based programs (1.5) Biomass measurement guidelines and technical manual are not in use. The technical manual is outdated.	(1.1) Investment mobilized to implement BEST recommendations (1.1) Standardized baseline accepted by UNFCCC (1.2) Biomass Unit funded in proportion to revenue collected from the sector & central government budget by year 3. (1.2) Higher revenue collection by local administration from charcoal by the district by year 2. (1.3) Updateable baseline and functional database established at MEMD and UBS by end of year 1 (1.4) Guidelines and certification schemes developed and operational by end of year 2. (1.5) Coordinated awareness campaigns completed in each district by end of year 3 (1.5) Biomass technical manual is updated and available for use by year 2. Updated guidelines developed and in use by year	(1.1) Development, validation and approval of the National Biomass Energy Strategy completed. Implementation of key strategies is on-going including current use for guiding planning and attracting investments in the biomass sector in Uganda. (1.1) National charcoal survey was completed. This provided new data being used as standardized baseline for the charcoal industry in Uganda. (1.2) The ministry of Energy and Mineral		MS	Several of the expected outputs have been achieved (for instance completed survey, database, standards, etc.) or are in a process to be achieved within the period remaining for the Green Charcoal Project. Several norm and policy outputs/outcomes are stalled due to existing policy and institutional issues, such as the atomization and dispersion of the charcoal field in Uganda. There are discrepancies in perceiving what the Project is doing in the districts. For instance, there is reporting of achieving all four district charcoal plans, yet some districts indicate that these were drawn before

¹² With updates, up to March 2017 given that the 2016 PIR was over nine months old when the Mid Term Review took place.

¹³ Following indications for Mid Term Reviews, the analysis also concludes whether the end-of-project target: a) has already been achieved (colouring table cell green); b) is partially achieved or on target to be achieved by the end of the project (colouring table cell yellow); or c) is at high risk of not being achieved by the end of the project and needs attention (colouring table red). For further details on this sort of analysis, see *Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews Of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*.

Indicator Assessment Key

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= Not on target to be achieved
-----------------	----------------------------------	-----------------------------------

¹⁴ Six - point Progress Towards Results Rating Scale: HS, S, MS, MU, U, HU. Explanation of rating scale is attached in annexes (in the section Progress Towards Results Rating Scale).

ordinances at district level Outcome 1.5 Heightened awareness of new institutional frameworks and ordinances, guidelines and certification schemes at district level	developed, adopted and publicized in targeted pilot districts (1.5) Awareness and educational program on local guidelines and standards completed in all targeted pilot districts (1.5) Updated guidelines for measuring biomass (CAI & MAI) calculated using the biomass study technical manual. The technical manual will be updated and revised by year 2			Development recently transformed the Biomass Unit into a fully-fledged government department for Renewable Energy that is funded from the central government budget. (1.2) Development of District Charcoal Action Plans completed by the four project districts. The action plans have been integrated into the District Development Plans and being used as a framework for allocating funds, attracting investments in the charcoal industry and revenue generation in the districts. The frameworks for institutional coordination, resource mobilization and management of the charcoal sub-sector have been developed and popularized. (1.3) Establishment of update-able baseline and functional database completed. The database was designed in collaboration between the Ministry of Energy and Uganda Bureau of Statistics and		and/or without project's assistance. Reporting should clearly be of products, processes and outcomes <i>attributable</i> to the project and it should clearly inform stakeholders at the district level specifically what project assistance entails and it should be clearly shared with local stakeholders in order for them to know what the Project has truly carried out in their districts.
						Other outputs and outcomes have not been achieved, such as for instance the mobilization of investments, at expected level. There are no strong indications that these processes and achievements will occur in the remaining period unless a solid impulse to do so takes place soonest.
						Awareness raising campaign has reached a high number of people, in particular in target pilot areas.
						Support for developing a nationally led research agenda has taken place and products (i.e. thesis) are being developed and are near finalization.

					<p>relevant stakeholders.</p> <p>(1.4) A Technical Committee to review the 2007 National Charcoal and Briquette Standards has been instituted by the Uganda National Bureau of Standards in collaboration with the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development. The committee is currently conducting consultations on the standards that shall inform guidelines and certification schemes in Uganda. (1.5) Awareness campaigns using live radio talk-shows, community meetings, multi-stakeholder dialogues are on-going in all the project districts. About 1,500 individuals (30% women) have been sensitized about improved charcoal management practices through community meetings and training. A communication strategy for the BEST was finalized for use in awareness creation. More than 1.5 million people have been reached with messages on improved</p>			
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

					charcoal management using 48 live radio talk shows through 4 local radio stations in the project districts. (1.5) capacity of staff to establish biomass assessment plots was built and a technical manual has been completed by the National Forestry Authority. Initial assessments are on-going and findings shall be incorporated into the final technical manual. In addition, 5 Post graduate level students received technical and financial support to undertake charcoal related research activities to inform decision making for the sub-sector.			
Outcome 2	<p>Outcome 2.1 Low-carbon charcoal production technologies have successfully replaced inefficient systems in targeted pilot districts</p> <p>Outcome 2.2 Sustainable charcoal recognized as a viable SME in pilot districts by end of project</p> <p>Outcome 2.3 Carbon finance is integrated into sustainable charcoal practice in targeted areas</p> <p>Outcome 2.4 Increased incomes for all charcoal cooperatives involved</p>	<p>(2.1) 60 sustainable charcoal cooperatives organized and operational with 2,400 charcoal champions in pilot districts. Activities to meet this KPI will involve: Developing ranking criteria for categorizing charcoal producers or entrepreneurs</p> <p>Conducting surveys to rank different actors into pre-determined categories Training of all groups on local ordinances and standards for sustainable charcoal certification schemes as well as</p>	<p>(2.1) BAU Carbonization Technologies = Earthmound Kilns @ 10% efficiency conversion (2.1) Biomass Sources = non-renewable (2.1) No widespread use of improved kiln technologies and those that are in use are not licensed or monitored (2.1) Charcoal producers in target districts are not formally organized and do not have access to improved</p>	<p>(2.1) 143,314 metric tons of wood saved over project lifetime from improved kilns compared to BAU scenario (14,431 hectares of avoided deforestation) (2.1) Lifetime energy savings (compared to BAU scenario) of 1,843,200,000 MJ for Casamance kilns (avoided emissions of 210,816 tCO₂eq) ; and (2.1) 9,737,142,857 MJ for retort kilns (avoided emissions of 1,113,686 tCO₂eq) (2.1) additional lifetime avoided methane emissions for all retort kilns introduced of 252,000 tCO₂ eq (2.2) 60 charcoal producer associations with over 2400 members established and</p>	<p>(2.1) At least 80 Improved casamance kilns were disseminated by November 2016, including capacity built for 20 local artisans to continue fabricating and selling casamance kilns. (2.1) Retort kiln installation shall take off soon following solving the patent ownership issue. Criteria for calling for</p>		MS	<p>The pilot interventions (which mainly make up this expected outcome) are being implemented to a varying degree of process, achievements, and results.</p> <p>There is high ownership at the district and at the local levels.</p> <p>Besides the already mentioned issue of patent rights (see column 5 in this chart), there have been other delays identified that have</p>

in project Outcome 2.5 Technical support for charcoal briquetting producers enhanced	improved kiln technologies Demonstration of Casamance kiln operation and viability to target group (total of 400 casamance kilns deployed) Demonstration of retort kiln operation and viability to target groups (total of 200 retort kilns deployed) MRV, tracking and licensing system established for all improved kilns piloted All groups in compliance with certification standards (as per Output 1.4.1) (2.2) Delivery model to support consumer financing schemes for charcoal producing groups with local financial institutions established. (2.3) Basic Project submitted for registration to appropriate authority under an appropriate carbon development methodology in the Voluntary Market and/or a Sustainable Charcoal NAMA Design Document developed and endorsed (2.4) Profit margin per output unit of charcoal produced with new technologies increased by at least 20% per group (with new kilns) as compared to baseline scenario for all participating charcoal cooperatives (2.5) Training and technical assistance provided to all briquetting businesses that are receiving loans from Micro-Finance Institutions in conjunction with CleanStart	carbonization technologies (2.2) No recognized charcoal production SMEs in target areas (2.2) No organized charcoal producer organizations (2.3) No carbon finance projects in Uganda dealing with sustainable charcoal have been registered with a carbon authority (2.3) No charcoal NAMA Design Document developed or submitted (2.4) Average income of a typical itinerant charcoal producer in target districts established as baseline during year 1 (2.5) CleanStart scoping mission documented that at present there are about 17 formal briquette makers in Uganda, receiving limited training and financial assistance (2.5) A detailed baseline will be done as part of the CleanStart operations	registered (15 in each district) and operating sustainable charcoal businesses by end of project (2.2) Consumer financing schemes available for registered charcoal producing (CPA) associations by end of project. By end of project 20% of the registered CPA qualify for credit facilities from local financial institutions (2.3) Carbon Project successfully registered for carbon financing under Voluntary Carbon Standards by end of year 3. (2.3) NAMA Design Document developed and endorsed by end of year 3 (2.4) At least 5 CPAs in each district supply charcoal directly to large wholesalers in urban areas (2.5) The CleanStart business plan noted that the opportunity exists for the number of briquette producers to increase to at least 50 and daily production can easily be raised 8 tons to 50 tons per day. If confirmed the target would then be to provide training and TA to at least 50 charcoal briquetting enterprises by the end of the project (2.5) A detailed baseline will be done as part of the CleanStart start-up and call for proposals with FSPs (2.5) Emission reductions from TA for the briquetting enterprises will be developed once its confirmed whether the relevant FSPs will indeed provide loans for the improved machines	applicants to receive those retorts has been finalized. (2.2) Twenty (20) Charcoal Associations with over 400 members established and registered across the 4 project districts. (2.3) Framework for discussions with Carbon Finance promoters regarding the modalities for registering the current tree farmers into the voluntary carbon finance mechanism has been agreed. The Terms of Reference for procuring consultant necessary to develop the NAMA has been finalized and presented for review before Further discussions expected during the subsequent quarter. (2.4) Twenty-seven (27) Charcoal Producer Associations were formed in the four pilot districts with 300 members in total. In the next quarter, these shall be trained and equipped with capacity to supply charcoal directly to large wholesalers in urban areas. (2.5) Twelve community groups were		<p>slowed down the attainments. In particular, managing issues and disbursements issues have hindered efficiency and therefore hindered effectiveness for these outputs.</p> <p>There is high concern from key stakeholders that the emphasis on this section of the implementation process is due to the fact that targets are easily achievable and do not require a lot of effort ("low hanging fruit") and that quality assurance should be enhanced.</p> <p>Charcoal chain issues are neglected in several instances, business aspects are weak.</p> <p>In some districts, key stakeholders indicate that "very little work on charcoal" per se has taken place.</p> <p>There is also concern that pilots are not fully integrated to and with charcoal issues, many of the local pilots and interventions do not deal at all with charcoal (neither with inputs for charcoal, nor taking an agro-sylvo-pastoral approach for instance for the SLM) and that many pilot interventions are "business as usual" tree planting exercises.</p> <p>In this, and as will be seen in the section for the next expected outcome, pilots do not have monitoring, follow –</p>
--	--	--	---	---	--	---

					identified, trained in improved briquette production and supported with equipment to set up briquette enterprises, which formed an alternative source of income and biomass for cooking.		up or extension processes associated with them and stakeholders are implementing the pilots in an unsystematic and unguided manner in several cases. Comparison and analysis is often hindered since the Project has not carried out a thorough process of monitoring, nor collected and produced data of the results or the effects that the pilots/training/dissemination are having.
Outcome 3	<p>Outcome 3.1 Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots</p> <p>Outcome 3.2 SLM/SFM knowledge effectively transferred from ongoing SLM Best Practices in the neighboring Cattle Corridor districts replicated in the four target districts</p>	<p>(3.1) Improved capacities of stakeholders in targeted districts to manage SFM and establish dedicated renewable biomass feed stocks. More specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - At least 1,100 private woodlot owners in the four pilot districts identified, trained and contracted to make land available for woodlot establishment (minimum 5,900 hectares' set-aside). - Training all communities/woodlot managers on new charcoal regulations and SFM best practices, including use of specified tree species and optimal ecological yield from such species. - Technical support provided to all woodlot owners on tree nursery management as an entrepreneurial activity with target to plant over 17.4 million seedlings - Dissemination of over 17.4 million tree seedlings to woodlot owners - Establishment of land use and forest management plans (including zoning and mapping of forest areas) for all targeted woodlot 	<p>(3.1) No community or private woodlots for charcoal production in targeted districts</p> <p>(3.1) Degraded forests and agricultural land in the four districts</p> <p>(3.2) * Limited amount of land in targeted districts under SFM regimes or benefiting from SFM practices (baseline to be established during year 1) * 4,800 ha of land across four districts deforested each year for charcoal production</p> <p>* Conservation farming not widely practiced across target districts</p> <p>* Communities in targeted districts have not had exposure to the SCISLM approach or LADA tool</p> <p>* District Land Use Planning staff have little knowledge of techniques that support community planning, implementation processes and land</p>	<p>(3.1) - Accumulated yields of 368,770 MT of renewable biomass produced over 5,900 hectares under woodlot management by end of project (year 5) and 1,475,083 MT of biomass accumulation over the lifetime.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Net avoided lifetime emission reductions of 2,699,402 tCO₂ of avoided deforestation compared to the BAU scenario from use of this renewable biomass in kilns compared to a BAU scenario (3.2) - 50,000 ha of forestlands across four pilot districts brought under improved multifunctional forest management leading to enhanced carbon sequestration of 2,100,000 tCO₂eq over lifetime - A least half of land under improved SFM registers reduction in land degradation by at least 20% as measured by reduction in soil erosion and improvement in soil organic matter - Conservation farming practices piloted leading to verified improved soil organic matter and yield increases across 400 hectares - Community's indigenous knowledge of SLM enhanced using the Stimulating Community Innovations (SCISLM) approach to generate local solutions to land degradation - Land use planning (one each 	<p>(3.1) Close to 2,000 ha of woodlot planted for sustainable charcoal production. This translates into about 100,000 Metric Tons of renewable biomass by end of the project.</p> <p>(3.2) Over 1,500 farmers (40% women) identified, trained in Sustainable Forest Management best practices and registered, established dedicated renewable biomass feed stock and realized reduction in land degradation by at least 15% (3.2) 250 farmers (45% women) were identified and trained in conservation farming practices. These registered improvement in</p>	MS	<p>Planting of seedlings has taken place at a positive rate and even when disbursement issues manifested themselves.</p> <p>Capacity building at the local level has also taken place, at different levels and with different approaches.</p> <p>There is high ownership at the district and at the local levels.</p> <p>In many cases pilots, do not have follow – up or extension processes associated with them and stakeholders are implementing the pilots in an unsystematic unguided manner in several cases.</p> <p>Comparison and analysis is often hindered since the Project has not carried out a thorough process of monitoring, nor collected and produced data of the results or the effects that the</p>

		<p>areas - Contracts signed between woodlots owners and charcoal producer groups for feedstock supply (3.2) SLM/SFM knowledge effectively transferred from ongoing SLM projects in neighboring districts to four pilot districts for this project.</p>	<p>degradation assessment * No detailed mapping of biomass stocks (both forestry and agricultural areas) done in targeted districts * No method in place to accurately measure and monitor land use change and deforestation in targeted districts</p>	<p>target district) done using FAO-LADA-WOCAT developed.</p> <p>- District Land Use Planning staff trained in the use of techniques that support community planning, implementation processes and land degradation assessment - Mapping completed of all targeted areas under sustainable forestry management as well as agricultural lands under SLM in collaboration with FAO and National Forestry Authority's new GIS/mapping platform</p>	<p>soil fertility and increased yield of over 50% from farming practices conducted in about 200 hectares of community land. (3.2) Indigenous knowledge on Sustainable Land Management best practices and ability to generate local solutions to land degradation enhanced among 250 farmers (45% women). (3.2) Forty (40) district land use and physical planning extension staff were trained in the use of techniques that support community planning, implementation processes and land degradation assessment.</p>		<p>pilots/training/dissemination are having.</p>
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Although activities and processes (and delivery) have increased in the latter part of the implementation period, the set-up process and the beginning of delivery of products was somewhat slow at project start up, causing several delays in implementation. As seen in the 2016 PIR (with its actualization of March 2017) at the product level there are several achievements made and other products are being implemented. As the Project enters its last tranche of implementation (considering that implementation has been programmed from May 2014 for four years) delays are apparent.

While there are no mid-term markers/indicators in the designed log frame that would allow for measurable achievements at project median point (and as seen in the section of design, several indicators are weak with regard measurability) it is clear that many of the expected objectives /results / products / outputs have been achieved while others have not been achieved to the degree expected at mid – point. Overall, several achievements have been positive when they materialized yet there are also several issues with these outputs and with the expected results still outstanding.

On the positive side, the following are some highlights regarding progress toward outcomes:

- Some key achievements of products at the national level are being attained, with a good possibility that they can support the formation and implementation of national policy and institutions to deal with charcoal and biomass issues in Uganda. National level products (database, survey, database, standards, research, etc.) have been achieved, laying a baseline for the achievement of policies, norms, financial investments and other products/outcomes sought within the Project and beyond.
- The issues are highly relevant to the country, and most planned outputs and outcomes are very relevant and continue to be pertinent, even as the Project develops.
- The above also relates to the high ownership evident not only at the national level but also at the district and at the local levels, as well as ownership by local stakeholders that continues to be expressed as the Project implements activities, processes, and pilots.
- The implementation and the attainment of products at the local level has been done at a good pace of delivery (for instance, pilots and the drafting of ordinances), notwithstanding issues and challenges encountered at sites.
- Capacity building processes have taken place, in particular at the pilot sites, and they have been positive in dissemination of information and in the generation of capabilities, in particular when they were accompanied by demonstration.
- Extensive awareness raising has taken place, mainly dissemination of information through media such as radio.

REMAINING BARRIERS TO ACHIEVING THE PROJECT OBJECTIVE

As seen above, expected outputs and products are being achieved at a moderate level, yet several barriers, weaknesses, issues, and challenges have been identified which, if acted upon in the remaining implementation period, can positively impact on the progress toward outcomes and in achieving the Project's objective in a sustained and sustainable manner. These are:

- Barriers of an organisational nature, in particular obstacles caused by delays in disbursements, postponements due to management issues, and due to bureaucratic procedures for implementation and administering of the Project. These organisational barriers not only cause concerns in efficiency, but they are also having adverse effects on the effectiveness of the Green Charcoal Project. For instance, due to delays in disbursements of payments associated to seedlings that were to be planted in the four

target districts, pay-outs were made after planting season was over. Other examples are the prolonged delays in procurement that take place, hindering efficient implementation of the Project.

- Project design issues hinder implementation in many ways. For instance, the convoluted design as well as the varied and different areas of work and of approaches which do not allow for a streamlined integrated approach to the charcoal issue in Uganda.
- Frail overall focus on the improvement of charcoal technologies, with some interventions not dealing with this matter at all (neither at the supply side, nor at the technological innovation side)
- Technical issues are also barriers to fully achieving project objective in a durable and sustainable manner.¹⁵ Some of the technical and related issues that arise at the time of the mid-term review are:
 - Technical issues related to how kilns function or even malfunction once installed
 - Working problems that arise once the kilns begin to be used (wear and tear, mechanical problems, etc.)
 - Forest cover needed for the kilns to be efficient and effective
 - Tree species to be used for charcoal production in each of the pilot areas
 - Transport of raw materials to provide for the kilns, for marketing, etc.
- Lack of technical follow up, since once pilots are fixed there is no continuation regarding use of technologies, technical issues as expressed above, maintenance of technology, quality assurance of effects and impacts, extension support, forestry, as well as business backing and transfer of knowledge in business issues.
- Also, follow up on approval and adoption process of district norms (such as ordinances that not only need to be approved at the district levels but also approved at the national level for them to be binding) could be strengthened in order to seek effect and meet with results objectives.
- Although the Project has a robust design partiality towards business aspects of charcoal production in Uganda, this has not materialized in the implementation, hindering obtaining the overall objective.
- While the inclusion of the private sector is indicated in the design, their applicable inclusion has not taken place in the implementation, in project investment, nor in the expected catalytic role.
- While outside of the purview of the Project in many ways, yet a barrier that needs to be considered and addressed if objective is to be fully pursued, is the atomization and dispersion of the charcoal chain and charcoal sector in policy and between institutions in Uganda.

At this stage in the Project's cycle there is also weak coordination in several instances between the different implementing agents as well as little coordination with other stakeholders in the field which deal with the crucial issue of biomass energy and charcoal in Uganda as a whole and in the target districts in particular. For instance, stakeholders from different areas of government (such as from the agriculture sector and from the forestry sector) report frail coordination at the implementation level amongst themselves. Given that the Project evidently does not operate alone (neither at the national and nor at

¹⁵ Although the review has only harnessed some of these technical issues since its role is not monitoring but evaluating, it would be positive for the project to gather what all the technical issues that arise in implementing, in particular in the pilots, in order to address them in the remaining implementation period.

the district levels) given that the charcoal issue is of great importance for Uganda, there are many actors in the field working on this matter. There is also evidence and reporting of weak coordination or even weak exchanges between different actors (actors within and actors outside the Project) that work in charcoal and charcoal-related issues. Furthermore, public – private sector involvement is not well articulated within the framework of the Project and this, together with the specific issues above also stalls to some degree obtaining results in line with the Green Charcoal Project objective.

4.3 PROJECT IMPLEMENTATION AND ADAPTIVE MANAGEMENT

MANAGEMENT ARRANGEMENTS

The management arrangements established in the design and inception phases are the characteristic organizational provisions of this sort of intervention. The Project is managed at the national level by a Project Manager, and a Finance and Administration Assistant who will be in charge of overseeing financial management of the project. These management arrangements established at design have been implemented as such.

However, other management arrangements as determined in project design have not been implemented as planned. Although in each of the four target districts there are focal points (usually one dealing with environmental issues and another dealing with forestry issues), the Project has no thematic field officers as such, keeping in mind that the design called for three field officers dedicated to several thematic / technical issues.¹⁶

Furthermore, up to the time of the mid-term review (that is, up to point where the Project enters its last year of planned implementation) there was no Project Technical Advisor responsible for technical issues. Although it was indicated to the review that hiring of a technical advisor was imminent, the lack of this key personnel has affected the implementation process thus far, hampering quality assurance, quality monitoring, and technical robustness of the Project. Although through the hiring of consultants or through UNDP fulfilling some of the roles that this advisor should have had some of the functions have been realised, the overall guidance that an advisor can provide has been lacking thus far.¹⁷

Since the Project is not exclusively executed by the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (Implementing Partner), but it is being implemented in partnership with other areas of national

¹⁶ That is, the design documents indicate that there would be one field officer who would be responsible for training, extension, data collection and monitoring activities during Feedstock Production and SFM Management in agroforestry – multipurpose species, woodlots, plantations, selective harvesting in natural forests, enrichment planting and optimal land utilization, management, land use and harvesting plans, and silvicultural issues; a second field officer to be responsible for efficient conversion and carbonization management, including training programmes and record keeping on charcoal recovered, emission reductions and losses; as well as a third field officer responsible for charcoal value chain management.

Although it is understood that during inception and first committee meetings it was recommended that (with the aim of strengthening capacity of responsible partners and the districts) the recruitment and hiring of three field officers as indicated in the ProDoc was to be halted, it is of note that this change has had effects on management arrangements and technical robustness of the Project.

¹⁷ The Project Document indicates that the Project Technical Advisor would in particular ensure that activities are based on good science and draw lessons from the country and region, would supervise district level officers who will be responsible for technical implementation of the project on the ground, and be responsible for technical quality control of project reports, especially the technical reports.

government (such as specific divisions within the Ministry of Water and Environment and the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries) as well as with district governments, this has had positive aspects in management as well as unconstructive issues to contend with. On the positive side, the involvement of different areas and various levels of government has implied that the Green Charcoal Project is being implemented inclusively with the perspectives of and relevance for different line ministries and various levels of governmental administration. On the other hand, management issues are taxing given that each different institution has its own administrative and organisational structures, as well as different internal programming. Several stakeholders also report that coordination on the ground at site levels is lacking to some degree when several different institutions and collaborating partners are involved.

The Project Steering Committee (PSC) oversees project activities. The PSC acts as the Project's board. Specifically, it is intended that the Committee would be responsible for overall guidance and direction to the project. It would also be responsible for making (by consensus) management decisions for the project as required. Specifically, the PSC is to provide this overall guidance and direction by addressing issues that arise out of project management, guidance on risks and risk management, ensure that deliverables are produced satisfactorily and according to plan, provide strategic advice to the PMU¹⁸, ensure that deliverables are produced satisfactorily, as well as ensure coordination among the Green Charcoal Project and other on – going processes/projects that deal with the same issues as the Project in Uganda. Lastly, the PSC is charged with reviewing and approving work plans as well as financial planning of the Project.

The PSC meets regularly barring some unusual circumstance and has guided processes. The Committee has also had a managerial role in financial / budgeting matters. For instance, it has determined and approved caps on spending concerning what can be realistically achieved by the Project on a yearly basis. The PSC is aided in its decision-making processes by the Project's Technical Committee, which establishes technical topics and planning for implementation.

Engagement in the Committee is rather dissimilar between different institutions, with some institutions/stakeholders fully engaged in the PSC and others much less or not engaged at all. Several members of the PSC might not be aware of all of its obligations and responsibilities. For instance, several members, although they perceived themselves as active PSC members, requested from the evaluation higher funding for their own activities within the Project, without being aware that this sort of budget allocation is discussed and determined within the PSC. Although it is understood that stakeholders might express this as an admission that a mid-term review has a bearing on resource allocation, when specifically asked about their role in PSC (including budget allocations), many members of the Committee were not aware of what they were.

UNDP and the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development co-chair the PSC and through this and other linkages jointly are key drivers of the Project, the former as Implementing Agency and the latter as Implementing Partner. However, there is ample space for coordination and work between the two institutions to improve addressing management and implementation of the Project in order to assure quality results-oriented work.

¹⁸ Interestingly the Project Document specifies that the PSC will provide strategic advice to ensure the integration of project activities with poverty alleviation and sustainable development objectives, which is a step forward to integrating management with broad impact objectives that a project should sustain.

WORK PLANNING

The Project has had some delays in project start up, although these do not appear to be major. Delays are often associated to bureaucratic and organisational issues more than to start – up.

Work planning processes are product oriented and based on delivery of these, in particular pilot interventions and interventions in the four target districts. Work-planning processes do not tend to be results-based. Work planning has had adjustments and guidance by the PSC and UNDP. For instance, in the last year an annual spending limit was set for the 2017 Annual Work Plan based on what, realistically, the Project could deliver.

Adaptive management is a project's ability to adapt to changes to the project design (project objective, outcomes, or outputs) during implementation resulting from: (a) original objectives that were not sufficiently articulated; (b) exogenous conditions changed, due to which a change in objectives was needed; (c) the project's restructuring because the original objectives were overambitious; or (d) the project's restructuring because of a lack of progress. In the case of the Green Charcoal Project there are no indications of adaptive management to date.

FINANCE AND CO-FINANCE

The Project was designed to receive funding and co – funding as follows: GEF US\$ 3,480,000; UNDP US\$ 1,860,000; Government US\$ 6,928,246; FAO US\$ 1,600,000; UNCDF US\$ 1,300,000; GIZ US\$ 2,607,562; BTC US\$ 290,000.

At the time of the mid-term assessment the Project reports that 52 percent of the total expected GEF financing amount has been spent. The yearly expenditures are below.

Year	Expenditure [US \$]
2014	86,328
2015	674,718
2016	972,793
2017- as of 30 March 2017	39,723
<i>Total Expenditure</i>	<i>1,773,563</i>
Total GEF Budget	3,480,000
<i>Balance</i>	<i>1,706,436</i>

Given the above figures and due to a planned expenditure of 900,000USD by the end of 2017, the total expected expenditure at the end of the year (i.e. at the end of 2017) would be of USD \$2,633,840 USD. This is seventy-five percent of the genuine funding budget for the Project.

The Project has not made available information to this mid-term review regarding co – financing. Therefore, no commentary or analysis on co-financing can be done. However, there is no indication that co – financing is being raised at the expected levels, in particular by partners besides the core implementing stakeholders, and there are indications the project budget is now limited to GEF funds.

PROJECT-LEVEL MONITORING AND EVALUATION SYSTEMS

Monitoring at design included standard instruments and tools which are habitual for monitoring and evaluation of UNDP-implemented / GEF – funded projects. In the monitoring and evaluation strategy drawn in the Project Document the following are the types of monitoring activities that should take place within the implementation time frame of the Project are indicated:

- | | |
|--|------------------------------|
| ▪ Inception Workshop and Inception Report | ▪ Quarterly progress reports |
| ▪ Measurement of Means of Verification of project results | ▪ Audits |
| ▪ Measurement of Means of Verification for Project Progress on output and implementation | ▪ Visits to field sites. |
| ▪ APR/PIR | ▪ Issues Log |
| ▪ CDRs | ▪ Risks Log |
| | ▪ Lessons Learned Log |
| | ▪ Terminal Report |
| | ▪ Lessons learned. |

The implementation of the monitoring tools followed, approximately, the plan as established in design. However, monitoring and reporting is perceived by several key stakeholders as lacking in content and not sufficiently analytical in several areas. For instance, monitoring in the field (and measurement of project progress) centres upon outputs. This is deemed ineffective by key stakeholders since only monitoring outputs is frail given that UNDP-implemented GEF-financed project distinguishes that products are just means to obtaining results, effects and impacts. Therefore, while the Project tallies to a degree products and delivery, it does not thoroughly monitor effect and impact.

Gender issues have been assessed to some degree in monitoring thus far. To begin with, although the Project Document mentions gender issues in its narrative, there were no specific gender indicators in the log frame to determine effect or impact of the intervention on women's equality. Monitoring this gap, UNDP commissioned a review of the project document and to identify gaps and key gender considerations that can be implemented to step up the participation and benefit of women from project interventions, as well as identify women's participation in charcoal production and land management. Although it is known that a fuller gender assessment is being commissioned at present by the Project, the delay can have impaired the full incorporation of gender issues in the implementation process thus far.

Regarding evaluation, the Green Charcoal Project has planned a mid-term review and a final evaluation. Therefore, design at entry for monitoring and evaluation is the standard for the Project's specific context. Nevertheless, the implementation of the evaluation system thus far has been delayed (the Pro Doc specifically states that the mid-term review "will be undertaken at exactly the mid-point" of the Project timeline). According to the Country Evaluation Plan, the review should have taken place in August 2016.

STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

As seen in the section on design, at the project formulation level there was a strong stakeholder analysis. This occurred not only identifying institutions or typologies of institutions to be involved in the Project but also going further by carrying out an analysis of anticipated roles and responsibilities in project implementation.

Stakeholders engagement in the Green Charcoal Project is varied and ample. Stakeholders from different sorts of institutions participate in one way or another in project's guidance (technical and screening committees) as well as in implementation. These are stakeholders from diverse institutions such as national government, district governments, non – governmental organizations, and academia. The Project, however, has not engaged fully with the private sector as expected.

REPORTING

Annual reporting (PIRs) take place following planned timing and content. The PIRs convey what activities and processes have taken place or not within the implementation period they refer and they are sufficiently analytical to be of use for further implementation and for adaptive management if the latter would occur. Quarterly reporting does take place broadly following what was planned at design.

However, there are indications and submissions by key stakeholder that project reporting (in a broad sense not only as it relates to quarterly reports) is frail in some areas, and that there is a need for quality control and proper record keeping, also associated to monitoring and reporting. Stakeholders indicate that this should also (where relevant) be associated to improved monitoring of implementation of technologies and of pilots. There is also doubts by some key stakeholders as to whether the reporting of some pilots and site-related efforts are exclusively linked to products or deliverables directly provided by the Project or if other stakeholder's or institution's activities are also reported jointly. Therefore, given these inconsistencies, there is a call for quality control and improved record keeping, monitoring and subsequent reporting as well as enhanced overall monitoring (both quantitatively and qualitatively).

COMMUNICATIONS

The Project does have a concrete communication strategy, called “*A Communication and Media Campaign Strategy for The National Biomass Energy Strategy (NBEST) And Green Charcoal Project Activities*”. In line with this strategy, awareness campaigns using live radio talk-shows, community meetings, multi-stakeholder dialogues are on-going in all four target districts. There is no discernible application of the strategy at the national level.

4.4 SUSTAINABILITY

Mid-term evaluations, when dealing with sustainability, assess the likelihood of sustainability of outcomes at project termination. Sustainability is normally considered to be the prospect of continued benefits after a project ends. Consequently, the assessment of sustainability considers the risks that are likely to affect the continuation of project outcomes. The *Guidelines for GEF – funded / UNDP-implemented project evaluations* establish four areas for considering risks to sustainability: financial, socio – economic, institutional framework and environmental. That is, at mid-point, evaluations attempt to recognise early identification of risks to sustainability. In general terms, several of the risks to sustainability of the Green Charcoal Project can be outlined in order to begin exploring how sustainability can be assured.

FINANCIAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

An evaluation ascertains if there are financial risks that may jeopardize the sustainability of project outcomes as well as the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once granted assistance ends. In the case of the Green Charcoal Project financial sustainability has been a key aspect of the intervention given that an expected target is “Investment mobilized to implement BEST recommendations”. Nevertheless, this is one of the aspects which has not been achieved thus far.

Financial sustainability at other levels, for instance districts and with pilots, is mixed. District level stakeholders seem to be unaware that this is a pilot project and that there is no continuous direct and in direct financial support given that this a finite project. That is, they seem to be unaware that the activities and processes remaining after conclusion as well as potential upscaling and /or catalysing of the results need to be up taken financially by the districts themselves. The pilots, although there continue to be demands from local stakeholders and direct beneficiaries for further direct financing, would have a greater chance of financial sustainability if business plans and extension work is carried out in the remaining implementation period to underscore financial sustainability factors.

SOCIO-ECONOMIC RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

The socio - economic risks to sustainability are few. There are low social and political risks in Uganda that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes. Therefore, there are high chances of socio – economic sustainability due to the country’s stability, ownership of the processes being implemented, and the sheer importance of biomass energy in the country. Most stakeholders (including district governments, parishes, local stakeholders, beneficiaries, local authorities, and several areas of national government) are very supportive of most of the Project’s objectives and this reduces socio – economic risks to sustainability.

INSTITUTIONAL FRAMEWORK AND GOVERNANCE RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

The relatively high ownership of the Project expressed by most national and district level stakeholders, as well their expressed support of its long-term objectives, indicates that there are no major institutional framework and governance risks threats to sustainability from most stakeholders. Yet, risks to sustainability are identified at the national policy level and at the national institutional framework in the sense that there are few concrete national policies or institutional restructuring in the charcoal field that are taking place. As an example, an expected outcome of the Project is “Existing & ongoing policy, regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security integrated with recommendations”. However, accomplishments in this area are not evolving within the framework of the Project, substantially in relation to the already mentioned fragmentation of the charcoal / biomass energy sector in the country and also due to a lack of emphasis in this expected outcome within the framework of the Project. A different consideration is made for institutional framework and governance instruments at the district level. The Project has supported the drafting of charcoal ordinances for the four target districts and has supported (to a greater or lesser degree in each one of them) the development/updating of charcoal plans to be integrated in district – level development plans. Therefore, with the right guidance and support for the districts to adopt and sanction the ordinances and the plans, institutional and governance risks at the district level are less likely to occur.

ENVIRONMENTAL RISKS TO SUSTAINABILITY

Regarding environmental risks to sustainability these are quite evident for the Green Charcoal Project. And for some of these risks, unfortunately, there is no need to wait for sustainability after project conclusion for these risks to manifest themselves since they are already being experienced within the Project. The main environmental risk to sustainability is clearly climate change and its associated manifestations, and although some of the processes and outputs within the Green Charcoal Project have a strong emphasis on climate smart agriculture, the risk of climate change in Uganda in general and in several areas where the project is piloting interventions in particular, is a very present menace. Several of the demonstration pilots failed due to drought in the regions where they are being conducted, which clearly demonstrates the effect that climate change is having at the local level. The extreme weather

events that the country is experiencing is one of the major threats to the Uganda's socio – economic issues and has direct bearing on the issues that the Project attempts to tackle, including increased and unsustainable pressure on natural resources associated with charcoal production. Therefore, environmental risks to sustainability are rather high, especially those risks associated to climate change.

The project did not include in its design a thorough sustainability strategy. An exit strategy that fully takes into account the sustained implementation of achieved products in the short and medium term is lacking. In summary, sustainability probabilities are mixed, yet the Project is still on time to design and drive sustainability factors by supporting several aspects of the achievements made and by driving an exit strategy.

EXTENSION REQUEST

The Implementing Partner and the PMU are considering requesting a no – cost extension request. The project's formal timeframe considers that the Project should end in December 2017 given that it was signed at the end of 2013 and it has a four-year duration. Yet the Project start – up date was May 2014 according to some documents, and therefore –based on this—some documents such as the Project Implementation Report (PIR) establish project closure to be May 2018.¹⁹

The Project has had a series of setbacks in implementation processes. The Project also sustained changes brought about by UNDP reorganization, organizational and implementing standstills, and problems with the successful completion or attainment of products. All of this, in turn, generated some setbacks in implementation and programming, in obtaining products and, of course, in obtaining results and achievements. Therefore, it is considered that a no cost extension request ought to be granted, if requested. At the time of the mid-term review extension periods (six months, a year, etc.) were discussed but they were projected in a haphazard way. The partners and project management would have to determine the time period to be requested for an extension based on programmatic needs and financial issues as well as meeting with UNDP/GEF guidelines for an extension request.

Taking into account either date (December 2017 or May 2018), this evaluation ascertains that it is unlikely that the Project can be completed in the remaining implementation timeframe. Seventy – five percent of its budget would have been expended by the end of 2017. Therefore, since extensions are no – cost, consideration to financing aspects should be made if or when an extension is requested.

¹⁹ And, as seen in several other sections of this report, some actors perceive that Project started at launching in October 2014.

5. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 CONCLUSIONS

The *Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach Project* in Uganda has as an overarching goal “Improved charcoal production technologies and sustainable land management practices through an integrated approach in Uganda.” The project’s objective is “to secure multiple environmental benefits by addressing the twin challenges of unsustainable utilization of fuel wood (including charcoal) and poor land management practices common in Uganda’s woodland through technology transfer, enhancement of the national policy framework and the promotion of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) practices.”

Besides the national – level outputs and expected outcomes, the pilot sites for the project are four districts in Uganda: Kiboga, Kiryandongo, Mubende and Nakaseke. The goal and objective are to be obtained through three specific areas of work with several expected outcomes and sub outcomes. In a summarized form as follows:

- I. *Data collection and improved coordination and enforcement of regulations governing the biomass energy sector, in particular those related to sustainable charcoal.*
 - ❖ Outcome 1: Existing & ongoing policy, regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security integrated with recommendation from the new biomass energy strategy (BEST).
 - ❖ Outcome 2: Improved coordination of institutions managing sustainable charcoal production at district level
 - ❖ Outcome 3: Improved data collection and monitoring of biomass energy and charcoal production and use (integrated into national database)
 - ❖ Outcome 4: Improved charcoal and biomass guidelines and ordinances at district level
 - ❖ Outcome 5: Heightened awareness of new institutional frameworks and ordinances, guidelines and certification schemes at district level
- II. *Dissemination of appropriate technologies for sustainable charcoal production in selected (4) charcoal-producing districts (Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo).*
 - ❖ Outcome 1: Low-carbon charcoal production technologies have successfully replaced inefficient systems in targeted pilot districts leading to:
 - ❖ Outcome 2: Sustainable charcoal recognized as a viable SME in pilot districts by end of project and for post-project sustainability
 - ❖ Outcome 3: Carbon finance is integrated into sustainable charcoal practice in targeted areas
 - ❖ Outcome 4: Increased incomes for all charcoal cooperatives involved in project
 - ❖ Outcome 5: Technical support for charcoal briquetting producers enhanced
- III. *Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots.*
 - ❖ Outcome 1: Improved capacities of stakeholders in targeted districts to establish and manage dedicated sustainable woodlots leading to:
 - ❖ Outcome 2: Best practice SLM/SFM knowledge effectively transferred from successful.

The Green Charcoal Project, through these objectives/results/components/outcomes/outputs, expects to address the barriers that deter effective sustainable equitable management of the charcoal sector in Uganda. Given the importance of biomass energy in the country, the intervention is highly relevant to Uganda. This is also due to the fact that it is consistent with national and district level policies and priorities as well as with the needs of intended beneficiaries.

The design of the Project was very thorough in its analysis and use of baseline information, drawing upon knowledge within the country and the region on the biomass/charcoal sector, its relation to sustainable development, natural resources and key issues for Uganda such as deforestation and adaptation to climate change. The design was also sound conceptually since it considers the problem and the interventions from a multi-level approach (that is, from the national to district levels) and because it not only deals with environmental issues per se but also considers livelihood issues, social matters, and gender issues. However, it can also be said that design is highly convoluted, overly ambitious, some of the intended processes to be implemented are unfeasible, it is confusing in several of its programmatic aspects, it loses sight that it is a piloting/innovation project, and it is overly complex. Lastly, several of the indicators are not measurable, and in relation to the above issues, several are unattainable. A lesson learned in this regard is that the value of a streamlined yet robust, realistic design cannot be overestimated. A proper design is strongly linked to eventual successful implementation and obtaining developmental sustainable results.²⁰

Regarding the Project's efficiency and effectiveness, these have been varied. Understanding that efficiency (which is determined by how economically resources or inputs such as funds, expertise and time are converted to results) and effectiveness (which is determined by the extent to which the initiative's intended results have been achieved or the extent to which there has been progress toward achieving outputs or outcomes) are interlinked concepts, the Green Charcoal Project has had an average degree of accomplishment when analysing through these criteria since some products have been achieved and delivered, yet they are in need of further underpinning to be effective, results-based, and truly sustainable.

Organisational issues have hindered to some degree timely implementation. Issues such as delays in disbursement, lengthy procurement processes, and to some degree lack of coordination between partners, have resulted in several postponements.²¹

Although positive in many respects, the implementation of piloted technologies, innovative approaches, and some of the general activities lack strong business and private sector components.²² Several of the implemented pilots, again although positive in many aspects, have encountered technical issues in their implementation, calling for support and adjustments if they are to be truly effective and sustainable.²³ The same is true with the policies driven and supported by the Project at the district level (mainly proposed ordinances, but also district charcoal plans). While this is positive at the product level, in order for these proposals to be adopted, approved and sustained, the districts could attain support in the adoption, approval, and implementation processes and –through this–impel the transition from

²⁰ Recommendations 1 through 3 in the following section (sub section: RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE DESIGN LEVEL FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING OF GEF FUNDED – UNDP IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS) are linked to these issues.

²¹ Recommendation 4 in the following section is linked to these issues.

²² Recommendation 5 in the following section is linked to these issues.

²³ Recommendations 6 and 12 in the following section are linked to these issues.

products to results and eventually effects and impacts.²⁴ While also positive in many particulars, the implementation of piloted sustainable land management pilots and sustainable forest management component at times are not fully integrated to charcoal issues within the framework of the Project and would need to be integrated further for enhancing effectiveness and relevance.²⁵

The Green Charcoal Project included gender considerations beginning from its design level. Implementation however, until the time of the mid-term review, has had some gaps in gender considerations in order for these to be fully integrated in all aspects of the Project as to enhance benefit sharing for women from project intervention.²⁶

The Project has achieved several key products at the national level.²⁷ Yet, several expected norms and policies to be obtained within the Project framework (expected outputs/outcomes) are stalled, in part due to existing policy and institutional issues, such as the atomization and dispersion of the charcoal field in Uganda. Therefore, in part due to this, the search for attaining policy and institutional outputs and outcomes has been lagging to some degree.²⁸

UNDP's role as implementing agency has been positive. Yet this role can certainly be strengthened in order to guide and leverage implementation of the Project closely and strengthen relation with partners regarding the quality and the results of the intervention.²⁹ Although the implementing partner is formally the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development of Uganda, the Project is being implemented in partnership with a series of other agencies, institutions and stakeholders. Although positive in the sense that a multi – faceted project is implemented in a multi – stakeholder manner, characteristics of this modality should be taken into account early in the project design and implementation. A lesson learned would be that when projects are implemented with the participation of multiple stakeholders, each one's role, functions, partnership arrangements, and responsibilities should be clearly delineated before project starts and adhered to throughout project implementation in order to avoid misunderstandings, delays in implementation and impact on project effectiveness.³⁰

With regards to the criterion of sustainability there are several aspects which are positive regarding the possibility of sustaining whatever results and effects are successfully achieved once the Project concludes. Mainly because there is strong ownership from most stakeholders, including national and district level authorities as well as from local stakeholders where site interventions are taking place. However, for some issues there are some forewarnings that must be noted if the achievements accomplished and to be accomplished are to be sustainable in the short and medium term after the Project concludes. For instance, the need for strengthening the quality of the intervention, particularly in the local level, the need for consideration to financial sustainability, as well the need for an explicit exit strategy.³¹

²⁴ Recommendation 6 in the following section is linked to some of these issues.

²⁵ Recommendation 9 in the following section is linked to some of these issues.

²⁶ Recommendation 10 in the following section is linked to some of these issues.

²⁷ For instance, completed survey, database, standards, etc.

²⁸ Recommendation 8 in the following section is linked to some of these issues.

²⁹ Recommendation 11 in the following section is linked to some of these issues.

³⁰ Recommendation 4 in the following section is linked to some of these issues.

³¹ Recommendations 13 and 14 in the following section are linked to these issues.

The Green Charcoal Project is critical for addressing a crucial energy issue for Uganda. The positive achievements thus far can be underpinned and improved in order to obtain results that are integrated and sustainable. The Project can be redirected to produce lasting effects that deal with charcoal sector issues in a sustainable manner and with benefits for all stakeholders. This Project, if redirected and implemented in a systematic manner and if its aims and objectives are fulfilled, could be a keystone intervention, due to its high replicability, upscaling and catalysing factors, not only for the country but also for the region.

5.2 RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations presented here reflect suggested corrective actions for the design (that is, for future programming) and for the Green Charcoal Project's implementation, monitoring and evaluation well as proposals for future directions underlining main objectives. Recommendations are also relevant for actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project.

RECOMMENDATIONS AT THE DESIGN LEVEL FOR FUTURE PROGRAMMING OF GEF FUNDED – UNDP IMPLEMENTED PROJECTS

1. Design of these sort of projects should be streamlined, focused in subject and in territory, realistic and not overly dimensioned nor overly ambitious.
2. Indicators are key components of design and log frame and should be set at design with their intention made clear: to determine a project's progress, impacts, and effects.
 - a. Baseline indicators should be sought or set for all expected outputs and outcomes. Without measurable baseline data impact or effect cannot be measured nor attributed to an intervention.
 - b. Target indicators should be realistically set; that is, they must be set within the capability to be achieved given the resources, time frame, and capacities.
 - c. Means of verification should be included in the design and be methodologically robust and time bound in order to give validity not only to monitoring but also to the analysis of effects, outcomes, results and impact.
3. Exit strategies and sustainability factors should be part of the design of a project. This should include a realistic framework for results to continue after external aid is concluded, including schemes for accurate financial structures and for policy to sustain achievements.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REMAINING IMPLEMENTATION PERIOD OF THE PROJECT

4. Streamline organisational issues that hinder timely implementation, such as issues associated with delays in disbursements, lengthy procurement processes, and lack of coordination between partners.
5. Strengthen business and private sector components of the whole value chain of charcoal within the Project outputs and processes. Strengthen private sector engagement in the project, in the whole value chain of charcoal (supply, transport of inputs/biomass, marketing, vending, transporting). Generate and disseminate business plans of introduced technologies.

6. Monitor and follow up the implemented pilots regarding technical issues and other matters that have arisen after piloting interventions or the products achieved with the districts thus far:
 - d. For instance, for the pilots and for the introduction of technologies: address issues relating to maintenance of introduced technologies, functioning of technology/kilns beyond demonstration and once they are operational, input/supply needs of piloted kilns such as forest cover needs for kilns to be efficient and effective, transport of biomass and use of other technologies such as portable kilns, explore the use of different tree species (exogenous, indigenous, etc.) for charcoal production not only in terms of tree growth but also in terms of adaptation to climate change and local preferences. Use the information gathered in the above-mentioned monitoring to strengthen the overall focus on the improvement of charcoal technologies and to provide extension support to pilots.
 - e. For the support of district – level policies: Follow up and provide support for districts to have the draft ordinances adopted at the district level and approved at national level in order to seek effects from the products supported by the Project.
7. Strengthen the monitoring of implementation, technologies, outputs and achievements at the results, effects, and impact levels, making certain that monitoring fulfils quality assurance and is based on robust techniques and adequate methodologies.
8. Strengthen project expected outcomes that deal with national existing and ongoing policy, as well as national regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security, and dealing with the mobilization of investments in the charcoal field.
9. Integrate sustainable land management components and sustainable forest management components to charcoal issues within the framework of the Project.
10. Ensure that gender considerations are fully integrated in all aspects of the Project in order to enhance benefit sharing for women from project intervention, taking into account (among other issues) women's participation in the charcoal chain, land ownership, income generation, and meaningful participation.
11. Upgrade the role of UNDP to guide and leverage implementation of Project closely and strengthen relation with partners in order to improve implementation process and ensure quality and results of the intervention. Leverage UNDP and other partners' collaboration and coordination not only at the national but also at the local levels.
12. Strengthen the technical capacities of the Project, firstly by incorporating technical advisor and by making certain that the products, processes, monitoring, and outputs are of high technical quality and focusing on aspects that the Project is missing thus far.
13. Generate materials that can be used for different processes, for follow-up, upscaling and replication as well as to document the intervention. For instance:

- f. Generate processes and documents (lessons learned, gathering of reliable information, best practices, technical reports, etc.) as a learning exercise that can benefit further projects and interventions for upscaling and replicating what has been learned through the Green Charcoal Project.
 - g. Generate training materials to accompany awareness raising, capacity building and training, in particular of local stakeholders and beneficiaries in order to have these processes and activities be durable. Training materials should accompany demonstration of technologies, of sustainable practices. They should also be produced in a user-friendly manner taking into account the capacities of those they are aimed at, and be translated into local languages for the districts where they will be disseminated.
14. Begin to generate an exit strategy soonest, including financial and policy/institutional aspects that need to be taken into account if achievements are to be sustained after project closure.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR AN EXTENSION REQUEST

15. It is recommended that a no - cost extension, should one be requested, be granted for the Project considering the delays it had. The extension request should be accompanied by and documented with changes that need to be applied in order to implement the last period of the Project seeking quality results, effects and impacts in line with the project objective and be based on an analysis of the time period feasibly needed for completion, together with financial programming of a no – cost extension.

6. ANNEXES

▪ **ANNEX 1: MTR ToR FOR NATIONAL CONSULTANT (EXCLUDING ToR ANNEXES)**

BACKGROUND

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full -sized project titled “Addressing barriers to adoption of improved charcoal technologies and Sustainable land management practices through an integrated approach” implemented through the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD), National Forestry Authority (NFA) and four district Local Governments including Kiryandongo, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Mubende.. The project was signed in May 2014, though full implementation commenced in July 2014 and is currently in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this ToR sets out the expectations and its process will follow the guidance outlined on http://web.undp.org/review/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/GuidanceMidtermReview_EN_2014.pdf

Over 80% of the entire population in Uganda depend on biomass as the main source of energy for cooking. Charcoal is most preferred in most urban centres due to its higher energy density, easier storage and transportation. Recent estimates indicate that the demand for charcoal has been increasing steadily at an estimated 6% per annum.

The industry also faces challenges relating to inadequate mechanisms for regulation and conflicting policy provisions besides no designate policy for the country hence making it difficult for Local Governments to perform their roles. The industry also experiences challenges such as; poor production methods and lack of sustainable supplies, exuberated by low capacities of Local Governments to address the current management challenges within the industry including enforcement of regulations governing the production and utilization of biomass energy and the demand for commercialization of charcoal. Eventually, the growing demand for charcoal if not properly managed may translate into dis-incentives that may escalate the degradation of the charcoal sources (forests/woodlands).

Since July 2014, the Government of Uganda through MEMD with support from UNDP/GEF has implemented the Green Charcoal project supporting institutional and capacity development at the district level on both policy and policy adaptation/implementation, delved into transfer of technologies for efficient charcoal production and sustainable land management practices, and enhanced tree stocks with NFA.

Being half –way the project life, this MTR will help to document the progress made so far, recommend strategies that will enhance delivery of intended project results commensurate with the investments made. According to the GEF guidance notes, MTRs are a monitoring tool to assess project status and challenges, identify corrective actions to ensure that projects are on track to achieve planned outcomes. As such, MTRs are required for full-sized UNDP supported projects with GEF financing such as this one.

I. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The MTR will review the project design and strategy, assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, assess early signs of project success, or failure including risks to sustainability. The goal will be to identify and recommend the changes necessary to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.

II. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The MTR shall provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The International Consultant will work with a counterpart National Consultant; the latter to support provide the local content while the former will be the lead Consultant to ensure the deliverables are realized. The MTR

team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal Area Tracking Tool (AMAT) submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool.

The MTR is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach³² ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.³³ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: executing agencies, senior officials and task team leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to selected 4 districts (Kiryandongo, Kiboga, Mubende and Nakaseke) where the MTR team should be able to meet the project responsible parties and conduct site verification.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

III. **SCOPE**

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

a) **Project Strategy**

Project design:

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?

³² For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Review strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

³³ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Log-frame:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log-frame indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

b). Progress towards Results

Progress towards Outcomes Analysis:

Review the log-frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved."

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before MTR.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits

c) Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.

- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ log-frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Review Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and review budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and review? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

d). Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.³⁴ Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table. The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

IV. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 25 working days over a time period of 5-6 weeks. A National Consultant will complement the Lead/International Consultant for a period of 15 working days over the 6 weeks period.

V. DELIVERABLES

Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	By 8 th August, 2016	National consultant participates in preparation and ensures timely submission of inception report
Presentation of Draft report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	By 29 th August, 2016	National consultant supports data collection, analysis and presentation by MTR Lead consultant presents to UNDP internal Review Committee and, Project Coordinating Unit,
Presentation of Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes and addressing comments of internal review committee	By 2 nd September, 2016	National consultant supports filling of any gaps identified by review committees prior to final submission by MTR lead consultant's presentation to stakeholders including Project Board, Technical Committee and Responsible Parties
Final Report	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	By 9 th October, 2016	Participate in finalisation of report to be sent to the UNDP for review by UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, GEF Operational Focal Point

³⁴ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

VI. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT/REPORTING RELATIONSHIP

The international consultant will work under the daily supervision of the Project Manager and the overall guidance of the Practice Specialist at UNDP Country Office. Overall, the Consultant will report to the UNDP Country Director, with regular working relationship with the Project Coordinator MEMD. The Lead Consultant will report to MEMD on technical obligations and to UNDP on all contractual obligations.

VII. LOGISTICS AND ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT TO PROSPECT TECHNICAL ADVISOR

The UNDP Uganda and MEMD through the Project Management Unit will make available all the transport and ensure that the consultant has access to resources, key partners and sites as planned. The Project Management Unit will facilitate the MTR team to meet with interact with the stakeholders at the national level and in the Districts/communities.

b) UNDP will support the Consultant in the following areas:

- Access to required information (copy of project document, Annual Work plans, Progress reports and other project related reports).
- Access to UNDP Office and its infrastructure (e.g. conference room and internet while at UNDP);
- Support and assistance to gain access to relevant stakeholders for consultations;

c) UNDP Kampala and the Project Office will coordinate the study and keep abreast of the Mission's activities during the Consultant's stay.

VIII. QUALIFICATIONS**Academic Qualifications:**

Masters Degree or equivalent in Environment or Natural resources Management or other closely related fields.

Experience:

A minimum of 3 years in similar or closely related projects review. Working experience in the Engineering sector and with Monitoring and Evaluation of donor funded projects will be an added advantage.

Competencies:

- Recent experience with result-based management review methodologies,
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios,
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation,
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-reviews,
- Experience working in Uganda or Eastern Africa,
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years,
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive review and analysis,
- Excellent communication skills,
- Demonstrable analytical skills,
- Project review/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language and other skills:

Proficiency in both spoken and written English

Compliance of the UN Core Values:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards,
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP,
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability,
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism,
- Fulfills all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

IX. **SELECTION CRITERIA**

Qualified Individual Consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Individual Consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
 - Technical Criteria weight is 70%
 - Financial Criteria weight is 30%

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Max. Points
Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))	70%	100
Understanding the Scope of Work; comprehensiveness of the methodology/approach; and organization & completeness of the proposal		30
Minimum educational background		20
Minimum years of experience		30
Additional competences (energy engineering /M&E)		20
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer X100)	30%	30
Total Score	Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score *30%	

** It is a mandatory criteria and shall have a minimum of 50%*

X. **PAYMENT MILESTONES**

Instalment of Payment/ Period	Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered	Approval should be obtained	Percentage of Payment
1 st Instalment	upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report	UNDP and MEMD	20%
2 nd Instalment	upon submission of the draft MTR report	UNDP	30%
3 rd Instalment	upon finalization of the MTR report	UNDP and MEMD	50%

XI. **RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSALS**

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, you are hereby given a template of the Table of Content. Accordingly, your Technical Proposal document must have at least the preferred content as outlined in the IC Standard Bid Document (SBD). The financial proposals should be ALL inclusive.

XII. **CONFIDENTIALITY**

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

XII. ANNEXES

Existing literature and documents that will help Offerors gain a better understanding of the project situation and the work required are provided as annexes to the TOR, including:

- *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (2014)*
- List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
- MTR Evaluative Matrix template
- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
- MTR Required Ratings & Achievement Summary Table and Ratings Scales
- MTR Report Clearance Form
- MTR Audit Trail template
- Progress Towards Results Matrix template

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by **20 July, 2016**. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications **in one single PDF document**:

- 1) Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability**
- 2) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- 3) **Technical proposal**:
 - a. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment
 - b. A methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- 4) **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs.
- 5) Interested applicants should send an email to: Diana.nabbanja@undp.org for a detailed copy of the Terms of Reference.

Evaluator ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

This TOR is approved by:

Signature:

Name and Designation:

Date of Signing:

- **ANNEX 2: MTR TOR FOR INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT (EXCLUDING TOR ANNEXES)**

TERM OF REFERENCE (TOR)**For the procurement of International Consultant to conduct Midterm Review****XIII. GENERAL INFORMATION**

Project/Program Title:	Addressing barriers to adoption of improved charcoal technologies and Sustainable land management practices through integrated approach
Post Title:	International Consultant
Consultant Level:	_____
Duty Station:	Home-based with mission travel
Expected Places of Travel:	Selected 4 districts (Kiryandongo, Nakaseke, Mubende and Kiboga)
Duration:	Twenty five (25) working days from 8 August to 9 th September, 2016
Expected Start Date:	Immediately after Concluding Contract Agreement

XIV. BACKGROUND

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full -sized project titled “Addressing barriers to adoption of improved charcoal technologies and Sustainable land management practices through an integrated approach” implemented through the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD), National Forestry Authority (NFA) and four district Local Governments including Kiryandongo, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Mubende.. The project was signed in May 2014, though full implementation commenced in July 2014 and is currently in its second year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this ToR sets out the expectations and its process will follow the guidance outlined on http://web.undp.org/review/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/GuidanceMidtermReview_EN_2014.pdf

Over 80% of the entire population in Uganda depend on biomass as the main source of energy for cooking. Charcoal is most preferred in most urban centres due to its higher energy density, easier storage and transportation. Recent estimates indicate that the demand for charcoal has been increasing steadily at an estimated 6% per annum.

The industry also faces challenges relating to inadequate mechanisms for regulation and conflicting policy provisions besides no designate policy for the country hence making it difficult for Local Governments to perform their roles. The industry also experiences challenges such as; poor production methods and lack of sustainable supplies, exuberated by low capacities of Local Governments to address the current management challenges within the industry including enforcement of regulations governing the production and utilization of biomass energy and the demand for commercialization of charcoal. Eventually, the growing demand for charcoal if not properly managed may translate into dis-incentives that may escalate the degradation of the charcoal sources (forests/woodlands).

Since July 2014, the Government of Uganda through MEMD with support from UNDP/GEF has implemented the Green Charcoal project supporting institutional and capacity development at the district level on both policy and policy adaptation/implementation, delved into transfer of technologies for efficient charcoal production and sustainable land management practices, and enhanced tree stocks with NFA.

Being half –way the project life, this MTR will help to document the progress made so far, recommend strategies that will enhance delivery of intended project results commensurate with the investments

made. According to the GEF guidance notes, MTRs are a monitoring tool to assess project status and challenges, identify corrective actions to ensure that projects are on track to achieve planned outcomes. As such, MTRs are required for full-sized UNDP supported projects with GEF financing such as this one.

XV. OBJECTIVES OF THE MID-TERM REVIEW

The MTR will review the project design and strategy, assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document, assess early signs of project success, or failure including risks to sustainability. The goal will be to identify and recommend the changes necessary to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results.

XVI. APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The MTR shall provide evidence based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The International Consultant will work with a counterpart National Consultant; the latter to support provide the local content while the former will be the lead Consultant to ensure the deliverables are realized. The MTR team will review all relevant sources of information including documents prepared during the preparation phase (i.e. PIF, UNDP Initiation Plan, UNDP Environmental & Social Safeguard Policy, the Project Document, project reports including Annual Project Review/PIRs, project budget revisions, lesson learned reports, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the team considers useful for this evidence-based review). The MTR team will review the baseline GEF focal Area Tracking Tool (AMAT) submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool.

The MTR is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach³⁵ ensuring close engagement with the Project Team, government counterparts (the GEF Operational Focal Point), the UNDP Country Office(s), UNDP-GEF Regional Technical Advisers, and other key stakeholders.

Engagement of stakeholders is vital to a successful MTR.³⁶ Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to: executing agencies, senior officials and task team leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Steering Committee, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc. Additionally, the MTR team is expected to conduct field missions to selected 4 districts (Kiryandongo, Kiboga, Mubende and Nakaseke) where the MTR team should be able to meet the project responsible parties and conduct site verification.

The final MTR report should describe the full MTR approach taken and the rationale for the approach making explicit the underlying assumptions, challenges, strengths and weaknesses about the methods and approach of the review.

XVII. SCOPE

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress.

b) Project Strategy

Project design:

³⁵ For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Review strategies and techniques, see [UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results](#), 05 Nov 2013.

³⁶ For more stakeholder engagement in the M&E process, see the [UNDP Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](#), Chapter 3, pg. 93.

- Review the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions. Review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document.
- Review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results. Were lessons from other relevant projects properly incorporated into the project design?
- Review how the project addresses country priorities. Review country ownership. Was the project concept in line with the national sector development priorities and plans of the country (or of participating countries in the case of multi-country projects)?
- Review decision-making processes: were perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources to the process, taken into account during project design processes?
- Review the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design. See Annex 9 of *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for further guidelines.
- If there are major areas of concern, recommend areas for improvement.

Results Framework/Log-frame:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's log-frame indicators and targets, assess how "SMART" the midterm and end-of-project targets are (Specific, Measurable, Attainable, Relevant, Time-bound), and suggest specific amendments/revisions to the targets and indicators as necessary.
- Are the project's objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
- Examine if progress so far has led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women's empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
- Ensure broader development and gender aspects of the project are being monitored effectively. Develop and recommend SMART 'development' indicators, including sex-disaggregated indicators and indicators that capture development benefits.

b). Progress towards Results

Progress towards Outcomes Analysis:

Review the log-frame indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets using the Progress Towards Results Matrix and following the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects*; colour code progress in a "traffic light system" based on the level of progress achieved; assign a rating on progress for each outcome; make recommendations from the areas marked as "Not on target to be achieved".

In addition to the progress towards outcomes analysis:

- Compare and analyse the GEF Tracking Tool at the Baseline with the one completed right before MTR.
- Identify remaining barriers to achieving the project objective in the remainder of the project.
- By reviewing the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identify ways in which the project can further expand these benefits

c) Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

- Review overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document. Have changes been made and are they effective? Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear? Is decision-making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner? Recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) and recommend areas for improvement.
- Review the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP) and recommend areas for improvement.

Work Planning:

- Review any delays in project start-up and implementation, identify the causes and examine if they have been resolved.
- Are work-planning processes results-based? If not, suggest ways to re-orientate work planning to focus on results?
- Examine the use of the project's results framework/ log-frame as a management tool and review any changes made to it since project start.

Finance and co-finance:

- Consider the financial management of the project, with specific reference to the cost-effectiveness of interventions.
- Review the changes to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and assess the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions.
- Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
- Informed by the co-financing monitoring table to be filled out, provide commentary on co-financing: is co-financing being used strategically to help the objectives of the project? Is the Project Team meeting with all co-financing partners regularly in order to align financing priorities and annual work plans?

Project-level Monitoring and Review Systems:

- Review the monitoring tools currently being used: Do they provide the necessary information? Do they involve key partners? Are they aligned or mainstreamed with national systems? Do they use existing information? Are they efficient? Are they cost-effective? Are additional tools required? How could they be made more participatory and inclusive?
- Examine the financial management of the project monitoring and review budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and review? Are these resources being allocated effectively?

Stakeholder Engagement:

- Project management: Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
- Participation and country-driven processes: Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
- Participation and public awareness: To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Reporting:

- Assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the project management and shared with the Project Board.
- Assess how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated PIRs, if applicable?)
- Assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners.

Communications:

- Review internal project communication with stakeholders: Is communication regular and effective? Are there key stakeholders left out of communication? Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received? Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
- Review external project communication: Are proper means of communication established or being established to express the project progress and intended impact to the public (is there a web presence, for example? Or did the project implement appropriate outreach and public awareness campaigns?)
- For reporting purposes, write one half-page paragraph that summarizes the project's progress towards results in terms of contribution to sustainable development benefits, as well as global environmental benefits.

d). Sustainability

- Validate whether the risks identified in the Project Document, Annual Project Review/PIRs and the ATLAS Risk Management Module are the most important and whether the risk ratings applied are appropriate and up to date. If not, explain why.
- In addition, assess the following risks to sustainability:

Financial risks to sustainability:

- What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes)?

Socio-economic risks to sustainability:

- Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained? Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project? Are lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?

Institutional Framework and Governance risks to sustainability:

- Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.

Environmental risks to sustainability:

- Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Conclusions & Recommendations

The MTR team will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.³⁷ Recommendations should be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. A recommendation table should be put in the report's executive summary. See the *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* for guidance on a recommendation table. The MTR team should make no more than 15 recommendations total.

Ratings

The MTR team will include its ratings of the project's results and brief descriptions of the associated achievements in a *MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table* in the Executive Summary of the MTR report. See Annex E for ratings scales. No rating on Project Strategy and no overall project rating is required.

XVIII. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 25 working days over a time period of 5-6 weeks. A National Consultant will complement the Lead/International Consultant for a period of 15 working days over the 6 weeks period.

XIX. DELIVERABLES

Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
MTR Inception Report	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	By 8 th August,2016	MTR consultant submits inception report to UNDP and MEMD
Presentation of Draft report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	By 29 th August,2016	MTR expert presents to UNDP internal Review Committee and, Project Coordinating Unit,
Presentation of Final Report	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes and addressing comments of internal review committee	By 2 nd September,2016	MTR expert presents to stakeholders including Project Board, Technical Committee and Responsible Parties
Final Report	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	By 9 th October,2016	Sent to the UNDP for review by UNDP Regional Technical Advisor, GEF Operational Focal Point

XX. INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT/REPORTING RELATIONSHIP

³⁷ Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

The international consultant will work under the daily supervision of the Project Manager and the overall guidance of the Practice Specialist at UNDP Country Office. Overall, the Consultant will report to the UNDP Country Director, with regular working relationship with the Project Coordinator MEMD. The Lead Consultant will report to MEMD on technical obligations and to UNDP on all contractual obligations.

XXI. LOGISTICS AND ADMINISTRATION SUPPORT TO PROSPECT TECHNICAL ADVISOR

The UNDP Uganda and MEMD through the Project Management Unit will make available all the transport and ensure that the consultant has access to resources, key partners and sites as planned. The Project Management Unit will facilitate the MTR team to meet with interact with the stakeholders at the national level and in the Districts/communities.

b) UNDP will support the Consultant in the following areas:

- Access to required information (copy of project document, Annual Work plans, Progress reports and other project related reports).
- Access to UNDP Office and its infrastructure (e.g. conference room and internet while at UNDP);
- Support and assistance to gain access to relevant stakeholders for consultations;

d) UNDP Kampala and the Project Office will coordinate the study and keep abreast of the Mission's activities during the Consultant's stay.

XXII. QUALIFICATIONS

Academic Qualifications:

Master's Degree or equivalent in Environment or Natural resources Management or other closely related fields.

Experience:

A minimum of 5 years in similar or closely related projects review. Working experience in the Engineering sector and with Monitoring and Evaluation of donor funded projects will be an added advantage.

Competencies:

- Recent experience with result-based management review methodologies,
- Experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios,
- Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change adaptation,
- Experience working with the GEF or GEF-reviews,
- Experience working in Uganda or Eastern Africa,
- Work experience in relevant technical areas for at least 10 years,
- Demonstrated understanding of issues related to gender and climate change adaptation; experience in gender sensitive review and analysis,
- Excellent communication skills,
- Demonstrable analytical skills,
- Project review/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset.

Language and other skills:

Proficiency in both spoken and written English

Compliance of the UN Core Values:

- Demonstrates integrity by modelling the UN's values and ethical standards,
- Promotes the vision, mission, and strategic goals of UNDP,
- Displays cultural, gender, religion, race, nationality and age sensitivity and adaptability,
- Treats all people fairly without favoritism,
- Fulfils all obligations to gender sensitivity and zero tolerance for sexual harassment.

XXIII. SELECTION CRITERIA

Qualified Individual Consultant is expected to submit both the Technical and Financial Proposals. Individual Consultants will be evaluated based on Cumulative Analysis as per the following scenario:

- Responsive/compliant/acceptable, and
- Having received the highest score out of a pre-determined set of weighted technical and financial criteria specific to the solicitation. In this regard, the respective weight of the proposals are:
 - Technical Criteria weight is 70%
 - Financial Criteria weight is 30%

Evaluation Criteria	Weight	Max. Point
Technical Competence (based on CV, Proposal and interview (if required))	70%	100
Understanding the Scope of Work; comprehensiveness of the methodology/approach; and organization & completeness of the proposal		30
Minimum educational back ground		20
Minimum years of experience		30
Additional competences (energy engineering /M&E)		20
Financial (Lower Offer/Offer X 100)	30%	30
Total Score	Technical Score * 70% + Financial Score * 30%	

** It is a mandatory criteria and shall have a minimum of 50%*

XXIV. PAYMENT MILESTONES

Instalment of Payment/ Period	Deliverables or Documents to be Delivered	Approval should be obtained	Percentage of Payment
1 st Instalment	upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report	UNDP and MEMD	20%
2 nd Instalment	upon submission of the draft MTR report	UNDP	30%
3 rd Instalment	upon finalization of the MTR report	UNDP and MEMD	50%

XXV. RECOMMENDED PRESENTATION OF TECHNICAL AND FINANCIAL PROPOSALS

For purposes of generating proposals whose contents are uniformly presented and to facilitate their comparative review, you are hereby given a template of the Table of Content. Accordingly, your Technical Proposal document must have at least the preferred content as outlined in the IC Standard Bid Document (SBD). The financial proposals should be ALL inclusive.

XXVI. CONFIDENTIALITY

The Individual Consultant shall not either during the term or after termination of the assignment, disclose any proprietary or confidential information related to the consultancy service without prior written consent. Proprietary interests on all materials and documents prepared by the consultants under the assignment shall become and remain properties of UNDP.

XII. ANNEXES

Existing literature and documents that will help Offerors gain a better understanding of the project situation and the work required are provided as annexes to the TOR, including:

- *Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects* (2014)
- List of documents to be reviewed by the MTR Team
- Guidelines on Contents for the Midterm Review Report
- MTR Evaluative Matrix template
- UNEG Code of Conduct for Evaluators/Midterm Review Consultants
- MTR Required Ratings & Achievement Summary Table and Ratings Scales
- MTR Report Clearance Form
- MTR Audit Trail template
- Progress Towards Results Matrix template

APPLICATION PROCESS

Applicants are requested to apply online at <http://jobs.undp.org> by **5th August, 2016**. Individual consultants are invited to submit applications together with their CV for these positions. UNDP applies a fair and transparent selection process that will take into account the competencies/skills of the applicants as well as their financial proposals. Qualified women and members of social minorities are encouraged to apply.

DOCUMENTS TO BE INCLUDED WHEN SUBMITTING THE PROPOSALS.

Interested individual consultants must submit the following documents/information to demonstrate their qualifications **in one single PDF document**:

- 6) Duly accomplished **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability**
- 7) **Personal CV or P11**, indicating all past experience from similar projects, as well as the contact details (email and telephone number) of the Candidate and at least three (3) professional references.
- 8) **Technical proposal**:
 - a. Brief description of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment
 - b. A methodology, on how they will approach and complete the assignment.
- 9) **Financial proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price, supported by a breakdown of costs.
- 10) Interested applicants should send an email to: Diana.nabbanja@undp.org for a detailed copy of the Terms of Reference.

Evaluator ethics

Evaluation consultants will be held to the highest ethical standards and are required to sign a Code of Conduct upon acceptance of the assignment. UNDP evaluations are conducted in accordance with the principles outlined in the UNEG 'Ethical Guidelines for Evaluations'.

This TOR is approved by:

Signature: _____

Name and Designation: _____

Date of Signing: _____

- **ANNEX 3: MTR EVALUATIVE MATRIX (EVALUATION CRITERIA WITH KEY QUESTIONS, INDICATORS, SOURCES OF DATA, AND METHODOLOGY)**



Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
Relevance: Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results?			
Do the project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national level? To what extent is the project suited to local and national development priorities and policies?	Degree to which the project supports national environmental objectives. Addressing gaps and/or inconsistency with the national and local policies and priorities Addressing gaps in capacity framework.	National policies Project Document	Document analysis
How relevant the project's intended outcomes? How relevant is the involvement of different partners in the Project implementation given the institutional and policy fragmentation of the charcoal field in Uganda?	Degree to which the project supports national environmental and development objectives	Project documents and evaluations	Document analysis
Were the project's objectives and components relevant, according to the social and political context?	Degree of coherence between the project and national priorities, policies and strategies	Government of Uganda, UNDP, Project Management	Interviews
Are counterpart resources (funding, staff, and facilities), enabling legislation, and adequate project management arrangements in place at project entry? Are the stated assumptions and risks logical and robust? And did they help to determine activities and planned outputs? Is the project coherent with UNDP programming strategy for Uganda? To what extent is the project in line with GEF operational programs	Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities Coherence UNDP and GEF operational programming	Project partners and relevant stakeholders UNDAF, UNDP/GEF Programming statements	Interviews Document analysis
Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?			
What expected outputs have been achieved thus far?	Degree of achievement vis a vis expected outcome indicators	PIR 2016 Interviews	Document analysis Site Visits Interviews

<p>To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?</p> <p>What have the products, such as studies, policy recommendations, dissemination campaigns, etc., affected [keeping in mind that this is a midterm review and several if not many products are still in the implementation or planning process]</p>			
<p>Was the project effective in acquiring a policy guidance for future developments in the field of charcoal and sustainable land management in Uganda?</p> <p>How is the Project addressing fragmentation of charcoal policies, and institutional scattering considering this fragmentation?</p> <p>How is the Project contributing to avoiding fragmentation across policies and cross-cutting mandates?</p> <p>What other partners can be involved in the Project in a meaningful way to streamline the issue and bypass or address the institutional and policy fragmentation of the charcoal field in Uganda?</p>	<p>Indication of policy guidance in project outputs, documents, products.</p> <p>Changes in policy attributable to project regarding the field of charcoal and SLM in Uganda.</p>	<p>Project outcomes</p> <p>Norms, policies debated, adopted</p>	<p>Document analysis</p> <p>Stakeholders interviews</p>
<p>How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies as they relate to charcoal and SLM in Uganda?</p> <p>How has the project incorporated gender issues as the relate to charcoal and SLM in Uganda?</p>	<p>Involvement of (direct and indirect) beneficiaries in project development and implementation</p> <p>Incorporation of gender dimension</p> <p>Analysis of participation by stakeholders (communities, civil society, direct and indirect beneficiaries, etc.).</p> <p>Effect of project aspects implemented at sites</p>	<p>Project outputs and outcomes</p>	<p>Interviews</p> <p>Site visits</p>
<p>What is causing delays in implementation and delivery of outputs Green Charcoal Project?</p>	<p>Discrepancies between expected outputs/outcome by the time of mid-term and actual achievements</p>	<p>Findings in project documents, achievement indicators</p>	<p>Document analysis (minutes of meetings specially)</p> <p>Site visits observation</p>

In what outputs? Where are the implementation 'bottlenecks'? How can these issues be solved? What changes need to be implemented?			Stakeholder interviews
Partnerships for implementation	Working relationship between PMU, UNDP, and other strategic partners as well as donors Board functions	Findings in project documents (PIRs, minutes of meetings) Indications in interviews	Document analysis Stakeholder interviews
In what ways are long-term emerging effects to the project foreseen?	Level of coherence between project expected results and project design internal logic	Government of Uganda, Project team, UNDP	Interviews
Were the relevant representatives from government and civil society involved in project implementation, including as part of the project	Level of coherence between project design and project implementation approach Role of committees in guidance Harness effectiveness by analysing how project's results were met vis-à-vis intended outcomes or objectives Draw lessons learned/good practices from the implementation and achievement of results	Project partners and relevant stakeholders	Document analysis
Efficiency: Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and could adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?			
Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards?	Policies adopted / enacted Policies implemented Budgetary / financial means to implement policies drawn	Policy documents contain sustainability factors (policy adopted, implemented) Budget arrangements (allocations, etc.) made to sustain project outputs and outcomes	Documentation analysis Stakeholder interviews
	Was adaptive management used thus far and if so, how did these modifications to the project contribute to obtaining the objectives? Has the project been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level monitoring and evaluation systems, reporting, and project communications supporting the project's implementation?	Quality of existing information systems in place to identify emerging risks and other issues	Project documents
	How did institutional arrangements influence the project's achievement of results?	Quality of risk mitigations strategies developed and followed	Government of Uganda, Project team, UNDP

Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?

Sustainability possibilities Does the Project have an exit strategy? What components should an exit strategy have for this project?	In what way, may the benefits from the project are likely to be maintained or increased in the future?	See indicators in project document results framework and log frame	Project documents and reports
Social sustainability factors	Is there sufficient public/stakeholder awareness in support of the project's long-term objectives?	Evidence that particular partnerships/linkages will be sustained	Government of Uganda, Project team, UNDP
Political/financial sustainability	Do the legal frameworks, policies, and governance structures and processes within which the project operates pose risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project benefits?	Evidence that particular practices will be sustained	Government of Uganda, Project team, UNDP; tourism (safari) endeavours
Replicability	Which of the project's aspects deserve to be replicated in future initiatives?	Evidence that particular practices will be sustained	Government of Uganda, Project team, UNDP

▪ **ANNEX 4: SAMPLE INTERVIEW GUIDE USED FOR DATA COLLECTION**

1. How relevant is the project for Uganda?
2. What have been the project's achievements (at the output, outcome, results levels) thus far?
3. How were these results achieved? What issues have arisen that hinder the achievement of results?
4. What planning instruments were designed, adopted and / or implemented to deal with effective charcoal production and consumption in the site-specific areas and in Uganda as a whole?
5. How have gender issues been incorporated in the Project?
6. What effects or impacts (change) have occurred due to the project (policy, investments, etc.)?
7. Were the relevant country representatives, from government and civil society, as well as the private sector and universities, NGOs, CBOs, Associations, etc., involved in the project preparation and execution? What has been the effective role of the steering committee?
8. How did the partnership and management arrangements between different institutions work and when it did not)? Was it effective? Efficient?
9. What have been the issues or problems encountered in the implementation of the project?
10. What have been the projects weaknesses, if any?
11. How is the work with the communities carried out? With stakeholders (NGOs, private sector, etc.)?
12. What are the probabilities that results would be sustained over the medium/long term?
13. If something could have been done different, in hindsight what could this have been (lesson learned)?
14. What recommendations would you make for the second implementation tranche?

The Questions will be administered to various categories of stakeholders as appropriate such as:

For Project management:

- 1) Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?

Participation and country-driven processes:

- 2) Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project? Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?

Participation and public awareness

- 3) To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives?

Sustainability

- 4) Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes? What is the risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained?
- 5) Do the various key stakeholders see that it is in their interest that the project benefits continue to flow? Is there sufficient public / stakeholder awareness in support of the long term objectives of the project?
- 6) What are the lessons learned being documented by the Project Team on a continual basis and shared/ transferred to appropriate parties who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future?
- 7) What is the likelihood of sustainability if the financial and economic resources are not being available once the GEF assistance ends (consider potential resources can be from multiple sources, such as the public and private sectors, income generating activities, and other funding that will be adequate financial resources for sustaining project's outcomes
- 8) Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project benefits? While assessing this parameter, also consider if the required systems/ mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer are in place.
- 9) Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?

Sample Community questions:

- 1) What are the benefits of this project?
- 2) What are the strengths of the project?
- 3) What are the weakness of the project?
- 4) What are the challenges being faced by stakeholders during this project implementation?
- 5) What is the likelihood of continuity of activities (sustainability) if the financial and economic resources are not being available once the assistance ends?
- 6) What factors threaten sustainability of the project, could they be social factors/political factors.
- 7) What lessons learned are being documented by the Project?

▪ **ANNEX 5: RATING SCALES**

Rating scale for performance

Rating	Explanation
Highly Satisfactory (HS)	No shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Satisfactory (S)	Minor shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	Moderate shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	Significant shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Unsatisfactory (U)	Major shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	Severe shortcomings in the achievement of its objectives in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency

Rating Scale for Sustainability

Rating	Explanation
Likely (L)	Negligible risks to sustainability, with key outcomes expected to continue into the foreseeable future
Moderately Likely (ML)	Moderate risks, but expectations that at least some outcomes will be sustained
Moderately Unlikely (MU)	Substantial risk that key outcomes will not carry on after project closure, although some outputs and activities should carry on
Unlikely (U)	Severe risk that project outcomes as well as key outputs will not be sustained
Highly Unlikely (HU)	Expectation that few if any outputs or activities will continue after project closure

Progress Towards Results Rating Scale

Highly Satisfactory (HS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”.
Satisfactory (S)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings.
Moderately Satisfactory (MS)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings.
Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)	The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings.
Unsatisfactory (U)	The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets.
Highly Unsatisfactory (HU)	The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets.

▪ **ANNEX 6: PROJECT'S LOG FRAME**

PROJECT RESULTS FRAMEWORK: Logical Framework specifying the Project Goal, Objectives, Outcomes, Success Indicators, Targets as well as Assumptions and Risks

Applicable GEF Strategic Objective and Program:

CCM-2: Promote investment in energy efficient technologies

2.1 Investment in market transformation for energy efficiency increased

Output - Energy Savings achieved

CCM-5: Promote conservation of carbon stocks through sustainable management of land use, land-use change and forestry

5.1 Good management practices in LULUCF adopted both within the forest land and in the wider landscape

Output - Forests and non- forest lands under good management practices

Output - Carbon stock monitoring systems established

LD-2: Forest Landscapes: Generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services in drylands, including sustaining livelihoods of forest dependent people

2.1: An enhanced enabling environment within the forest sector in dryland dominated countries

Output - Types of innovative SFM practices introduced at field level

2.2: Improved forest management in drylands

Output - Suitable SFM interventions to increase/maintain natural forest cover in dryland production landscapes

2.3: Sustained flow of services in forest ecosystems in drylands

Output- Appropriate actions to diversify the financial resource base

2.4: Increased investments in SFM in dryland forests ecosystems

Output - Information on SFM technologies and good practice guidelines disseminated

SFM REDD+1: Reduce pressures on forest resources and generate sustainable flows of forest ecosystem services

1.2: Good management practices applied in existing forests

Output - Forest area under sustainable management, separated by forest type

1.3: Good management practices adopted by relevant economic actors

Output - Types and quantity of services generated through SFM

Project Objective: To secure multiple environmental benefits by addressing the twin challenges of unsustainable utilization of biomass for charcoal and poor land management practices common in Uganda's Woodlands.

Outcomes	KPI	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
COMPONENT 1: Data collection and improved coordination and enforcement of regulations governing the biomass energy sector, in particular those related to sustainable charcoal					
<i>Outcome 1.1: Existing & ongoing policy, regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security integrated with new biomass energy strategy (BEST) under development</i>	Biomass Energy Strategy (BEST) developed, validated, approved and in use. National charcoal survey and updated standardized baseline reports completed based on current data	BEST still in design form	Investment mobilized to implement BEST recommendations Standardized baseline accepted by UNFCCC	Budgetary estimates and allocation reports to MEMD. Ministry progress and development reports National charcoal survey published Standardized baseline report updated and accepted by UNFCCC	A. Continued government and donor support for BEST; regulatory work from SLM enabling project translates into actual regulations R. Donor support wanes due to governance issues

<i>Outcome 1.2: Improved coordination of institutions managing sustainable charcoal production at pilot district level</i>	Framework for institutional coordination and resource mobilization developed between MEMD, local government authorities and the National Forest Authority to manage charcoal trade at district level Charcoal by-laws including licensing procedures standardized and strengthened	Biomass energy mandate is distributed across many government agency with no focal point License fees not standardized	Biomass Unit funded in proportion to revenue collected from the sector & central government budget by year 3. Higher revenue collection by local administration from charcoal by the district by year 2.	Published budgetary estimates and allocations to unit and published district revenue records on charcoal production licenses District records and annual MEMD reports and Economic Review Reports	A: Political support for integrating sustainable charcoal into overall energy and development plans R: Charcoal associations formed and putting sustained pressure on local government
<i>Outcome 1.3: Improved data collection and monitoring of biomass energy and charcoal production and use (integrated into national database and for use as baseline information in a possible NAMA)</i>	Baseline report and functional biomass database established and hosted at MEMD and published in Uganda Bureau of Standards reports	Current database is uncoordinated, inadequate and unreliable	Updateable baseline and functional database established at MEMD and UBS by end of year 1	MEMD, UBS & MWE use data for planning purposes. Charcoal data linked to UBS Statistics and Economic review reports, as well as for use in baseline in a future NAMA	A: Ministry of Planning and Finance taking interest in charcoal; charcoal NAMA is selected for development R: Baseline is not regularly maintained and updated post-project
<i>Outcome 1.4: Improved charcoal and biomass guidelines and ordinances at district level</i>	Local guidelines and standards for certification schemes developed, adopted and publicized in targeted pilot districts ³⁸	Guidelines and standards non-existent	Guidelines and certification schemes developed and operational by end of year 2.	A model ordinance for one of the districts legislated and replicated in other districts	A: MEMD and MWE work in harmony to develop guidelines and certification schemes

³⁸ The targeted districts for this project are **Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo**

<i>Outcome 1.5: Heightened awareness of new institutional frameworks and ordinances, guidelines and certification schemes at district level</i>	<p>Awareness and educational program on local guidelines and standards completed in all targeted pilot districts</p> <p>Updated guidelines for measuring biomass (CAI & MAI) calculated using the biomass study technical manual. The technical manual will be updated and revised by year 2</p>	<p>Inadequate and uncoordinated individual /NGO driven and project based programs</p> <p>Biomass measurement guidelines and technical manual are not in use. The technical manual is outdated.</p>	<p>Coordinated awareness campaigns completed in each district by end of year 3</p> <p>Biomass technical manual is updated and available for use by year 2. Updated guidelines developed and in use by year</p>	<p>Validated and approved awareness and educational programs published, with specific gender-sensitive materials developed Outreach and awareness materials developed PIRs and MTE validates increased awareness levels and use of updated guidelines and technical manual</p>	<p>A: The timing of the awareness campaigns are contingent on the completion of the guidelines and certification schemes being developed and operational by end of year 2</p> <p>The updated guidelines for measuring biomass and the revision of the technical manual should happen in close conjunction with and in sequence with activities under Outcomes 1.2-1.4</p> <p>R: Outcomes 1.4 and 1.5 are closely interlinked. If there are delays in Outcome 1.4 then Outcome 1.5 cannot be undertaken</p>
Outcomes	KPI	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Component 2: Financial incentives and roll-out of appropriate technologies (i.e. improved kilns) for sustainable charcoal production and SLM in selected (4) charcoal-producing districts established					
<i>Outcome 2.1: Low-carbon charcoal production technologies have successfully replaced inefficient systems in targeted pilot districts</i>	<p>60 sustainable charcoal cooperatives organized and operational³⁹ with 2,400 charcoal champions in pilot districts. Activities to meet this KPI will involve:</p> <p>Developing ranking criteria for categorizing charcoal producers or entrepreneurs</p> <p>Conducting surveys to rank different actors</p>	<p>BAU Carbonization Technologies = Earthmound Kilns @ 10% efficiency conversion</p> <p>Biomass Sources = non-renewable</p> <p>No widespread use of improved kiln technologies and those that are in use are</p>	<p>- 143,314 metric tons of wood saved over project lifetime from improved kilns compared to BAU scenario (14,431 hectares of avoided deforestation)</p> <p>Lifetime energy savings (compared to BAU scenario) of :</p>	<p>Documented records of 60 groups formed with membership information</p> <p>All participating charcoal cooperatives receiving kilns keeping records of wood use, batches, and charcoal produced from kilns</p>	<p>Monitoring, tracking and licensing system are put in place and records kept</p> <p>Participating charcoal producers respond to improved kilns and do not revert back to inefficient practices</p> <p>Local administrative officers work closely with MEMD and charcoal producer</p>

³⁹ The charcoal cooperatives will likely be drawn from existing FAO APFS and FFS in districts where FAO is operational such as Nakaseke, Kiboga and Mubende; in Kiryandongo they will be formed in consultation with existing projects and structures already on the ground.

	<p>into pre-determined categories</p> <p>Training of all groups on local ordinances and standards for sustainable charcoal certification schemes as well as improved kiln technologies</p> <p>Demonstration of Casamance kiln operation and viability to target group (total of 400 casamance kilns deployed)</p> <p>Demonstration of retort kiln operation and viability to target groups (total of 200 retort kilns deployed)</p> <p>MRV, tracking and licensing system established for all improved kilns piloted</p> <p>All groups in compliance with certification standards (as per Output 1.4.1)</p>	<p>not licensed or monitored</p> <p>Charcoal producers in target districts are not formally organized and do not have access to improved carbonization technologies</p>	<p>- 1,843,200,000 MJ for Casamance kilns (avoided emissions of 210,816 tCO₂eq) ; and</p> <p>- 9,737,142,857 MJ for retort kilns (avoided emissions of 1,113,686 tCO₂eq)</p> <p>- additional lifetime avoided methane emissions for all retort kilns introduced of 252,000 tCO₂ eq</p>	<p>Records confirm that at least 50% of all participating group members are women</p> <p>Monitoring, tracking and licensing system established for all improved kilns piloted with records kept at project level</p> <p>Amount of sustainably produced charcoal recorded by chief administrative officers in the local districts and DFS</p> <p>Amount of charcoal revenue recorded in the district.</p> <p>PIRs report on wood consumption (MT) from improved kilns for each participating group</p> <p>CCM TT and MTE</p>	<p>groups to monitor and track improved charcoal production.</p>
<p><i>Outcome 2.2: Sustainable charcoal recognized as a viable SME in pilot districts by end of project</i></p>	<p>Delivery model to support consumer financing schemes for charcoal producing groups with local financial institutions established.</p>	<p>No recognized charcoal production SMEs in target areas</p> <p>No organized charcoal producer organizations</p>	<p>60 charcoal producer associations with over 2400 members established and registered (15 in each district) and operating sustainable charcoal businesses by end of project</p> <p>Consumer financing schemes available for registered charcoal producing (CPA) associations by</p>	<p>All charcoal producer associations are registered and licensed with annual financial statements showing revenue and expenditures from operations</p> <p>Project reports</p> <p>TE validates that by end of project 20% of the registered CPAs working within the target area have qualified for credit facilities at local</p>	<p>Government sub-policy on charcoal provides guidelines for legalizing sustainable charcoal enterprises</p> <p>Charcoal will continue playing a significant role in Uganda's energy mix</p>

			end of project. By end of project 20% of the registered CPA qualify for credit facilities from local financial institutions	financial institutions	
<i>Outcome 2.3: Carbon finance is integrated into sustainable charcoal practice in targeted areas</i>	Basic Project submitted for registration to appropriate authority under an appropriate carbon development methodology in the Voluntary Market and/or a Sustainable Charcoal NAMA Design Document developed and endorsed	No carbon finance projects in Uganda dealing with sustainable charcoal have been registered with a carbon authority No charcoal NAMA Design Document developed or submitted	Carbon Project successfully registered for carbon financing under Voluntary Carbon Standards by end of year 3. NAMA Design Document developed and endorsed by end of year 3	Appropriate carbon registry shows project has been registered Project reports and TE NAMA Design Document	Sustained interest in carbon finance projects by carbon buyers Price of VERs is favorable and provides incentive for development of a project Land owners to make land available for carbon project interventions
<i>Outcome 2.4: Increased incomes for all charcoal cooperatives involved in project</i>	Profit margin per output unit of charcoal produced with new technologies increased by at least 20% per group (with new kilns) as compared to baseline scenario for all participating charcoal cooperatives	Average income of a typical itinerant charcoal producer in target districts established as baseline during year 1	At least 5 CPAs in each district supply charcoal directly to large wholesalers in urban areas	District revenue records and charcoal business records Project reports and TE	Charcoal producer groups willing to invest in new technology and practices, and organized production system
<i>Outcome 2.5: Technical support for charcoal briquetting producers enhanced</i>	Training and technical assistance provided to all briquetting businesses that are receiving loans from Micro-Finance Institutions in conjunction with CleanStart	CleanStart scoping mission documented that at present there are about 17 formal briquette makers in Uganda, receiving limited training and financial assistance A detailed baseline will be done as part of the CleanStart operations	The CleanStart business plan noted that the opportunity exists for the number of briquette producers to increase to at least 50 and daily production can easily be raised 8 tons to 50 tons per day. If confirmed the target would then be to provide training and TA to at least 50 charcoal briquetting enterprises by the end of the project	The monitoring and evaluation of this output will be done in close conjunction with the targets and verification platforms used in the CleanStart business plan, which is still in draft form. CleanStart will be tracking all loans from participating FSPs to briquetting businesses and in conjunction will track associated TA support to these same enterprises done	A: In the area of biomass energy applications, briquetting machines and institutional cook stoves have been identified as potential clean technologies for support by CleanStart in Uganda. Since the selection of technologies to finance rests with CleanStart's partner financial institutions, this output assumes that indeed the participating FSPs are willing to provide energy loans for briquetting machines and do not

			A detailed baseline will be done as part of the CleanStart start-up and call for proposals with FSPs Emission reductions from TA for the briquetting enterprises will be developed once its confirmed whether the relevant FSPs will indeed provide loans for the improved machines	under this output The C/S M&E framework will be harmonized with the framework for this project so both projects will track progress Project reports and TE	decide to choose other technologies instead R: That the C/S FSPs are not willing to deliver and provide loans for briquetting machines
Outcomes	KPI	Baseline	Target	Means of Verification	Assumptions and Risks
Component 3. Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots					
<i>Outcome 3.1:</i> Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots	Improved capacities of stakeholders in targeted districts to manage SFM and establish dedicated renewable biomass feed stocks. More specifically: - At least 1,100 private woodlot owners in the four pilot districts identified, trained and contracted to make land available for woodlot establishment (minimum 5,900 hectares set-aside). - Training all communities/woodlot managers on new charcoal regulations and SFM best practices, including use of specified tree species and optimal	No community or private woodlots for charcoal production in targeted districts Degraded forests and agricultural land in the four districts	By end of project: - Accumulated yields of 368,770 ⁴² MT of renewable biomass produced over 5,900 hectares under woodlot management by end of project (year 5) and 1,475,083 MT of biomass accumulation over the lifetime. - Net avoided lifetime emission reductions of 2,699,402 tCO ₂ of avoided deforestation compared to the BAU scenario from use of this renewable	Local registry of private forests at district offices with names of farmers and the acreage of land under tree plantation available for inspection. Reports from DFS & NFA confirming proper management of existing forest CCM and LD TTs, Project reports and MTE/TE	A: Private landowners are willing to allocate land for woodlots. Funding mechanism is established to support private woodlots Chosen species are appropriate for the woodlots and achieve expected growth targets from seedlings There is adequate extension services Appropriate woodlot and silviculture management practices are adopted R: major climatic shocks or increased rainfall/drought could impact successful achievement of targets

⁴² See Section A.5 for detailed assumptions behind figure

	<p>ecological yield from such species.</p> <p>-Technical support provided to all woodlot owners on tree nursery management as an entrepreneurial activity with target to plant over 17.4 million seedlings⁴⁰</p> <p>- Dissemination of over 17.4 million tree seedlings to woodlot owners⁴¹</p> <p>- Establishment of land use and forest management plans (including zoning and mapping of forest areas) for all targeted woodlot areas</p> <p>- Contracts signed between woodlots owners and charcoal producer groups for feedstock supply</p>		biomass in kilns compared to a BAU scenario ⁴³		
Outcome 3.2: SLM/SFM knowledge effectively transferred from ongoing SLM Best Practices in the neighboring	SLM/SFM knowledge effectively transferred from ongoing SLM projects ⁴⁴ in neighboring districts to four pilot districts for this project.	- Limited amount of land in targeted districts under SFM regimes or benefiting from SFM practices (baseline to be established during year 1)	By end of project: - 50,000 ha of forestlands across four pilot districts brought under improved multifunctional forest management	Vegetation modeling done as part of carbon finance project MRV requirements Vegetation modeling and ABG stock	A: There is stakeholder consensus and buy-in for all the targeted practices and knowledge sharing platforms FAO can provide key technical input into use of LADA and

⁴⁰ 3,000 tree seedlings will be planted per hectare at the recommended spacing of 1.5 x 1.5 metres bringing a total of 17.4 million seedlings to be planted across 5,800 hectares

⁴¹ For more details refer to Project Document section 1.7.4 on Sustainable Forest Management and Opportunities for Charcoal Production

⁴³ This figure nets out estimated BAU CO₂ eq emissions from deforestation activities for charcoal production in the four targeted districts – see Annex F

⁴⁴ The best practices to be transferred will be those from two other SLM projects operating in neighboring districts, namely the “Sustainable Land Management in the Cattle Corridor Districts of Uganda” a 4 year project which commenced in 2009 to 2014 and is funded by the Government of Norway through UNDP/DDC and the UNDP/GEF “Enabling Environment for SLM to overcome land degradation in the cattle corridor of Uganda” – for a description of best practices please see Sections A.5 and A.7

Cattle Corridor districts replicated in the four target districts		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 4,800 ha of land across four districts deforested each year for charcoal production - Conservation farming not widely practiced across target districts - Communities in targeted districts have not had exposure to the SCI-SLM approach or LADA tool - District Land Use Planning staff have little knowledge of techniques that support community planning, implementation processes and land degradation assessment - No detailed mapping of biomass stocks (both forestry and agricultural areas) done in targeted districts - No method in place to accurately measure and monitor land use change and deforestation in 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> leading to enhanced carbon sequestration of 2,100,000 tCO₂eq over lifetime⁴⁵ - A least half of land under improved SFM registers reduction in land degradation by at least 20% as measured by reduction in soil erosion and improvement in soil organic matter - Conservation farming practices piloted leading to verified improved soil organic matter and yield increases across 400 hectares - Community's indigenous knowledge of SLM enhanced using the "Stimulating Community Innovations (SCI-SLM) approach"⁴⁶ to generate local solutions to land degradation - Land use planning (one each target district) done using FAO-LADA- 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> assessments done by NFA Visual Soil Field Assessment Tool assessments and LADA WOCAT LD measurement tools (to be chosen and developed during the first year of the project) Verified increase in yields and organic soil matter for all CA plots (same M&E methodology as was used in UNDP DDC project framework) CCM and LD TTs, Project reports and MTE/TE - Published and disseminated land use plans and District Environment Action Plans for each target district - Published new land cover map and statistics on forestry stocks and land use change published by NFA that includes meso-scale analysis of biomass stocks in the targeted districts 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> WOCAT methodologies and tools Continued political support for integration of SLM into Development Plans R: major climatic shocks or increased rainfall/drought could impact successful achievement of targets
---	--	--	---	--	---

⁴⁵ As per GEF guidelines the lifetime is 20 years

⁴⁶ SCI-SLM stands for Stimulating Community Innovations centred on identifying innovative forms of land management within communities themselves (community generated solutions to land degradation). This included characterizing communities, validating their innovations, and improving them through joint experimentation with researchers and scientists and stimulating the communities to go forward with their efforts through farmer to farmer cross visits

		targeted districts	<p>WOCAT developed.⁴⁷</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - District Land Use Planning staff trained in the use of techniques that support community planning, implementation processes and land degradation assessment - Mapping completed of all targeted areas under sustainable forestry management as well as agricultural lands under SLM in collaboration with FAO and National Forestry Authority's new GIS/mapping platform 		
--	--	--------------------	--	--	--

⁴⁷ The Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) is a tool of FAO and has as part of its objectives to assess land degradation at local, national and global scale. In order to do so, the project has developed guidelines for each assessment level. WOCAT (World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies) is an established global network of Soil and Water Conservation (SWC) specialists, contributing to sustainable land management (SLM). WOCAT's goal is to prevent and reduce land degradation through SLM technologies and their implementation approaches. The network provides tools that allow SLM specialists to identify fields and needs of action, share their valuable knowledge in land management, that assist them in their search for appropriate SLM technologies and approaches, and that support them in making decisions in the field and at the planning level and in up-scaling identified best practices.

▪ **ANNEX 7: LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED**

- 2015 - 888k approved AWP
- 2015 AWP revised
- 2015. Annual Work Plan Revised.
- 2016 Final revised approved WP - iv
- 2016 final revised WP Budget Notes - iv
- *A Communication And Media Campaign Strategy For The National Biomass Energy Strategy (NBEST) And Green Charcoal Project Activities*
- *Addressing Barriers To Adoption Of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies And Sustainable Land Management Practices Through An Integrated Approach In Uganda* (Green Charcoal Project). Annual Progress Report, 2016. Nakaseke District Local Government.
- Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Management Practices through an Integrated Approach in Uganda – (Green Charcoal Project). NYABYEYA FORESTRY COLLEGE. ANNUAL REPORT 2016.
- Annual Work Plan 2017.
- Approved 2016 Q2 WP
- *Biomass Energy Strategy (BEST)*.
- Biomass Energy Strategy (BEST). Uganda. MINISTRY OF ENERGY AND MINERAL DEVELOPMENT (MEMD)-GoU. 2014.
- Final Revised Work Plan Approved. 2016
- FINAL-PIR-2016-GEFID4644-PIMS4493
- GC Q1 2015 WP - initial
- GCP 2016 Annual Progress Report - overall
- Green Charcoal Q2 (Apr - Jun 2015) WP
- Green Charcoal Q3 (July - Sept 2015) WP
- Green Charcoal; 2015 AWP - FINAL
- Inception report - FINAL
- Minutes of 1st Board meeting 2.10.2014-Final
- Minutes of 4th Board meeting; 17.12.2015-Luwero
- Minutes of 5th Board meeting 8 09 2016-kiboga -Final

- Minutes of Board meeting 2; 18.11.2014 - final
- National Charcoal Survey - Final Main Report
- PIMS 4493 Signature page
- PIMS 4493_Uganda MFA_CC-M TRACKING TOOL_final_24 11 2013-1
- PIR-2015-GEFID4644-PIMS4493 - FINAL
- Project Document. *Addressing Barriers To Adoption Of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies And Sustainable Land Management Practices Through An Integrated Approach (Pims 4493) Project In Uganda.* 2013.
- Project Implementation Review 2016.
- Project Implementation Review Update March 2017.
- Project Resource Overview. April 25 2017.
- Q1 2015 Progress report - charcoa - Final
- Q1 Progress report - 2016
- Q2 2015 Progress report - charcoal - Final
- Q2 2016 Progress report
- Q3 2015 Progress report - Final
- Q3 2016 Work Plan - approved
- Q4 WP Oct - Dec 2015
- Robert Nabanyumya. *Mid Term Review Report Of The Green Charcol Project In Uganda. Notes Of Stakeholder Meetings* (March, 2017)
- Signed AWP 2016
- Summary of 2015 progress - GCP
- Training Modules For Charcoal Value Chain Actors.

▪ **ANNEX 8: MEETINGS SCHEDULE**

Dates	Meetings/Interviews/Field Site Visits	Venue
Tuesday 14 th March, 2017	International Consultant arrived in Uganda	
	8.30am – 9.30 am: International consultant meeting with National Consultant	
Wednesday 15 th March, 2017	10.00am – 1.00 pm: Presentation of Inception Report	MEMD
	2.00 – 3.00 pm: Mr. Stephen Turyahikayo: National Consultant for the training of the Charcoal Producers' Association	
	3.00 - 4.00 pm: Mr. James Banaabe Isingoma -Acting Director, Energy Resources Directorate: Chairman of the Project Steering Committee	MEMD
	4.00 – 5.00 pm: Project Manager	MEMD
Thursday 16 th March, 2017	9.00am -12.00: Meeting with UNDP	UNDP Board Room
	2.30:-04:30 Meeting with National Forestry Authority: Mr. Obedmoth Aldus	NFA Headquarters
Friday 17 th March, 2017	9:30 – 11.00 am Meeting with UNDP: Mr. Wilson Kwamya	UNDP
	10.30 – 11.30 am: Meeting with GCCA – Drs. Kennedy Igbokwe and Willy Kakuru	FAO
	12.00 – 1.00pm: Mr. John Tumuhimbise: National Project Coordinator	MEMD
	1:00 -2.00pm: Meeting with academia on research – met Msc. Research students sponsored by the project.	MEMD
	2.30 – 3.30 pm: Meeting with consultants (Prof. Kasimbazi Emmanuel – On Charcoal Ordinances)	Kamwokya consultants' Office
	3:30- 4:30 GEF National Focal Point Ms Pauline Akidi	MFED

Dates	Meetings/Interviews/Field Site Visits	Venue
	5.00 – 6.30 pm Meeting MAAIF (Muwaya Steven and Mr. Tabalamule Fred)	Parklane
Saturday 18 th March, 2017	10:30 to 11:30 am: International consultant meeting with National Consultant	
Sunday 19 th March, 2017	Preparation of First Findings and for Field Work	
Monday 20 th March, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Travel to Kiryandongo for field work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ~ Meeting with District Team (LCV) ~ Visited some project sites 	Kiryandongo
	Kazi na Bidi Casamance user group	Mutunda Sub County
	Biomass woodlots	Kigumba Subcounty
Tuesday 21 th , March 2017	Travel to Nakaseke district: Met with District Team; LCV Chairman and the CAO. Visited selected project sites and Communities	Nakaseke
	Agali Awamu Briquette making group	Wakyato Sub County
	Tulina Esuubi SLM – small scale irrigation	Wakyato Sub-county
	Agali Awamu Conservation Agriculture group	Kapeeka Sub County
Wednesday 22 st March 2017	Travelled to Kiboga: Met with District Team; the LCV chairman and deputy CAO	Kiboga district
	Nyamiringa + Ssesa charcoal producing group Casamance	Kapeke Sub county
	Kagobe Community Development Association - SLM	Kapeke Sub county
	Kapeke Youth Development Association - CA	Kapeke Sub county
Thursday 23 nd March, 2017	field work in Mubende: Met with District Team (DFO, DEO and LCV Chairman) Visit project sites & Communities	Mubende
	Mubende Catholic Church – biomass woodlot	Eastern Division, Municipality
	Bageza women Briquette making group	Mubende Sub-county
	Kabunyansi Agali awamu women's group	
Friday 24 th March, 2017	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 10:00am- 12:00: Debriefing Meeting at the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) 	MEMD
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 12.00 -1.00pm: Meeting with GIZ 	Amber House

Dates	Meetings/Interviews/Field Site Visits	Venue
Saturday 25 th March, 2017	<i>Departure of International Consultant</i>	
Wednesday, 29 th March, 2017	<i>1.00 – 03.00 pm:</i> Kisakye Richard - Principal Lecturer Nyabyeya forest college.	Kampala
Friday, 31 st March, 2017	<i>10:00-12.30pm:</i> Meeting MWE (Bob Kazungu)	FSSD Headquarters

▪ **ANNEX 9: LIST OF STAKEHOLDERS ENGAGED WITH DURING MID TERM REVIEW**

	Obedmoth Aldous	Plantation Development Specialist NFA	
	Muyanja Hatimu	Energy officer	
	Kimuli M. Godfrey	Senior energy officer/RED/Assistant coordinator	GEP
	Evelyne Nyafwono	MEMD/PMU	
	Omar Senyonjo	FAA(UNDP)	
	Nicholas Burunde	UNDP	
	Sarah Mujabi	Program officer/UNDP	
	Anne-marie Oyuge Ngure	Program finance specialist /UNDP	
	Justine Akumu	Energy officer	
	Wafula Wilson	Ag. Commissioner	
	Nuwagaba Micheal	M&E finance specialist	UNDP
	Fred Tabalamule	SLM specialist /MAAIF	
	Bob Kazungu	Senior Forest Officer/MWE/DEA/FSDD	
	Wilson Kwamya	IGGR	
	Kennedy Igbokwe	FAO	
	Willy Kakuru	FAO	
	John Tumuhimbise:	Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD)	
	Atuyamba Alexander	Uganda Martyrs University	
	Kato Arthur Martin	Makerere University	
	Bamwenda Pascal	UMU	
	Kasimbazi Emmanuel	Private Sector	
	Pauline Akidi	Ministry of Finance	
	Stephen Muwaya	MAAIF	
	James Banaabe Isingoma	MEMD-Acting Director, Energy Resources Directorate	
	Simon Peter Amunau	Green Charcoal Project	
	Onesmus Muhwezi	UNDP	
	Gloria Namakula	GIZ	
	Gloria Namazzi	GIZ	
	Kisakye Richard	Nyabyeya Forest College	
	Kasangaki Fred	Coordinator Green Charcoal Project/Head Forestry	Kiryandongo District
	Ntairehoki Charles Ammoti	LCV Chairman.	Kiryandongo District
	Moses Ndaaga	District planner	Kiryandongo District
	Mawa Charles	LC1 chairman	Kiryandongo District
	Ayanya Sophie	Councilor	Kiryandongo District
	Kisembo Deo	Kikumbe parish	Kiryandongo District
	Micheal Kajura		Kiryandongo District
	Donga Luucial	Chairman	Kiryandongo District
	Mugisha Amos	Chairperson	Kiryandongo District
	Otuba Muhammad	Member	Kiryandongo District
	Waniyo Helper	Member	Kiryandongo District
	Wedunga Sam	Member	Kiryandongo District
	Ajeng Kenda Francis	Member	Kiryandongo District
	Onegi Geoffrey	Member	Kiryandongo District

	Aliango Sofi	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Atyeronimungu Jeska	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Mukasa Joseph	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Ocungi Bori	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Oringi Farouk	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Okello Ibu	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Oringi Saidi	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Okethi Colman	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Birwinyu Evaline	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Esther Angokendo	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Akello Inene	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Adokorach Kiristin	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Ayera Ango	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Ruka Chea	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Fatuma Agnes	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Faima Izasuri	Member	<i>Kiryandongo District</i>
	Wabwire Raphael	Acting DNRO (district forest officer)	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Sekagya Moses	District environment officer	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Koomu Ignatius	LCV Chairman	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Edith Mutabazi	CAO	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Kaweesa Christopher	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Teruleza John	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Mugwanya Geofery	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Kisa Joyce	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Namatovu Margret	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nakayiza Florence	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Kauuma Taddex	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Ssesanga Clement	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nalumansi Ebranch	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nalubwama C	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Katumba David	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nakamya Loy	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nalongo Kisagala	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Naluyima T	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nawombwe M	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Ssemwezi Alex	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Kavuma Paul	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nakaabugo Margret	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Namusisi Betty	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Kilyowa Florence	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nabasumba Christ	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Namagebe Teowo	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nakanwangi Christine	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Nakatee Madina	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Sakku Zakayo	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>

	Walu Zzuyutube	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Saabwe James	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Byekwaso Francis	Member	<i>Nakaseke District</i>
	Patrick Musasizi	District coordinator	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Andama Joseph	Field Coordinator	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Yiga Isreal	Chairman LC V	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Nalumansi Rose	Deputy CAO[on behalf of Makumbi]	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	George Mulindwa Senkomago	Coordinator	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Joseph Kayebale	Security	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Namono Gladys	Chair person	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Muyinda Godfery	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Kabakyenga Brian	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Sekyanzi Fred	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Makayo Joseph	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Bakwatanisa Bauben	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Lutaaya Jamir	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Nakeje Rosemary	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Nvnkriyehe Sirasi	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Kironde Fred	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Namisasi Teddy	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Salongo John	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Joseph Kayabula	secretary	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Male Ivan	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Muhuhwiza lawrence	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Tuzyabitunga Godion	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Asiimwe Robert	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Karyimba livingstone	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Ssempatya Diosi	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Kiviiri Clinton Kaye	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Nabossa Masitula	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Kalori Naula	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Akiiza Emmanuel	Member	<i>Kiboga District</i>
	Ronald Lotet	District Environment Officer	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Justine Nantume	Ag DFO	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kibuuka Francis B. Amooti	LCV – Chairman	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Emmanuel Malebekande	Priest	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Tumuhindiise Pafula	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kyalimpa Julius	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Ssenvubu Jimmy	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kizito Josephs	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Ssekyanzi	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kalungi Denis	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Mwewsige Sabalongo	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Nakyazze Anna Mary	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Namuyiga Florence	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>

	Nalubega Christine	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kwilangama alestoni	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Mugabe Michael	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Mugisha Kyango	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Nuwamanya Steven	Chair person	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Tumuhimbise Kedeth	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Asingwire J	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Tesemerirwe O	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Turyahabwe M	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kagwa S	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Naburime	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Tukwasibwe s	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Nakatto A	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kyarimpa T	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Katushabe J	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Adijja N	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kobusingya A	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Karangwa F	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Tusemereriwra A	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Tugumurize S	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Scovia	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Nyanizumbi J	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Tuyramuhebwa J	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kyomuhangi Getu	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Twino mugisha A	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Nasasira	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Tumuramye J	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kyomukama A	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kembabazi P	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Siwawana Juliet	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Nayiga Harriet	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kobusingye Federesi	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kansiime Scovia	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Muberu Yorokamu	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kaggwa Godfrey	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Matsiko Apolo	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Kaliegyeya James	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Tuhame John	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>
	Mwesigwa Frank	Member	<i>Mubende District</i>

▪ **ANNEX 10: SIGNED UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM FOR NATIONALCONSULTANT**

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System

Names of Consultants:

Dr. Robert Nabanyumya - National Consultant

Name of the Consultancy Organization: Nil

We confirm that we have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.



Name: Dr. Robert Nabanyumya
21 April 2017
Kampala, Uganda

-
- **ANNEX 11: SIGNED UNEG CODE OF CONDUCT FORM FOR INTERNATIONAL CONSULTANT**

Evaluators/Consultants:

1. Must present information that is complete and fair in its assessment of strengths and weaknesses so that decisions or actions taken are well founded.
2. Must disclose the full set of evaluation findings along with information on their limitations and have this accessible to all affected by the evaluation with expressed legal rights to receive results.
3. Should protect the anonymity and confidentiality of individual informants. They should provide maximum notice, minimize demands on time, and respect people's right not to engage. Evaluators must respect people's right to provide information in confidence, and must ensure that sensitive information cannot be traced to its source. Evaluators are not expected to evaluate individuals, and must balance an evaluation of management functions with this general principle.
4. Sometimes uncover evidence of wrongdoing while conducting evaluations. Such cases must be reported discreetly to the appropriate investigative body. Evaluators should consult with other relevant oversight entities when there is any doubt about if and how issues should be reported.
5. Should be sensitive to beliefs, manners and customs and act with integrity and honesty in their relations with all stakeholders. In line with the UN Universal Declaration of Human Rights, evaluators must be sensitive to and address issues of discrimination and gender equality. They should avoid offending the dignity and self-respect of those persons with whom they come in contact in the course of the evaluation. Knowing that evaluation might negatively affect the interests of some stakeholders, evaluators should conduct the evaluation and communicate its purpose and results in a way that clearly respects the stakeholders' dignity and self-worth.
6. Are responsible for their performance and their product(s). They are responsible for the clear, accurate and fair written and/or oral presentation of study limitations, findings and recommendations.
7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.

MTR Consultant Agreement Form

Agreement to abide by the Code of Conduct for Evaluation in the UN System:

Name of Consultant: Maria ORESTINI

Name of Consultancy Organization (where relevant): _____

I confirm that I have received and understood and will abide by the United Nations Code of Conduct for Evaluation.

Signed at Buenos Aires, Argentina (*Place*) on March 1st 2017 (*Date*)

Signature: 