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**Annex 1: Terms of Reference**

INTRODUCTION

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full and medium-sized UNDP support GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the full-size project “ Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in the Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy” implemented by Environment Forest and Climate Change Commission (EFCC) - PIMS 4644

The essentials of the project to be evaluated are as follows:

Project Summary Table

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Project Title: | : Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in the Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy | | | | | |
| GEF Project ID: | | 4464 |  | | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | | 00087290 | GEF financing: | | 3,316,453 | 3,316,453 |
| Country: | | Ethiopia | IA/EA own: | | 0 | 0 |
| Region: | | Africa | Government (in kind): | | 14,200,000 | 14,200,000 |
| Focal Area: | | Biodiversity | Government in cash: | | 1,600,00 | 0 |
|  | |  | UNDP in cash | | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP): | | Conservation and sustainable utilization of biodiversity and ecosystems | Total co-financing: | | 16,000,000 | 14,200,000 |
| Executing Agency: | | Environment Forest and Climate Change Commission | Total Project Cost: | | 19,316,453 | 17,716,453 |
| Other Partners involved: | | Regional Bureaus of Amhara, Oromia Somali and SNNP | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | | | 06/03/2015 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | December 31,2019 | | Actual:  December 31, 2019 |

Objective and Scope

The project was designed to ensure that the biodiversity of Ethiopia is better protected from current and future threats by ensuring development and investment decisions do not impact negatively on biodiversity. This project is designed to address the prevailing rampant biodiversity loss due to various driving factors, hence this need to put in place safeguards to, ensure that the current high level of growth and planned investments do not impact negatively on biodiversity. The fundamental thought of the project is that Ethiopia’s long term development ambition can only be attained through green and climate resilient path where biodiversity and ecosystems are the green cushioning mechanism that safeguards the wellbeing of Ethiopian society and the GDP. The project has two interrelated outcomes: Outcome 1: The enabling framework for mainstreaming incentives for biodiversity conservation into the CRGE is strengthened and Outcome 2: At least 20,000 hectares of the highly threatened Afromontane ecoregion are under PES resulting in improved stewardship by community land managers and reduced pressure on biodiversity. The project highly contributes for wider objectives and targets of Ethiopia’s NBSAP (2016-2020), SDGs 1,2 ,13,14,15 and pillar II of UNDP Ethiopia CPD. The *Terminal Evaluation will cover the entire MIBC project.*.

**Scope of the Terminal Evaluation:**

The TE will be conducted according to the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects.

The objectives of the evaluation are to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming.

Evaluation approach and method

An overall approach and method[[1]](#footnote-1) for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact,** as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects. A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR. The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Amhara, Oromia, SNNP and Somali regional states including the following project sites Choke in Amhara, Diga-Arjo in Oromia, Kulfo in SNNP and Hadew in Somali regional states*.* Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum: UNDP CO, RTA, EFCCC, National and Woreda Project steering Committee, PMSU staff, project beneficiaries at the four project sites, Arbamich University, Debremarkos University and Wolega University.

The evaluator will review all relevant sources of information, such as the project document, project reports – including Annual APR/PIR, project budget revisions, midterm review, progress reports, GEF focal area tracking tools, project files, national strategic and legal documents, and any other materials that the evaluator considers useful for this evidence-based assessment. A list of documents that the project team will provide to the evaluator for review is included in [Annex B](#_TOR_Annex_B:) of this Terms of Reference.

Evaluation Criteria & Ratings

An assessment of project performance will be carried out, based against expectations set out in the Project Logical Framework/Results Framework ( [Annex A](#_TOR_Annex_A:)), which provides performance and impact indicators for project implementation along with their corresponding means of verification. The evaluation will at a minimum cover the criteria of: **relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability and impact.** Ratings must be provided on the following performance criteria. The completed table must be included in the evaluation executive summary. The obligatory rating scales are included in  [Annex D](#_TOR_Annex_D:).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Ratings:** | | | |
| **1. Monitoring and Evaluation** | ***rating*** | **2. IA& EA Execution** | ***rating*** |
| M&E design at entry |  | Quality of Implementation |  |
| M&E Plan Implementation |  | Quality of Execution - Executing Agency |  |
| Overall quality of M&E |  | Overall quality of Project Implementation / Execution |  |
| **3. Assessment of Outcomes** | **rating** | **4. Sustainability** | **rating** |
| Relevance |  | Financial resources: |  |
| Effectiveness |  | Socio-political/economic: |  |
| Efficiency |  | Institutional framework and governance: |  |
| Overall Project Outcome Rating |  | Environmental: |  |
|  |  | Overall likelihood of sustainability: |  |

Project finance / cofinance

The Evaluation will assess the key financial aspects of the project, including the extent of co-financing planned and realized. Project cost and funding data will be required, including annual expenditures. Variances between planned and actual expenditures will need to be assessed and explained. Results from recent financial audits, as available, should be taken into consideration. The evaluator(s) will receive assistance from the Country Office (CO) and Project Team to obtain financial data in order to complete the co-financing table below, which will be included in the terminal evaluation report. The International consultant will be team leader of the assignment.

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Co-financing  (type/source) | UNDP own financing ( US$) | | Government  (mill. US$) | | Partner Agency  (mill. US$) | | Total  (mill. US$) | |
| Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Planned | Actual | Actual | Actual |
| Grants | 200,000 | 200,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Loans/Concessions |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-kind support |  |  | 14,200,000 | 14,200,000 |  |  |  |  |
| Other (Cash) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Mainstreaming

UNDP supported GEF financed projects are key components in UNDP country programming, as well as regional and global programmes. The evaluation will assess the extent to which the project was successfully mainstreamed with other UNDP priorities, including poverty alleviation, improved governance, the prevention and recovery from natural disasters, and gender. In addition, the evaluation will be included in the Country Office Evaluation Plan.

Impact

The evaluators will assess the extent to which the project is achieving impacts or progressing towards the achievement of impacts. Key findings that should be brought out in the evaluations include whether the project has demonstrated: a) verifiable improvements in ecological status, b) verifiable reductions in stress on ecological systems, and/or c) demonstrated progress towards these impact achievements.[[2]](#footnote-2)

Conclusions, recommendations & lessons

The evaluation report must include a chapter providing a set of **conclusions**, **recommendations** and **lessons**.

Implementation arrangements

The principal responsibility for managing this evaluation resides with the UNDP Ethiopia CO*.* The UNDP CO will contract the evaluators and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the evaluation team. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the Evaluators team to set up stakeholder interviews, arrange field visits, coordinate with the Government etc.

Evaluation timeframe

The total duration of the evaluation will be *34* days according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | Timing | Completion Date |
| **Preparation** | *4 days* | *July 25, 2019* |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 15 days | *August 15, 2019* |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | **10 days** | *August 20, 2019* |
| **Final Report** | *5 days* | *August 29,2019* |

Evaluation deliverables

The evaluation team is expected to deliver the followings:

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Deliverable | Content | Timing | Responsibilities |
| **Inception Report** | Evaluator provides clarifications on timing and method | August 2, 2019. | Evaluator submits to UNDP CO |
| **Presentation** | Initial Findings | August 16,2019 | To project management, UNDP CO |
| **Draft Final Report** | Full report, (per annexed template) with annexes | August 23, | Sent to CO, reviewed by RTA, PCU, GEF OFPs |
| **Final Report\*** | Revised report | August 29, 2019 | Sent to CO for uploading to UNDP ERC. |

\*When submitting the final evaluation report, the evaluator is required also to provide an 'audit trail', detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final evaluation report.

**ANNEX 2: EVALUATION MATRIX**

| **Evaluative Criteria Questions** | | **Indicators** | **Sources** | **Methodology** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Relevance: How does the project relate to the main objectives of the GEF focal area, and to the environment and development priorities at the local, regional and national levels? | | | | | |
|  | * How the project has contributed to GEF-5 strategic objective, which is conservation and sustainable utilization of biodiversity and ecosystems | * Consistency with national and UNDP/GEF priorities * Amendments to Ethiopia’s CRGE strategy to address contribution of biodiversity * Changes in priorities or commitments that may have affected relevance of the project | * Revised, modified or new national strategy due to the project * Interview data on the quality of the project design | * Interview and Focal Group Discussions * Review of alignment with GEF and government programmes and institutions |
|  | * How far the project designing process has considered participation of counter parts from national and local government as well as project beneficiaries at the community level | * Number of agencies and people (M/F) that participated * Extent of partners’ involvement and ownership including integration into ongoing programmes | * Minutes kept during LPAC meeting and inception reports * Interview notes | * Meetings, FGDs, personal interviews |
|  | * How do you weigh the project strategies and objectives? Are these sufficient to reverse degradation of ecosystem conditions and loss of biodiversity in the selected project areas, do you think sites selected by the project are fairly representative? | * Stakeholder views of the project concept and approach * Project design level of representative targeting of GEF focal area objectives and national objectives * Achievability of ProDoc targets | * Prodoc, Project MTR report, Success stories, annual reports * Interview notes | * Desk review * FGDs, interviews |
| Effectiveness: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved? | | | | | | | |
|  | * **Objective: Mainstreaming biodiversity**   1) To what extent has biodiversity conservation been integrated into national/local development systems?  2) What is the status of the targeted PAs and use of PES agreements and funding in Ethiopia? | * National system that appreciate values of biodiversity * Number of institutions strengthened * Number of biodiversity PER study * % of pressure reduction on the land resource * Area of land put under community stewardship via PES system | * Annual report * National PER study document for the biodiversity sector * Physical observation of selected project sites | * Desk review | | |
|  | * **Outcome 1: Enabling framework**   1) What decision support tools and plans have been established at each pilot site?  2) What processes have been established and utilized to assess biodiversity values?  3) What policy measures, technical support and organizational development have occurred to support conservation?  4) What training has been completed and how have new skills been applied? | * Number of newly created institutions * Number of strengthened institutions * Application of tools and knowledge products for biodiversity conservation * Policy changes instigated by the project * Number of trainings, persons trained and results of trainings | * Quarter and Annual reports * Project MTR * Project outputs * Post-training surveys | * Desk review * Interview * Observation * FGDS | | |
|  | **Outcome 2: PES pilots**  1) How successful have the PES pilots been in establishing agreements for ecosystem services?  2) What is the current capacity of the 34 CBOs to facilitate biodiversity conservation and PES?  3) What capacity gaps remain within government and communities?  4) What are the main lessons and challenges that have emerged from the PES pilots? | * PES agreements produced by the project * CBO survey and field observation on status of PAs * Capacity scorecard ratings, organizational changes and post-training assessments * Rating of CBO’s capacity to implement enhanced biodiversity conservation and PES agreements * Funding commitments for PES agreements | * Quarter and Annual reports * Project MTR * Interviews with project participants | * Desk review * Interview * Meetings * FGDs * Surveys of CBOs | | |
| Efficiency: Was the project implemented efficiently, in-line with international and national norms and standards? | | | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project timely launched and completed all the deliverables as originally planned? | * Timeliness | * Project annual reports and MTR | * Desk review | | |
|  | * Have the project personnel and finance been utilized in line with the intended international and national standards? | * In Conformity with GEF priorities and national plan * Participant satisfaction | * GEF-5 strategic objective * Ethiopia’s national plan 2016-2019 | * Desk review * Interviews * Financial audit review | | |
|  | * Has the project resource efficiently utilized to address the needs/problems identified during the project design? | * Time disaggregated (quarter, year) fund utilization track | * PIR report * Finance data compilation/analyses | * Desk review | | |
|  | * Project efficiency/cost effectiveness: Has the project been generally efficient and cost effective in relation to results? | * Outputs achieved relative to costs; value for money * Proportion of costs for project management | * PIR report * Finance data compilation/analyses | * Desk review | | |
|  | * Finance/cofinancing: Has project financing and budgeting occurred as planned? | * Co-financing and in-kind contributions * Efficiency of disbursements and financial management and reporting | * Finance data compilation/analyses | * Desk review | | |
| Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, social-economic, and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results? | | | | | | | |
|  | * Has the project sufficiently forecast institutional, socio-economic and environmental risks to sustain the project gains? What about risk mitigation strategies? | * Number of Risk analysis and mitigation plans * Responses to anticipated risks | * Project document * Interview notes | * Desk Review of risk management | | |
|  | * Has the project sufficiently linked its results to existing government systems? | * Number and level of arrangements * Policy developments that have enhanced sustainability | * Government Commitment letters * Project reports | * Desk Review * Interviews | | |
|  | * Is the project strategy been sufficiently owned and sustained by national and local government? | * Level of Government ownership * Institutional development measures to enhance sustainability | * Government Commitment letters | * Desk Review * Interviews | | |
| **Impact: Are there indications that the project has contributed to, or enabled progress toward, reduced environmental stress and/or improved ecological status?** | | | | | | | |
|  | * What are the project effects across the project regions in reducing environmental stress and biodiversity loss | * % reduction in biodiversity loss in the project conservation areas * % of ecological restoration in the project sites | * Project reports * Project MTR * Data on PA status | * Desk review * Interview * Physical observation | | |
|  | * What is the overall progress rate of the project to its original targets /to improve ecological status? | * Overall environmental trend of the project conservation sites (inclining, declining or no change) * Trends in ecosystem status, wildlife species and habitats of concern | * Project tracking tools * Project Digital maps * Data on PA and ecosystem and species status | * Desk review * Physical observation in selected project sites | | |

**Annex 3: Summary of project achievements as per Results Framework - July 2019**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Components** | **Indicators (updated after MTR)** | **Baseline** | **Target for end of project** | **Current status of Achievements – prepared by MIBC PMU** |
| **Project objective:**  **To ensure that the biodiversity of Ethiopia is better protected from current and future threats by ensuring development and investment decisions do not impact negatively on biodiversity** | (i) A comprehensive CRGE that recognizes conservation and sustainable BD as a major contributor to its goal of increasing GDP; and delivers a coherent response to BD loss, and CC;  (ii) Area (ha) of land of the highly threatened afro-montane forests are under improved stewardship by community land managers, as a result of a PES scheme piloted, indicated by no loss of habitat in BD sensitive areas (from clearance for agriculture) | The importance of biodiversity conservation not adequately appreciated across sectors – or the budget process in Ethiopia | 1. The importance of biodiversity conservation is better recognised at all levels in Ethiopia – including in the federal budget process –, investment in the environment is increased and decision makers in the planning system are better able to make decisions to protect biodiversity and ecosystem services.  2. Pilot PES operational in four sites.  3. At least 20,000 ha of the highly threatened Afromontane ecoregion are under improved stewardship by community land managers, as a result of the PES scheme piloted, indicated by no loss of habitat in BD sensitive areas (from clearance for agriculture, deforestation for fuel / building wood or grazing). | The importance of biodiversity is noticed among policy makers, as a result CRGE result indicators that previously overlooked biodiversity have been revised and fairly reflected biodiversity affairs. Evidences were generated through preparation of a biodiversity public expenditure review (PER) for Ethiopia that covered a period of 2002-2016 to influence decision making process with the policy people, including the budgetary processes. Apart from informing policies on the low investment trend for biodiversity in the country, evidence based contribution of the sector for the national economy (GDP) has also been elaborated and used as an advocacy tool. Various policy forums were also organized and discussed on the need of increasing fiscal attention that must be proven by substantial increment of fiscal budget for the biodiversity sector. Those Policy personnel working on environmental and natural resource at the parliament of the federal democratic republic of Ethiopia has took note to take concrete actions on the budget redistribution.  To more scale up existing project gains to scale level, the project has assisted the ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change to prepare a strategy and national road-map to design an innovative domestic funding pool from ecosystem service payment (PES), which adds value for the CRGE strategy to create a sort of innovative domestic financing. The strategy document has provided the project with an opportunity to convince policies to design new PES legislation that substantiate additional funding opportunity for the biodiversity sector. Accordingly, GoE's environment ministry has adopted the strategy plan and also initiated the legislation of PES law (in a pipeline). |
| **Outcome 1:** **The enabling framework for mainstreaming incentives for biodiversity conservation into the CRGE at national level strengthened** | (i) Improved recognition of conservation and sustainable use of biodiversity as a major contributor to the CGRE strategy of increasing GDP; and delivers a coherent response to biodiversity loss, and climate change. | GoE budget not coded for environment  No BDER  Importance of biodiversity conservation is in planning and EIA systems but staff have limited capacity to implement systems | 1. Biodiversity Expenditure review completed.   2. GoE budget coded for biodiversity expenditure.   1. Increased awareness of 70 decision-makers; 2. Financial support to the biodiversity sector increased by 20%; and - Increased FDRE spending on biodiversity | -Biodiversity PER completed and hundreds of copies disseminated to key project stakeholders including local line offices and Universities in the project operation areas.  -Local governments at the project pilot areas adopted a practice of mainstreaming biodiversity budgetary decisions, series of advocacy work undertaken for pro biodiversity conservation at the national level that has a momentum to bring GoE to code budget for BD (the effect might take a bit longer time)  - > 130 Decision makers have got awareness towards the vital roles of biodiversity and that the budgetary trend for BD management is much lower as compared to other sectors and compared to SSA region.  -Budgetary allocation for sectors working towards BD has been rising since 2017 with at least 10% and max 22% as compared to the base year (2016), of course the project advocacy work has significant contribution in the process. [SOURCE?]   * The FDRE spending for biodiversity since 2017 is increasing; that of Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute is currently increasing at “aggressive scenario” (one of the four models used to forecast the increase in the project’s Biodiversity PER). The same is true for Ethiopian Wild Life conservation Authority, while that of EFCCC is at “expert modeler”, which is a bit higher than a “business as usual model”. Therefore, the GoE spending is much improved than years before the project period. |
| (ii) Requisite staff capacitated and well positioned to use decision support tools and the results from BPER, and other relevant studies regularly in their decision-making | 4. 6 regional level large scale digital maps of critical biodiversity areas developed;  5. Biodiversity score cards in place to determine a) no go areas (b) areas where developments may be allowed but with certain minimum conditions - target 6 (by end PY 2).  6. Spatial data, decision support tools and training provided to staff in all regions to better equip them to implement systems to support protection of biodiversity and ecosystem services in sustainable development.  7. Key staff trained in all relevant sectors at all levels on how to use the maps and scorecards for better land use planning and investments - – target 24 (by end PY2), 16 more (by end PY3), 24 more (by end PY4). | -08 large digital maps developed and disseminated to each of the project pilot areas, local governments in 03 of the project pilot areas have adopted the maps in their land related decision making and 01 of the sites is in a process to get formal adoption.  -The project’s biodiversity score card report has determined land use classification as core, buffer and transition zones that also has been adopted by communities and local governments to modify their land use practices.   * Key government staffs (54 staff members) have got awareness training on how to use decision support tools) |
| (iii) Better cooperation and interaction of institutions involved in managing the response to biodiversity loss and climate change | 1 concertation and coordination mechanism for national institutions established within the EBI, and quarterly meetings among sectorial ministries organized, to promote the mainstreaming of biodiversity in policy planning and budgeting (by PY4). | -02 coordination mechanisms for biodiversity mainstreaming has got support and strengthened at the national level; national biodiversity council and biodiversity technical committee. The same platform was created and strengthened at the project pilot areas . |
| **Outcome 2: Payments for biodiversity conservation and wider ecosystem services is [are] piloted at selected sites** | (i) Enhanced conservation security for the following threatened species …  (ii) Land use changes under PES, result in increased forest cover, reduced habitat loss and habitat degradation by 35% | No land under PES in selected pilot sites  Number of staff trained to effectively manage the PES scheme” to assess Target 5 (Outcome 2)  Number of prospective sellers identified per project site” to assess Target 7 (Outcome 2).  Guidelines for ecosystem services valuation developed, including indicators to evaluate biodiversity restoration status | 1. At least 20,000ha under PES agreements in pilot sites.    2. At least 25% of land users in pilot areas benefiting from PES.  3. 50 % of land users increasingly aware of importance of BD and ESs.  4. At least 25% of land users using SLM technologies to enhance production in non-PES pilot areas.  5. Key local staff of MEFCC and other local institutions (including universities) trained in negotiation, contracting, transaction, monitoring and verification to effectively manage the PES schemes [60 overall (10 per pilot area and 20 additional for scaling-up)].  6. *Metrics for determining the*  *payments designed:* Ecosystem services in the selected sites are defined, measured and assessed; amount of payment is determined. | ->34,000 ha of land put under community management through a day to day management of CBOs  -More than 50% of communities in the conservation sites have got benefit from a stabilized land from the rehabilitation work and communities witnessed that the local PES initiatives has benefited them regardless of the magnitude of the benefits.  -More than 75% land users in the conservation areas aware benefits of biodiversity and ecosystem services (taken from multiple FGDs)  -Key government staff (197) including those in the academia has got skills on PES scheme initiation and management. Furthermore, basics of PES and ecosystem service valuation training was provided to 1785 persons to date.  -Different PES metrics were assessed and suggested, with a final decision of complying with existing national metrics for ES payment per ha of developed land. |
|  | (iii) Institutional capacity of national and provincial governments (*woredas*) is emplaced to coordinate PES programmes, allowing for the systematic scale up of PES across the Afromontane forests (covering at least 20,000 hectares) | 7. Prospective sellers to supply ecosystem services identified; and their capacity to modify land use practices is enhanced through technical assistance / extension on biodiversity friendly land use practices.  8. PES agreements are brokered between sellers and Government specifying conditions for payments (Value of service; mode of payment; delivery of service) agreed upon by Government and sellers and operationalised through contracts.  9. Institutions in place to manage the PES scheme – such as negotiation, contracting, transaction and verification. |  |
| (iv) Increased government investment in pro-conservation PES in the Afromontane forests by EOP (MTR recommended revising indicator: ‘Guidelines for ecosystem services valuation developed, including indicators to evaluate biodiversity restoration status’. | 10. Monitoring and verification system measures the impact of intervention (PES) on land use changes (actual delivery of ecosystem services), biodiversity and livelihoods in the target sites using standards and indicators derived from baseline information. | - Direct and also Proxy indicators were used to measure changes in land use, ecosystem rehabilitation and livelihood conditions. The project sites taken into account their contexts to set indicators, however the following indicators used by all as the major indicators;   * Extent of soil stability * Extent of moisture retention * % of flood reduced * % of communities adopt modified land use * % of streams revived( amount of flow nd endurance of streams during dry seasons), * No of Wild life , etc… |

**ANNEX 4: Interview Guide**

This is a reference guide only, intended to assist interviews as needed and in conjunction with the evaluation criteria/matrix. It is not a questionnaire. It serves as an informal aid in prompting discussion during the interviews and will be supplemented with additional questions.

**Project Formulation**

1. Did you observe any problems or gaps in the project design or approach that affected project implementation?
2. Was there adequate participation of stakeholders and beneficiaries in the project formulation? (How were you involved?)
3. Has the project strategy – technical support/training and PES development and piloting, been effective? How could it have been improved?

**Project Implementation**

1. How effective and efficient was the Project Structure in facilitating project coordination, communications and implementation at national, provincial and local levels? Would you have changed anything in hindsight?
2. Has annual work planning and budgeting been effective? Have actual disbursements been in line with annual budgets, work plans and schedules (discuss Fin. Tables)? Were there any delays in administrative processes?
3. Have the project management bodies and partners been sufficiently active in guiding and responding to issues? (examples?) Are any MTR responses incomplete?
4. Have the project monitoring Indicators been effective and feasible for reporting on progress? Have they provided reliable measures of change?
5. What have been the major challenges or issues in implementing the project? Are there lessons for design of future projects?
6. What are the characteristics of PES sellers and buyers in the project pilot sites? What features have affected agreement or non-agreement?

**Project Results**

1. What aspects of the project have been most successful, and which least successful? Are there specific measures that have affected the potential for replication?
2. Can you identify *the Key Factors* that have affected the project results – either positive or negative?
3. What has been the most apparent change in biodiversity conservation that you have seen from the project? What gaps remain in capacity development?
4. What is the most important learning or skill, if any, that you have acquired from the project trainings or demonstrations? Any post-training data?
5. How have the decision support tools been used in decision making? Is there a long term vision for these tools?
6. Are there any expected results that have not been completely achieved or are not fully satisfactory?

**Sustainability**

1. Do you think that the use of decision support tools and PES processes will be continued after the project closes? Why? Why not?
2. Are there any exit strategies for the project? What actions could be considered to enhance sustainability? How will lessons be shared within Ethiopia and with other countries?

**Impact**

1. Should any further changes in government policy or regulations be considered to assist mainstreaming incentives into the CRGE strategy?
2. Are there any specific examples of alternative livelihoods that have succeeded in conjunction with conservation that could provide models for replication?
3. Is there any empirical evidence of project impact on government biodiversity conservation budget allocations?

**Annex 5: Mission Itinerary**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Date** |
| Arrival in Addis | 15 July, 2019 |
| Introduction to the CO and project team | July 16, 2019 |
| -Work from own room/Project office (flexible),  -Meeting & discussion with Plan & Budget Preparation, M&E Direwctorate | July 17 and 18 July |
| -Meeting and discussion with Commissioner, EFCCC  -Trip to **Arjo-Diga Project site**, 350 KM to the west and evaluation at Arjo-Diga | Arrival on July 19  Work there until 22 July, 2019 |
| Trip Back to Addis on the 22nd in the afternoon | July 22, 2019 |
| -One day stay in Addis and compiling the first project site finding into the TE draft report  - Meeting and discussion with Giz Senior Advisor for Bidiversity and Forestry Program, Giz | July 23,2019 |
| Trip to **Kulfo project site In SNNP state** (domestic flight available) | July 24,2019 |
| Work in Kulfo | Until 26 July 2019 |
| - Discussion with zonal Agriculture, NR, and Forest and Environmental Offices  - Back to Addis | July 27 2019 |
| Stay in Addis and feed field finding from the second project site | 28 - 29 July 2019 |
| * Trip to Bahirdar * Discuss with Amhara regional state Environment, Forest and Wild life Authority on progresses of legalizing **Choke project conservation site** | 30 July 2019 |
| Flight Back Addis | July 31st 2019 |
| Discussion with national project stakeholders   * Discussion with MIBC Focal Person * Discussion with EBI Director General | 1st August 2019 |
| Debriefing at UNDP CO | 2nd August 2019 |

**Annex 6: List of Contacts**

| **Name** | | **Position** | **Organisation** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Wubua Mekonen | | Program Specialist (GEF) | UNDP Ethiopia | |
| Abdeta Debella | | Project Manager | UNDP Ethiopia | |
| Mesfin | | Project Officer | UNDP Ethiopia | |
| Dawud Mume Ali | | M&E Directorate Director | Environment, Forest & Climate Change Commission (EFCCC) | |
| Fekadu Beyene (Prof.) | | Commissioner | EFCC Commission | |
| Kassahun Abera | | Advisor, Biodiversity and Forestry Programme | GiZ Addis Ababa | |
| Phemo Karen Kgomotso | | Regional Technical Advisor | GEF/UNDP | |
|  | |  | **Arjo-Digga woreda** | |
| Berhanu Asefa | | Head | Administration, Arjo-Diga woreda | |
| Dagene Lechisa | | Deputy Head | Administration, Arjo-Digaworeda | |
| Getu Galata | | Project Coordinator | EFCC Authority | |
| Tagay Mitiku | | Head | Agriculture & Natural Resources | |
| Genet Tekle | | Head | Women, Child & Youth Affairs | |
| Gutmo Jira (Dr) | | Researcher | Wollega University | |
| GutuMerga | | Expert | EFCC Authority | |
| Kebede Kusa | | Head | Cooperatives Office | |
| MissanuTaha | | Head | EFCC Authority | |
| Ato Emana | | CBO member | Bikiltu Gudisa CBO | |
| Ato Alata Hara | | CBO member | Bikiltu Gudisa CBO | |
| Wakjira Yadata | | CBO Chairman | Bikiltu Gudisa CBO | |
| Abebe Mekuria | | CBO member | ,, ,, | |
| Tesema Jabessa | | CBO member | Dhaloto Hara CBO | |
| Waritu Torata | | CBO member | ,, ,, | |
| Tamiru Kebede | | CBO member | ,, ,, | |
| Dumessa Tarfassa | | CBO member | ,, ,, | |
| Kebede Inkosa | | CBO member | ,, ,, | |
| Hindhibu Negaho | | CBO member | ,, ,, | |
| Yadessa Qalbessa | | CBO member | ,, ,, | |
| Wadaje Wagari | | CBO Member | ,, ,, | |
|  | |  | **Gamo Zonal government** | |
| Mesfin Mergia | | Head, Good Governance | Gamo Zone Admininistration Office | |
| Gambura Ganta | | MIBC focal person and BD Team Leader | Gamo Environmental Protection, Forests and Climate Change Office | |
| Maze Shekene | | Head EPFCC Control Office | As above | |
| Tomas G/hana | | Soil & water conservation expert | Gamo Agriculture Office | |
| Lemma Polo | | Head | Zonal Peace and Security Office | |
| Mekonnen Nigatu | | Head | Zonal water, mine & energy Office | |
| Eyasu Alaro | | Deputy Head | Food Security & Job Creation Department | |
| Marta Matewos | | Head | Women, Child & Youth Affairs Office | |
| Abayneh Leda (Dr) | | Head | Livestock & Fishery Resource Development Department | |
| Dejene Mulugeta | NR Head | | | Zonal Agriculture & Natural Resources Office |
| Molalign Kesessie | Project Officer | | | Gamo Environmental Protection, Forests and Climate Change Office |
| Mengesha Malsaye | Manager | | | ArbaMinich Municpality |
|  |  | | | ***CBO’s project areas*** |
| 7 attending CBO meeting | (2 chairmen & 5 members) | | | Orata and Lemlem CBOs |
| Mesay Lukas | Chairman | | | Dagim Lidet CBO |
| Akalu Geresu | Chairman | | | Nuni Esino CBO |
|  | ***Choke Project in Amhara Regional State*** | | | |
| Awake Yitay | Director | | | EFWPDA |
| Abraham Ayalew | V/Administrator | | | East Gojam Zone Administration |
| Eleni Abay | Head | | | Women, Children and Youth Affairs Department |
| Balew Yibaltal | Head | | | L.S |
| Nurligni Berhanu | Head | | | TVED |
| Mihret Alemayehu (Dr) | Community Service Director | | | DMU |
| Haimanot Aregahegn | DMU University Lecturer | | | DMU |
| Melese Mengist | Team Leader, Environment Protection and Development | | | East Gojam Zone |
| Abebe Mekonnen | Agr. Head | | | Agriculture |
| Atkilt Assabe | Head, ZFEC | | | ZFEC |
| Ayenew Gebeyehu | Expert | | | EFWPDA |
| Dawit Dessalegn | Head Land Administration | | | East Gojam Zone |
| Bekele Zerihun | Expert | | | ANRS EFWPDA |
| Solomon Birhanu | Project Manager Choke Project | | |  |
| Abraham Marye | Director | | | Wildlife Development and Protection Division |
| Melese Maryo Selamo (Dr) | Director General | | | Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute |
| Misikire Tessema (Dr) | Director | | | Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute |
| Temku Gede | GIS Specialist | | | Ethiopian Biodiversity Institute |
| Steering Committee members debriefing | 12 officials and officers from UNDP, EBI, EFCCC, EWCA and PMCU attended the debriefing session | | | |
| **73 persons listed** |  | | |  |

**Number of persons contacted by gender and organization**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Organization** | **Male** | **Female** | **Total** | **Remarks** |
| UNDP/PMCU | 2 | 1 | 3 |  |
| GEF/UNDP | 1 | - | 1 |  |
| EFCCC | 2 | - | 2 |  |
| EBI | 3 | - | 3 |  |
| GiZ Addis Ababa | 1 | - | 1 |  |
| Arjo-Digga woreda including CBO areas | 19 | 2 | 21 |  |
| Gamo Zone and CBO’s project areas | 18 | 3 | 21 |  |
| Choke project in Amhara Region | 13 | 2 | 15 |  |
| Debriefing participants | 5 | 1 | 6 | UNDP staff interviewed in advance were not included |
| **Total** | **64** | **9** | **73** |  |

**Annex 7: List of Documents Reviewed**

Johse Baneboka, Public Biodiversity Expenditure Review of Ethiopia, (2001-2015), Sept. 2017

Marie-Ange Baudoin (PhD), Jonse Bane Boka, Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in the Climate Resilient Green Economy Strategy (CRGE), Mid-Term Review – Final Report, October 2018.

Solomon Berham, slide presentation: Performance Report on Choke Pilot Site, August 2019

Environment, Forests and Climate Change Commission, Ethiopia PES Strategic Plan, 2018

Ethiopia Biodiversity Institute, 2015; Ethiopia’s National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2015 – 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Ministry of Environment, Forest and Climate Change, Report of the Inception Workshop for the Project ‘Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in CRGE, May, 9, 2016

The Institutional Strengthening for the Forest Sector Development Program in Ethiopia (ETH-13/0021 and Addendum No.1), June, 2018

Ethiopia Biodiversity Institute, 2015; Ethiopia’s National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan 2015 – 2020, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia

Fripp E., Payments for Ecosystem Services (PES): A practical guide to assessing the feasibility of PES projects.Bogor, Indonesia: CIFOR, 2014

GEF Investments on Payments for Ecosystem Services Schemes, GEF n.d.

GEF-5 PIF Ethiopia BD PIMS 4644, 2013

GEF/UNDP Project Document for Mainstreaming Incentives for Biodiversity Conservation in CRGE, 2015

GEF/UNDP, Progress Reports, MIBC, 2018, 2017, 2016.

Ethiopia PES Strategic Plan, 2018

CRGE Facility Consolidated Report, Reporting Period: July 2014 –March2017, March 2017

EFCCC, Annual Narrative Progress Report, Institutional Strengthening for the Forest Sector Development in Ethiopia, Reporting Period: Jan-Dec 2018, May 2019

Tadesse Woldemariam Gole, Report to undertake a biodiversity score card, December 2017

Linda Pappagallo, Operationalizing payments for ecosystem services for pastoralists in rangeland settings, CGIAR, April 2018

Environment and Climate Research Center, Ethiopian Development Research Institute, Indicator Assessment Report as an Input for the CRGE Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) System, Jan. 2018

Dr. Hugo von Zyl, The Economic Value and Potential of Protected Areas in Ethiopia, Sept. 2015

K. Whittaker, E.K. Kovacs, B. Vira, Reciprocal Commitments for Addressing Forest-Water Relationships, in Ecosystem Services and Poverty Alleviation, Trade-offs and Governance, Routledge, 2018

The World Bank, Ethiopia Climate Action Through Landscape Management (CALM), Technical Assessment Document, 2019

Yitbarek Tibebe Weldesemaet, National Ecosystem Services Valuation Guideline February 2018

**Annex 8: Analysis of PES Agreements in the MIBC Project, August 2019**

**Arjo-Diga Site**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **No** | **PES Agreement** | **Terms of Agreement and Payments** |
|  | *Seller (provider):*  Arjo-Digaworeda Environment, Forests and Climate Change Authority  *Buyer (user):*  Olana Farm Development SC.(Shalom Hotel) | Tree planting for watershed rehabilitation   * 450,000 ETB ($15,517) for purchase of 30,000 seedlings/yr at 5 birr per seedling for 3 yrs * 3 yr agreement * 150,000 ETB for planting 30,000 tree seedlings |
|  | *Seller (provider):*  Arjo-Diga woreda Environment, Forests and Climate Change Authority/representing the CBOs  *Buyer (user):*  Arjo-Didesa Sugar company | Agreement provides for tree planting and provision of sugarcane by-product (molasses used for animal fattening) and tree seedlings for afforestation  -To purchase indigenous seedlings from CBOs (5 birr/seedling)  -To give technical support on fattening and apiculture  -To distribute molasses(10,000 litre annually) |
|  | *Seller (provider):*  Arjo-Diga woreda Environment, Forests and Climate Change Authority/representing the CBOs  *Buyer:* Green Land development project of Evangelical Church MekaneYesus | Micro climate regulation  -To give seeds for CBOs based on their annual plan  -To re purchase seedlings from CBOs |
|  | *Seller (provider):*  Arjo-Diga woreda Environment, Forests and Climate Change Authority/representing the CBOs  *Buyer:*  DigaWoreda Livestock office | * To distribute fodder each year * To give capacity building on fattening and fodder development |
|  | *Seller (provider):*  Arjo-Diga woreda Environment, Forests and Climate Change Authority/representing the CBOs  *Buyer: Nekemte town Water and Sanitation office* | Agreement provides for Water supply and qualities  -Agreed to purchase 15,000 seedlings/year  -5 birr/seedling for 3 yrs (75,000 ETB/yr) ($2586) |
|  | *Seller (provider):*  Arjo-Diga woreda Environment, Forests and Climate Change Authority/representing the CBOs  *Buyer (user):*  Diga Wereda Agricultural Office | Agreement provides for  - provision of training and agricultural inputs  -Providing seedlings each year (150,000 birr) ($5172) [2 yrs] |
|  | *Seller (provider):*  Arjo-Diga woreda Environment, Forests and Climate Change Authority/representing the CBOs  *Buyer (user):*  East Wellega Culture and Tourism Office | Recreational value  Agreed to   * make this site center for tourism * capacity buildings on tourism attractions. |
|  | *Seller (provider):*  Arjo-Diga woreda Environment, Forests and Climate Change Authority/representing the CBOs  *Buyer*  Wollega University | Agreement provides to  -make the site center for education and research (100,000 ETB in kind) $3448  -Give trainings and capacity building (50,000 ETB in kind) ($1724) |
|  | *Seller (provider):*  Arjo-Diga woreda Environment, Forests and Climate Change Authority/representing the CBOs  *Buyer*  East Wellega Zone Water and Energy office | Agreed up on  -Supporting seedling establishments and purchasing the seedlings from the CBOs  -To give technical support on energy using technologies.(20,000 ETB in kind) $690 |
|  | *Total payment* | 2,325,000 (80,172) |

**Choke Site**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **PES Agreement** | **Terms of Agreement and Payments** |
| 1 | *Seller (provider):*  East Gojjam zone Environment, Forests and Climate Change Office  Office/representing the CBOs  *Buyer (user):*  DebreMarkes University | Agreement provides for protecting choke mountain as an education and research site  >500,000 ETB ($17,241) both in kind and in cash contribution. (one time) |
| 2 | *Seller (provider):*  East Gjojjam zone Environment, Forests and Climate Change Office  *Buyer (user):*  Amhara Forest Enterprise | Agreement provides for establishment of nursery at 3 woredas which cost 150,000 ETB ($5172) per year [assume 3 yrs]  Plantation of 606 ha of commercial forest from the sale of timber and grass each CBO will have an agreement to get 2mi ETH per ha |
| 3 | *Seller (provider)*  East Gjojjam zone Environment, Forests and Climate Change Office  *Buyer (user):*  Migbare-Seney NGO | Agreement provides for provision of training and agricultural inputs valued at more than 300,000 ETB ($10,345) [assume 3 yrs] |
|  | *Total payment* | 1,850,000 (63,857) |

**Kulfo Site**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
|  | **PES Agreement** | **Terms of Agreement and Payments** |
| 1 | *Seller (provider):*  Gamo Gofa Zone Env Protection & Forest Office  *Buyer (user):*  Arba Minch Town Municipality | Restore degraded areas to the point it can significantly contribute to flood mitigation   * 500,000 ETB ($17,241) for initial yr to be increased depending upon availability of funds and valuation of services provided   Five yr agreement commencing xxxx |
| 2 | *Seller (provider):*  Gamo Gofa Zone Env Protection & Forest Office  *Buyer (user):*  Arba Minch Water Utility and Sewerage Office | Restore degraded areas to the point it can significantly contribute to flood mitigation and increased water availability   * 20,000 ETB ($6897) for initial yr to be increased depending upon availability of funds and valuation of services provided   Five yr agreement |
|  | *Total payment* | 2,600,000 ETB ($89,655) |

**Hadew Site**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 1 | *Seller*  Regional Environment, Forestry and Mining Agency/on behalf of the CBOs  *Buyer*  Jijiga University | Agreement provides for protecting Hadew mountain as an education and research site.  A total of 300,000 ETB ($10,345), both in kind and in cash contribution to be paid by the university [assume one time grant] |
|  | *Total payment* | 300,000 ETB ($10,345) |

1 USD = 29 ETB Total Cash payment all sites: 7,075,000 ($243,966)

**Annex 9: Review of Project Sites**

| **Project Sites** | **Summary of Activities** | **TE Interviews and comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| ***Diga pilot project***: 1403 households involved in forest conservation and watershed rehabilitation on 10,834 ha of land in Oromia state.  Original estimated 5 kebeles involved in conserving 6300 ha has increased to 7 kebeles conserving 12,000 ha | * 7 PES agreements have been signed & 6 have been agreed * Upgraded conservation site from 5,437 ha to 12,000 ha * Soil and water conservation and related watershed rehabilitation (112.43 km contour/soil bunding, 11 km cut of drain), * Afforestation, **85,632** plant pit prepared and covered with indigenous trees by CBOs(86 % survived ), * CBO savings and loan microfinance with members; 4 M Birr ($) cash currently held in cooperative bank accounts * Fodder seed planted, * 5 CBOs engaged in beef fattening, some poultry farming and grain milling (1 poultry & 1 women grain milling seen by evaluation mission); 10% of CBO member HHs engaged in livelihood activities * A team of **90** persons from woreda and zonal stakeholders, CBO chairs Visited Humbo and transferred practices for CBO members. * Energy saving technologies provided to CBO HHs (700 cooking stoves and 700 solar equipment), * Agreement made with Arjo-Dedessa Sugar Factory for provision of molasses and tree seedlings. | 9 CBOs established and 11 M Birr (379,000 USD) expenditures, 9M Birr from the project and 2 M from other sources (>20%). 6 PES agreements have been approved to date. Public awareness was identified as a priority.  Key issues mentioned by project staff and CBO members and observed by TE:   * The main focus for local people is flood mitigation and livelihoods development. * Increased wildlife conflicts have occurred alongside forest rehabilitation; monkey population increase has increased attacks on farm livestock. * Effective Contour trenching, bunding and micro-basins in portions of the catchment should have a significant beneficial impact on runoff; groundwater recharge monitoring would be worthwhile. * 86% seedling survival rate after 3 yrs is modest; no dung or mulching added to pits. * Benefit sharing agreements with private owners are needed. * Livestock fattening and cut and carry fodder is the most popular introduced activity. * Need to diversify the limited number of alternative livelihoods; local flour mill investments have had a significant local impact. * Leakage of restricted harvesting practices has occurred beyond boundaries of the project area. * Business development for honey production and other income generating activities is unclear. |
| *Kulfo pilot project*: 386 households involved with 13 CBOs and a much larger local population conserving 7500 ha protected area (originally proposed for 1058 ha) | * 3 PES agreements signed and 3 are ongoing * Upgraded conservation site from 1,058 ha to 7,500 ha, * 13 CBO with 386 members and 7,500 ha area custody have been established, * Capacity enhancement training conducted (11 CBO members trained), * Conducted physical SWC activities that include: * Micro basin (25,000 m3) * Bench terrace (16 km) and fanyaju (26 km) * Check dam (1500 m3) * Soil bund (21 km) * Stone bund (9.25 km) * Improved pit (88,000) * Normal pit (120,000) * Bio-physical activities: * Multi indigenous and exotic trees were planted * A total of 53,869 seedlings (43,626 indigenous & 10,243 exotic) were planted * All 13 CBOs engaged in income generating activities, mainly fattening, poultry, apiculture, fishery, micro trade, etc * Conducted experience sharing visit to Humbo carbon trading project (47 CBO members and 20 Steering & Technical Committee members) | 13 CBOs established and 10-12 M Birr (345-414 ‘000 USD) in expenditures, 8- 9 M Birr from the project source (about 20%). There are currently 6 PES agreements approved and many more prospective ‘buyers’/partners. The project has leveraged a wide range of financial and in-kind contributions to the project activities in conjunction with government agencies, including a 500,000 birr/yr commitment from Arba Minich office, reflecting the significant concerns about flooding damage and the need and support for soil and water conservation.  Issues mentioned by project staff and CBO members and observed by TE:   * Delays in establishing the legal framework have constrained negotiations with PES prospects, especially private sector * Better linkages and working relationship are needed with the CRGE Goma Zonal Task Force; proposed Local PES Platform * Strengthening PPP for added PES agreements is a priority for the steering committee * Stretched demands on project site managers to cover an expanded area (7 x larger than original planned area) * Extensive SWC work; drainage issues on access roads need treatment; micro-basins are often too small/no mulching but good tree seedling survival and growth rate. Gully mitigation and control is needed. Overall significant regeneration of vegetation cover, reduction in runoff rate, and habitat improvement are apparent. * Livelihoods development are currently limited. No NTFPs are yet promoted in the afforestation. * Biodiversity Scorecard parameters are used to measure watershed changes, with some questions about reliability. |
| ***Choke pilot project*: 5,082 households involved with 14 CBOs, conserved 12,992 hectare area (originally proposed for 12,005 ha)** | * 3 PES agreements signed * Upgraded conservation site from 12,005ha to 12,992ha * Land delineated as pilot site to exercise PES, * Baseline data collection and land use and site management plan done by Debre Markos University, * Score card of Choke ecosystem done by consultant, * Provided capacity building training to 1,836 farmers (336 females), * Provided training on income generating activities (1,270 on SWC, 165 on apple production, 40 on malt barley production, 972 on poultry production, 140 on entrepreneurship, and 270 on livestock forage development), * Provided 10,992 chickens to poultry producers, 415 improved sheep breeds, 2,300 kg malt barley seed, and 6,019 apple seedling to farmers. * Provided 790 solar lights and 2000 cooking stoves to CBO members. * Constructed 314,942 different types water conservation and harvesting structures on 89.5 ha of land, * Carried out biological conservation structures /seedling planting on 108 ha (2,500 *Cordia africana*, 25,000 *Copruses lustanica*, 165,000 forage seedlings), * Conducted experience sharing visit to Humbo forest, Menz-Guassa and Guna community forest reserves, * Conducted identification of Choke Ecosystem services, and monetary value ecosystem services ($4,038,952,994 which seems hypothetical). | 14 CBOs with 5,082 HHs established and covered 12,992 hectare conservation area;  MOU signed with Choke area stakeholders, 3 PES agreements signed as of Oct. 2018:-  - Debremarkos University  - Amhara Forest Enterprise (Govt) &  - Migbare Senay (NGO)  to support in kind and cash. They agreed to support more than 500,000 Birr (17,241 USD), but non-finalization of the legal framework inhibited realization of the work.    Key issues mentioned by project staff and project stakeholders at Regional Level, Bahir Dar and observed by TE:   * Delay of enacting legal proclamation by parliament constrained those partied signed PES agreement to proceed forward. * The valuation of ecosystem services in monetary value ($4,038,952.99/year) is encouraging although the approach is highly hypothetical. * The land use management plan prepared by Debre Markos University needs modifications; has to be revised every five years. * Biodiversity scorecards developed by consultant is used to measure ecosystem changes, i.e. water quality in terms of upstream and downstream discharges, but there is doubt on its reliability. * The effort of Regional Wildlife Protection and Development Authority to establish an institution ‘’Choke Mountain Conservation and Development Office’’ that cover 53,358 ha ecosystem area with manpower and annual budget allocation may ensures sustainability, but still needs enactment of the regulation by regional council. It has been pointed out during the TE discussion that Govt is committed to overtake all activities of the project to run with Govt budget. * Stakeholders have the opinion to select indicators appropriate for measuring vegetation cover, wildlife status, and spring discharge in the future. * The stakeholders demanded capacitating the newly establishing office meant to overtakes the duty of the project as government institution. * The livelihood aspect of the project undertaken by CBOs (poultry production and solar light) improved annual income of HHs and health of women, but still not sufficient |
| ***Hadew pilot project*: 1,372 households involving 7 CBOs and 1500 ha of drylands** | * 5 PES agreement are going on * Covers conservation are of 1,500ha * Conducted biological conservation work on 9 ha land (planted 4,500 indigenous tree seedlings). * Carried out physical conservation works (88 km hillside terracing, 50 km soil bund, 15 km stone bund, and 55 m3 micro basins). | 7 CBOs with 1,372 HHs covered a conservation area of 1,500 ha.  Reports indicate that previously degraded area has well recovered with vegetation and ecosystem services.  Habitat loss and land degradation is reduced by more than 40% according to project reports.  Biodiversity score cards developed and applied in measuring ecosystem services. |

**Annex 10: List of PES-related Workshops/Trainings**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***S.No*** | ***Topics of the workshop/ training*** | ***Plan participants*** | | | ***Actual participants*** | | |
| ***Male*** | ***Female*** | ***Sum*** | ***Male*** | ***Female*** | ***Sum*** |
| ***A*** | ***Consultation workshop and symposiums*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *1* | *Engaging Public-Private sectors on payment and development of ecosystem services* |  |  |  | *125* | *40* | *165* |
| *2* | *National Strategy and Road-Map for Ecosystem service payment* | *30* | *20* | *50* | *29* | *6* | *35* |
| *3* | *PES legislation consultative workshop* | *20* | *20* | *40* | *30* |  | *30* |
|  | ***sum*** | ***120*** | ***100*** | ***220*** | ***97*** | ***100*** | ***197*** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***S.No*** | ***Topics of the workshop/ training*** | ***Plan participants*** | | | ***Actual participants*** | | |
| ***Male*** | ***Female*** | ***Sum*** | ***Male*** | ***Female*** | ***Sum*** |
| ***B*** | ***Training*** |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| *1* | *Ecosystem valuation technique* | *100* | *50* | *150* | *172* | *17* | *189* |
| *2* | *How to exercise LU and PES* | *115* | *115* | *230* | *230* | *-* | *230* |
| *3* | *Sustainable biodiversity management, payment for ecosystem services and improved livelihood alternative* | *100* | *55* | *155* | *109* | *44* | *153* |
| *4* | *Awereness on PES schemes* | *32* | *6* | *38* | *29* | *3* | *32* |
| *5* | *PES* | *20* | *15* | *35* | *33* | *-* | *33* |
| *6* | *Ecosystem service concept* | *80* | *5* | *85* | *85* | *-* | *85* |
| *7* | *Payment for ecosystem services* | *100* | *70* | *170* | *157* | *13* | *170* |
| *8* | *negotiation, contracting, transaction, monitoring and verification to effectively manage the PES schemes* | *50* | *10* | *60* | *56* | *6* | *62* |
| *9* | *PES and ES valuation with key personnel from regional, zonal relevant offices and neighboring woredas* | *20* | *20* | *40* | *33* | *7* | *40* |
| *10* | *biodiversity mainstreaming and the role of PES on eco system services* | *150* | *150* | *300* | *257* | *60* | *317* |
| *11* | *Ecosystem services and payment concept* | *200* | *100* | *300* | *225* | *80* | *305* |
| *12* | *practical training on spot ecosystem valuation* | *20* | *5* | *25* | *24* | *3* | *27* |
| *13* | *PES* | *30* | *20* | *50* | *28* | *20* | *48* |
| *14* | *PES, ES and BD conservation mainstreaming , MIBC project objectives* | *30* | *30* | *60* | *35* | *25* | *60* |
| *15* | *PES Principles, Design and Agreement* | *60* | *40* | *100* | *89* |  | *89* |
| *16* | *PES concept and approach* | *600* | *64* | *664* | *548* | *51* | *599* |
|  | **Total** | **1,707** | **755** | **2,462** | **2,110** | **329** | **2,439** |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ***S.No*** | ***Topics of the workshop/ training*** | ***Plan participants*** | | | ***Actual participants*** | | |
| ***Male*** | ***Female*** | ***Sum*** | ***Male*** | ***Female*** | ***Sum*** |
| *1* | *Federal* | *120* | *55* | *175* | *196* | *20* | *216* |
| *2* | *Regional , Zonal and woreda level experts* | *342* | *211* | *553* | *460* | *74* | *534* |
| *3* | *Community at large* | *1,245* | *489* | *1,734* | *1,454* | *235* | *1,689* |
|  | **Total** | **1,707** | **755** | **2,462** | **2,110** | **329** | **2,439** |

**Annex 11: Summary of TE Survey Responses**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Kulfo site (1 CBO reporting)** | **Argo-Digg site (6 CBOs reporting)** | **Hadew (7 CBOs reporting)** |
| **Main activities of the CBO** | 1. Undertaking physical soil and water conservation activities, afforestation  2. Controlling unwise intervention of animal and human to the project site  We engaged is livelihood activities like fattening, small scale trade (i.e. grain and edible fruits like mango, banana etc) which is geared towards tradeoffs with biodiversity conservation and maintain beneficiaries income on which they rely on direct utilization of the biodiversity resources. | Conserve natural resources by mobilizing community, preventing forest fires and illegal hunting; diversify livelihoods.  Conservation usage and livelihoods development  Control hunting; control fire, soil and water conservation activities | Physical and biological conservation including soil and water conservation activities, area closure, tree plantation (indigenous plant) ... etc. likewise,  animal fattening especially Billy goats and Oxen as alternative livelihood options |
| **Primary ecosystem services or biodiversity values of concern** | However, there are diverse services and values we own from the conservation of the site, we are duly concerned on services like local climate regulation, flood reduction, supply of fodder for the livestock are the main ones. | Climate regulation  Drought control  Water supply  Fodder, food  Recreation and cultural service  Totally this forest is our life; we are dependent | Education and recreational ecosystem service  Medicinal plant provision  Drought Mitigation |
| **Main threats to these ecosystems services/biodiversity** | Threats that were known to exist before the implementation of the project declined significantly, no significant threat exist, rather there has to be legal institutions that ensure the sustainability of the ecosystem services and goods under the support of the project | Biodiversity scorecard completed.  Illegal hunting on the border of Feromea area  Wildlife increased; some conflict in a few areas  Difficult to monitor 2000 ha  Only 2 yrs experience so far. | Low rainfall and drought are the major threats |
| **Key issues and challenges** | Previously, low level of understanding among the non cbo members and prohibition to utilize the resources haphazardly were one of the key challenges we faced at the start of the project but, after frequent awareness creation to the kebele administrative and the general public has been made, the outlined challenges showed dramatic improvement among the communities | Illegal hunting. We have a group of 20 CBO members to control this hunting but it needs attention and awareness raising in the boundary area  Wildlife conflict  Wildlife have increased in numbers  Forest fire is common; we have participated in fire control  Leakage of activities from bordering kebeles has an impact on our area | Relatively unsatisfactory service provision with some Government institutions together with frequent turnover of some government positions. |
| **Management plan or conservation agreement** | Yes, we have management plan and conservation agreement that we signed with the implementing institutions that includes what, how and when to do activities are clearly outlined in the documents, which is made real with the involvement of the cbo leaders from the planning to finalization of the management plan. | We have constructed soil and water conservation activities and planted trees in accordance with the plan  Have both a management plan and conservation plan  Management plan being used; has high awareness  Have a management plan and signed MOU with Environment & Forest Office to exercise the plan  Signed MOU and received the management plan | Yes, it is useful and we managed our conservation practices accordingly  We use the plan as a guiding tool to restore our site Biodiversity |
| **Monitoring program or system for inspection and reporting on the protected area** | Yes. In our case we developed a system that every members of the cbo's are assigned to undertake various tasks ranging from soil and water conservation activities to livelihood activities taking the tendency of the members to specific tasks by weekly bases | Monthly meetings with all members, and weekly meetings of the chairs. Satisfied with this program.  Monitor twice a mth with CBO chairs; once a month with CBO members  Sub-groups set up to monitor the area  Committee meets weekly; members meet monthly | Yes, we are very satisfied how entire monitoring process going on. Because in addition to our weekly monitoring as a CBO we have on spot technical working group and sometimes project steering committee monitoring.  We managed to have weekly meeting and in addition to that project site technical and steering committee monitor our site as per their schedule and give as direction to meet our plan. |
| **Status of information and knowledge about the ecosystems and biodiversity** | Following frequent awareness creation and training organized by the project office, we are very aware of our ecosystems and well equipped on how to manage our biodiversity resources sustainably that can be rated as high. | Awareness is increasing; generally it is greater than 50%. We plan to give continuous training/ awareness to our members  High information status  Moderate level of information; more awareness raising is needed  Moderate 50-70% information on our area  Status of community awareness is about 50% | Moderate, we got a number of training on the concept and benefits of ecosystem and biodiversity, Hence our awareness and stewardship increased from time to time in the project period. However, due top resource limitation the project awareness creation scheme is not as strong as it did to the members. Hence , it has to deploy resources and strengthen awareness creation effort to minimize the leakage effect.  Regarding our members it is increasing from time to time but it needs additional work on the community at large.  High , because members of the CBO awareness increased from time to time |
| **Current annual budget and sources of funding** | We don't have fixed annual budget that can be declared as budget rather, the money that we save from the money paid by the project for physical soil and water conservation activities and training. Since our establishment, we managed about 800,000 Ethi- Birr, and the funding agency is the project office | MIBC project and govt. We 700,000 ETB in our account.  Received 450,000 ETB; used 300,000 for livelihoods and revolving fund; have 150,000 on account.  Received 775,854 ETB from MIBC; in-kind support from govt is greater  Received 1.2M ETB; used 600,000 for livelihoods; purchased share from Gibe Didesa Union  Received 1.7 M ETB from MIBC; now have 683,000 ETB  Received 882,000 ETB for livelihoods, shelter, grinding mill; have 181,000 ETB in account | No fixed budget; estimated and average one hundred thousand Birr |
| **Alternative livelihoods introduced** | Two types of livelihood ( fattening and pity trade) options were introduced to strengthen and support cbo members income as it put positive impact to conservation of biodiversity resources in turn we tracked the success of the project in terms of biodiversity restoration and means of livelihood. | ‘Fattening already functional’. Business plan established for one grinding mill.  Started fattening and got benefits.  Prepared a business plan to start fattening, and a mill  Beekeeping, fattening, nursery  Fattening started, grinding mill had many benefits; planning other act. | Main alternative livelihoods are animal fattening |
| **CBO capacity self-assessment** | Primarily, the key beneficiaries of the catchment are not the established CBOs rather the entire households of the catchment (i.e. the area was known to serious flooding at every year) …. the management and administration structure engages all important sectors…. Actors to shoulder this responsibility in taking care of the ecosystem services are established. The project should create platform for key partners and institutions and a kind of agreement has to be reached on what and who to do in protecting the ecosystem services and goodsbefore its termination. | We have got capacity from the project; we sustain the protection of the ecosystem for our life. We have the capacity to continue even if any favourable environment is not available (or if any institution changed) we are with the ecosystem**.**  CBO has capacity; we need support from the govt.  We need capacity bldg. especially on livelihood options  Partial capacity; need more focus on livelihood activities  We have adequate capacity for conservation support; need govt support for technical follow-up  We have capacity and commitment to sustain the work; plan coffee and fruit trees in the forest | The agency is capable to support the CBO to sustain the ecosystem services and biodiversity values. |
| **Progress toward *Payment of Ecosystem* services** | Agreements with six government and private institutions (municipality, water service, sewerage office, GIZ, Fishery cooperatives etc...) in addition to the process we are in with many other private and public institutions to engage in PES. To further enhance the journey and engage potential beneficiaries in to the PES deal, government should pave legal grounds that will better benefit the environment and its citizens. | Signed an MOU with Digga Woreda Agricultural Office and Digga Woreda Livestock & Fishery Office  Have 3 MOUs in place; better to have legal enforcement and continuous awareness across the country to mainstream PES  Agreed with REDD+ Oromia to manage the ecosystem  On the way to sign MOUs with institutions  Signed MOU with govt and institutions such as Arjo-Dedse Sugar factory, Agric. Office, etc.  Got awareness on PES systems; signed MOUs with institutions | Since our site is endowed with medicinal plant as a result of our conservation effort we are still negotiating with Jigjiga University for our educational service provision |

1. For additional information on methods, see the [Handbook on Planning, Monitoring and Evaluating for Development Results](http://www.undp.org/evaluation/handbook), Chapter 7, pg. 163 [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. A useful tool for gauging progress to impact is the Review of Outcomes to Impacts (ROtI) method developed by the GEF Evaluation Office:  [ROTI Handbook 2009](http://www.thegef.org/gef/sites/thegef.org/files/documents/M2_ROtI%20Handbook.pdf) [↑](#footnote-ref-2)