Midterm Review of the project

"Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach"

UNDP PIMS#5331

GEF ID# 5719

MTR timeframe: September 2019 – December 2019

Final MTR Report

Submitted by: Jon Garcia

Requested by: United Nations Development Programme

December 11, 2019

Table of Contents

Acronyms and Abbreviations

Acronym	Definition
ADPP	Development Aid from the People for the People (by its initials in Portuguese)
APR	Annual Project Review
CETAC	Centre for Tropical Ecology and Climate Change (by its initials in Portuguese)
COSPE	Cooperation for the Development of Emerging Countries (by its initials in Italian)
EE	Energy Efficiency
EU	European Union
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organisation of United Nations
GABAC	Cabinet of Climate Change
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
ha	Hectares
IDF	Forestry Development Institute (by its initials in Portuguese)
IEA	International Energy Agency
INDC	Intended Nationally Determined Contribution
IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature
LPG	Liquefied Petroleum Gas
LULUCF	Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry
MINAGRIF	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry
MINAMB	Ministry of Environment
MINEA	Ministry of Energy and Water
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MTR	Midterm Review
NDP	National Development Plan
OECD DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
PAPAGRO	Agricultural Products Acquisition Programme (by its initials in Portuguese)
PB	Project Board
PIR	Project Implementation Report
PMC	Project Management Costs
PMU	Project Management Unit
PPG	Project Preparation Grant
PSC	Project Steering Committee
SDGs	Sustainable Development Goals
SRF	Strategic Results Framework
ToR	Terms of Reference
UCO	University of Cordoba

UJES	University Jose Eduardo dos Santos
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
UNV	United Nations Volunteers

1. Executive Summary

Table 1. Project information table

Project title: **Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach**				
GEF project ID:	5719		At endorsement (USD)	At MTR stage (USD)
UNDP project ID:	5331	GEF financing:	4,620,000	1,466,111
Country:	Angola	IA/EA own:	875,000	781,076
Region:	Sub-Saharan Africa	Government:	16,000,000	0
Focal area:	Climate change	Other:	1,836,700	1,423,782
FA objectives (OP/SP):	CCM-2 Promote market transformation for energy efficiency in industry and the building sector	Total co-financing:	17,836,700	2,204,858
Executing agency:	Ministry of Environment (MINAMB)	Total project cost:	23,331,700	3,670,969
Other partners involved:	Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MINAGRIF) – Institute for Forestry Development, Provincial Governments of Huambo and Kwanza Sul, Development Aid from the People for the People (ADPP by its initials in Portuguese), Cooperation for the Development of Emerging Countries (by its initials in Italian), University of Cordoba (UCO), University Jose Eduardo dos Santos, Huambo (UJES)	Prodoc signature:	September 27, 2016	
		Closing date:	Proposed: December 31, 2022	Actual

Overview of the review project

The project "Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach" is a full-sized project funded by the GEF, implemented by the UNDP and executed by Cabinet of Climate Change (GABAC) within the Ministry of the Environment (MINAMB) of the Government Angola. The objective of the project is "to reduce the current unsustainable and GHG-intensive mode of charcoal production and utilization from Angola's Miombo woodlands via an integrated set of interventions in the national charcoal value chain". Component 1 focuses on the policy framework, component 2 on technology transfer, component 3 on human capacities and institutions, with a focus on sustainable forest management, and component 4 on monitoring and evaluation. The project is implemented in rural areas in the provinces of Huambo and Kwanza Sul, focusing on production, as well as in the urban and peri-urban areas of Luanda, focusing on consumption, along the Luanda-Huambo corridor. This six-year project started on September 27, 1st 2016 and is planned to end in December 2022

Review objectives and scope

The purpose of this assignment is to conduct the midterm review (MTR) of the above-mentioned project. This MTR analyzes whether the programme is on-track, what problems or challenges it is encountering, and what corrective actions are required. This MTR assesses the performance of the programme since its CEO endorsement (September 2016) up to October 2019, referring also in some instance to its design. The findings of this MTR are based on a desk review of relevant documents and interviews of a selection of stakeholders. Based on the information collected, the evaluator has cross-analysed and triangulated the data in order to inform the selected indicators and answer the evaluation questions.

Overall evaluation rating of the project and key features of performance

The project is relevant and moderately efficient and sustainable. Effectiveness has been limited if achievement of mid-term targets at mid-term is considered, but moderately satisfactory if likelihood of achieving end-of-project targets by the end of the project is considered. The overall rating is Moderately Satisfactory.

Table 2. MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	The project addresses a relevant problem through a relatively effective strategy, with room for improvement in the integration of several aspects of the charcoal value chain. The project is in line with national policies and the international commitments of the country. The project contributes to gender equality and human rights. The objective and outcomes are clear and feasible. There is room for improvement in the activities and the SRF, which does not effectively measure the progress of the project.
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: Moderately satisfactory	Available data does not allow assessing progress in four of the six objective level indicators. As of 31 October 2019, in the other two, by mid-term, the mid-term targets have not been met. It is difficult to assess the likelihood of achieving the end-of-project targets by the end of the project. Available evidence suggests the quantitative targets in one indicator will not be met, probably by far; in the other indicator the target will likely be achieved with significant shortcomings (a strategy would be adopted but not enforced).
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: Moderately satisfactory	One indicator has HS and the other one MU. An overall MS can be given
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: Moderately satisfactory	Two of three indicators have a moderately satisfactory rating, and one moderately unsatisfactory rating.
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: Highly Satisfactory	The two indicators have highly satisfactory ratings
	Outcome 4 Achievement Rating: Satisfactory	The rating for the two indicators is satisfactory

Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	Moderately Satisfactory	Project management is good, with important room for improvement in the management of the work conducted in the field. There have been some delays, particularly at the beginning of the project. Expenditure is low, with a more reasonable part of the budget being already contracted. PMC are high, but perspectives are good to stay within the expected percentage by the end of the project. Co-financing is low and unlikely to meet planned commitments, although this has to do to a great extent with accounting aspects. The M&E plan is good, but the SRF weak. Monitoring and reporting has mostly taken place in accordance to the M&E plan. Overall, quality of reports is good with room for improvement on certain aspects. The project is not following the stakeholder engagement plan. While key stakeholders are properly involved, the engagement of a number of very relevant players should be strengthened. The project has exchanged lessons beyond UNDP, but should exploit synergies within the organization, and better systematize and share lessons from activities on the field. Overall, communication is very good.

Sustainability	Moderately Likely	The availability of financial and economic resources is moderately likely more through the economic activities promoted by the project than through government or donor funding, although this aspect should be further considered during implementation. Several social aspects contribute to sustainability. At institutional level key stakeholders are involved, but limited involvement of other stakeholders is an important risk. Some progress has been done and is in course at the policy level. Forest management plans are good, with concerns on some aspects. Climate change is a risk, although awareness and capacity have increased.

Main findings

Regarding the **project strategy**[1], the problem addressed by the project is highly relevant at the national and sub-national levels. Despite the reference in the title to a value chain approach, in design, the project does not consider all steps in the value chain[2], focusing mostly on technology. A community sustainable forest management component was included in the first phases of implementation. This adjustment increased the effectiveness of the project strategy. During implementation the scope of the project has been reduced. So far, in the first three years of implementation, the project has focused on step 1. There has also been some work on the steps 2, on carbonization, 5, on consumption, and 4, on storage. More work is planned on these steps. However, there is room for improvement on step 3 on transport and key elements of step 4, regarding distribution and retail for sustainable or more sustainable charcoal, energy efficient cookstoves and to a lesser extent briquetting machines and briquettes. The project has a comprehensive approach, in terms of dimensions or type of barriers it tries to overcome, it combines bottom-up and top-down approaches and was informed by lessons from other projects, at design and during implementation.

The project is in line with national policies and Angola's international commitments, particularly the INDC. Available information suggests all people affected or concerned by the project were consulted during project design. A detailed gender assessment was only conducted during project implementation, but the project is contributing to gender equality. While human rights are not

[1] For details see section 4.1
[2] The five steps of the charcoal value chain are forest management, carbonization, transport, distribution (including warehousing), and consumption.

prominent in the project document, project activities do promote human rights, with room for more detailed monitoring and reporting on this.

The objective of the project is clear and feasible. The outcomes would clearly contribute to achieve the objective. The outcomes are mostly clear and feasible. The definition of activities has important deficits. The indicators, baselines and targets focus too much on quantitative aspects, and some targets seem too ambitious. The shift towards forest management during project inception compromises the achievement of most of those targets, but contributes to overcoming existing barriers for a sustainable change.

Progress towards results[3] depends on the criterion used to assess it. As of October 2019, this project is far from achieving its mid-term targets, but will likely achieve its planned end-of –project targets by the end of the project, with some important shortcomings. Table 3 provides the details, including the justification for ratings. Section 4.2.1 assesses the impacts of the project in a more narrative way, indicating what has been done, what benefits have been provided and what is missing in the plan. On the field, the project has made important contributions on aspects not reflected in the results framework, although these benefits depend to a relevant extent on which implementer is taking the lead. Progress has been made on objective (2 (energy efficiency) of the GEF Tracking tool. Barriers for progress towards results can be identified at national and provincial levels, including the complexity of the problem addressed, institutional instability, novelty of the topic, weak institutional coordination, absence of a common approach by implementers, limited engagement with IDF, lack of identification elements for the members of the forest management groups and lack of equipment, low alphabetization rates, native tree species take very long to grow, and lack of basic equipment to protect charcoal producers from the heat and smoke produced by improved kilns. Table 9 summarizes these barriers (see section 4.2.2 for details). In the short term, there are opportunities for synergies with projects implemented by UNDP and FAO in the country and the region.

Regarding project implementation and adaptive management[4], UNDP's support to the management of the project is very good. The interaction between UNDP and the MINAMB is efficient, with room for improvement in the management of the activities carried out by the three implementers. There have been some delays, particularly at the beginning of the project. The project is trying to address the causes.

As of October 2019, total actual expenditure represented 32 per cent of GEF funding, when more than 58 per cent of the implementation time had been spent. Interviews suggest more substantive disbursements in the near future. At mid-term, actual PMC represented 10 per cent of total actual implementation costs, but there are good perspectives PMC will be below 5 per cent of total project costs by the end of the project. As of October 2019, the project had mobilized 12 per cent of total

[3] For details see section 4.2.
[4] For details see section 4.3.

planned co-financing. This is mostly explained by the difficulty to estimate the real cost of the complementarity activities actually implemented by the government.

The project document includes an M&E plan in accordance with the established procedures of both UNDP and GEF, but the SRF has important caveats. Monitoring and reporting has mostly taken place in accordance to the plan. Overall, quality of reports is good with room for improvement. The project seems to have adequate financial management.

The structures planned for engaging stakeholders in the management of the project have not been created or have met less than planned. The project has engaged relevant institutions, but there is room for further engaging many relevant institutions. Exchanges with other projects have taken place, but it would be good to strengthen exchanges within UNDP and enhance collection, systematization, integration and exchange of lessons learned from the project itself. Overall, external communication is good.

In terms of **sustainability**[5], the availability of financial and economic resources once the GEF assistance ends is moderately likely, mostly through sustainable charcoal production and alternative income generating activities, although work to further promote this is needed. Some positive social impacts will contribute to sustainability of project outcomes. The project could do more to exploit the opportunity that decentralization brings and, at the same time, build trust between IDF and communities. Similarly, there is room for improvement in the engagement of the private sector. The project will contribute to improve the enabling environment. Climate change could affect sustainability negatively. Positively, there is increased awareness and capacity to adapt.

Recommendations

Based on the discussions in the different sections, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

Table 3. Summary of recommendations with responsible parties

No.	Recommendation	Responsible party
1	Define a road map and strengthen implementation on policy, certification, kilns, cookstoves and briquetting machines and briquettes	UNDP, MINAMB, PMU, MINAGRIF-IDF
2	Strengthen forest management related activities including	UNDP, MINAMB,

[5] For details see section 4.4.

	developing and maintaining relatively large and diverse nurseries, reforestation with trees from the nurseries and some native trees bought from outside when necessary, and identifying and implementing alternative income generating activities	MINAGRIF-IDF, ADPP, COSPE, UJES-UCO
3	Strengthen management, including more frequent visit from Luanda, hiring a regional coordinator based in Huambo and procuring a car	UNDP, MINAMB, PMU
4	Strengthen accounting of co-finance, finding a way to estimate the cost of the complementary activities undertaken by the government.	PMU
5	Strengthen M&E, revising the SRF and the list of activities and strengthening reporting in the PIR, the GEF tracking tool and the activity level M&E tool.	UNDP, MINAMB, PMU
6	Strengthen the engagement of stakeholders, further involving some players and engaging new players, including other sectoral ministries, decentralized institutions and the private sector.	UNDP, MINAMB, PMU
7	Further document and exchange lessons, within UNDP, with other relevant projects and within the project	UNDP, PMU
8	Strengthen communication trying to provide a more comprehensive picture of the problem and the strategy, and its contribution to SDGs	UNDP, MINAMB, PMU
9	Strengthen sustainability, through continued advocacy, accelerating income generating activities, strengthening forest management community groups, revising forest management plans and strengthening the capacity of communities to adapt to climate change	UNDP, MINAMB, PMU, MINAGRIF-IDF

2. Introduction

2.1. Purpose of the MTR and objectives

The purpose of this assignment is to conduct the midterm review (MTR) of the abovementioned project. As indicated in the Terms of Reference (ToR), this aims to:

- 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 with the goal of identifying the necessary changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve intended results; and
- Review the project strategy and its risks to sustainability.

2.2. Scope and methodology

2.2.1. Scope

This MTR assesses the performance of the programme since its planned start (September 2016) up to 31 October 2019, referring also in some instance to its design. The MTR assesses progress with regards to:

- Project strategy: project design, results framework;
- Progress towards results (outcomes);
- Project implementation and adaptive management: management arrangements, work planning, finance and co-finance, project-level monitoring and evaluation (M&E) systems, stakeholder engagement, reporting, communication; and
- Sustainability: financial, socio-economic, environmental, institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability.

It provides conclusions and recommendations derived from the findings and rates project's results according to the template provided.

2.2.2. Methodology

This MTR has been implemented following a structured process that integrates data collection and data analysis, in order to assess the relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, and sustainability of results of the ongoing project, proposing recommendations for the remainder of the implementation. The review has been conducted considering Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD)'s Development Assistance Committee (DAC) criteria, and following ToRs and *the Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)-supported, Global Environment*

Facility (GEF)-financed projects. The review has also been carried out in accordance with United Nations Evaluation Group (UNEG)'s Code of Conduct for Midterm Review Consultants. In this sense, the review has adopted a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with key stakeholders and provides information that is based on evidence that is credible, reliable and useful. Gender aspects were integrated in the evaluation matrix presented in Annex 1. Data on gender was collected through desk review, interviews and focus groups. Of the three sites visited, in two sites mixed focus groups were conducted, with an effort being made for women to answer to the questions. In the other site, separate focus groups were conducted, one with women and one with men.

2.2.2.1. Data collection

Both primary and secondary data have been collected. Secondary data has been collected from project management staff and partners as well as through desk review of project documents, policy documents and others – a list of consulted documents is provided in Annex 6.2. Primary data has been collected mostly through interviews and direct observation, during the in-country mission, which allowed the evaluation team to meet with stakeholders (donor partners, beneficiaries, government officials) and observe the project progress first-hand. Annex 6.3 indicates the consulted stakeholders.

2.2.2.2. Data analysis

The evaluator has compiled and analyzed all collected data on progress towards meeting the project targets, intermediate results achieved, and gaps reported, if any. In order to ensure that the information was collected and cross-checked by a variety of informants, data triangulation has been a key tool for the verification and confirmation of the information collected. Findings are related to pertinent information through interpretative analysis. This systematic approach ensures all the findings, conclusions and recommendations are substantiated by evidence.

2.2.2.3. Analytical framework

The following elements have been used as the analytical framework for this review:

- **Evaluation matrix:** Based on an initial documentation review and following UNDP Evaluation Guidance document, an evaluation matrix was elaborated and is included in Annex 6.1. The MTR matrix is a key tool for data collection and analysis. It includes the evaluation questions as set in the ToR and details the most relevant qualitative and quantitative indicators that inform on the evaluative questions, information sources and data collection methods.
- **MTR Ratings and Achievements Summary Table:** This framework has been used to provide specific ratings for achievements to date.
- **Triangulation** of information ensures the validity and accuracy of findings.
- **Participatory and gender-sensitive approach:** to ensure that the perspectives of most vulnerable populations are considered in the review.

2.2.2.4. Process

This MTR has been structured around three phases. The consultancy started with documentation review. This allowed the reviewer to clarify the context around the project and identify the main challenges of the review mission and information gaps to be completed. The analytical framework and related evaluation matrix were developed based on this preliminary document review. An Inception Report was then developed to clarify the review process. Once the Inception Report was approved, the reviewer undertook data collection as described in Section 2.2.2.1 above, including a five-day in-country mission. At the end of the MTR mission, initial findings were presented to project stakeholders. Once all relevant information was acquired, the reviewer proceeded to data triangulation, and careful analysis of all collected data, in order to establish evidence-based findings and draw well-informed conclusions and recommendations for the second half of the project. On this basis, this draft MTR report has been prepared, following the Guidance for conducting midterm reviews of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects. The report includes the contents indicated in Annex B of the ToR.

This draft MTR report is being submitted to UNDP and the PMU, and will be disseminated to all relevant stakeholders as deemed appropriate. Comments received will be taken into account for the finalization of the MTR report. A comment response matrix will be provided in order to track the comments and the response given.

2.3. Structure of the MTR report

This draft MTR report is organized as follows. Section 1 provides the table that will be included in the executive summary, which will be developed during the preparation of the final MTR report. Section 2 explains the purpose, scope and methodology of the review, and presents the structure of the report. Section 3 provides a brief description of the project and its background. Section 4 presents the findings of the assessment, focusing on particular on project strategy, progress towards results, project implementation and adaptive management, and sustainability. Section 5 presents the conclusions and recommendations. Finally, section 6 provides the annexes, which include the evaluation matrix, the list of consulted documents, the list of consulted stakeholders, and the interview protocols.

3. Project description and background context

Firewood and charcoal represent over 57% of total energy consumption in Angola. Charcoal is the main source of energy in peri-urban areas of the main coastal cities (Luanda, Benguela); rural dwellers rely on firewood. Population growth and increasing per capita energy demand without substantive increases in energy efficiency have triggered demand for charcoal. Charcoal is mostly produced in the interior of the

country, in the Planalto Central, along the Huambo-Luanda corridor, which hosts the sub-tropical Miombo woodlands. In these areas, charcoal production often represents the only opportunity to generate cash income. Given a number of factors, including limited knowledge and enforcement capacity, only a small fraction of charcoal production and trade is formalized and compliant with national regulation, which does not follow international best practices. In this context, charcoal production is leading to losses in forest stock and biodiversity and medium term opportunities for rural livelihoods. Furthermore, environmental degradation is increasing the vulnerability of human settlements to climate change. Besides, charcoal production is contributing to greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions.

The project "Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach" is a full-sized project funded by the GEF[6], implemented by the UNDP and executed by Cabinet of Climate Change (GABAC) within the Ministry of the Environment (MINAMB) of the Government Angola. The objective of the project is "to reduce the current unsustainable and GHG-intensive mode of charcoal production and utilization from Angola's Miombo woodlands via an integrated set of interventions in the national charcoal value chain". The project is divided into four main components:

- Component 1: Strengthen the policy framework to support a sustainable charcoal value chain in Angola;
- Component 2: Transfer of sustainable charcoal technology to agents along the charcoal value chain;
- Component 3: Strengthening of human capacities and institutions;
- Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation.

The project is implemented in rural areas in the provinces of Huambo and Kwanza Sul, focusing on production, as well as in the urban and peri-urban areas of Luanda, focusing on consumption, along the abovementioned corridor[7]. This six-year project started on September 27, 1st 2016 and is planned to end in December 2022.

4. Findings

4.1. Project strategy

4.1.1. Project design

4.1.1.1 How important is the problem addressed by the project?

[6] More specifically, GEF-5.
[7] The project is working in 5 pilot areas, 3 in Huambo Province and 2 in Kwanza Sul Province, and involves 47 communities.

The project seeks "to reduce the current unsustainable and GHG- intensive mode of charcoal production and utilization from Angola's Miombo woodlands". This is highly relevant. Charcoal is a key sector in Angola. Traditional fuelwood and charcoal are the main energy sources for nearly 80% of the population, and make up 57% of the country's energy consumption. Most of this charcoal is produced in rural areas in the interior of the country and transported to and distributed and consumed in the peri-urban and urban areas of the main coastal cities (Luanda, Benguela). Population growth in peri-urban and urban areas, increasing energy demand and limited access to affordable alternative fuels such liquefied petroleum gas (LPG) have triggered charcoal production in the country. It is estimated that around 100,000 people are involved in the activity of wood collection and charcoal production. In the medium to long term, electrification is likely to advance and a fuel switch to LPG is likely to take place. Both aspects could curb charcoal demand in peri-urban and urban areas. However, charcoal production and consumption are predicted to exponentially increase up to 2030. It is worth noting that there are important opportunities for nationally produced charcoal. Given that the internal charcoal market is not well developed, some companies are importing charcoal from Namibia and South Africa. Due to the acute shortage of foreign currency, the Government of Angola is being protective and dis-encouraging imports. In this context, the government would like the internal production to satisfy the demand for charcoal.

Before the start of the project, the charcoal value chain was very unsustainable. The production of charcoal was significantly unsustainable. When external producers/traders buy the right to produce charcoal from a certain area from the community they cut all type of trees. Rural communities cut trees in great number to produce charcoal. While they differentiate between species that are good for producing charcoal and species that are not and cut only those that are good for that purpose, they cut these trees regardless of their size. Although many Miombo species regenerate quite well and some areas where charcoal had been extracted some years earlier had good regrowth, traditional cutting techniques do not contribute to the regeneration of trees. Traditional charcoal production is leading to deforestation[8], desertification and loss of soils and biodiversity, and thus the loss or reduction of the ecosystem services provided by forests, including regulation, provision, supporting and cultural services. Among other aspects, traditional charcoal production is affecting negatively the quantity and quality of available water and the availability of non-timber forest products, such as forest fruits, honey, mushrooms and medicines. Charcoal production related deforestation also contributes to greenhouse-gas emissions[9] and increases the vulnerability of communities to climate variability and change, for instance to drought and heavy rains. Despite their importance, rural communities tend to disregard the real social, economic and environmental costs of deforestation. Agricultural production is scarce and the alternative use of forests, for example through the use of non-timber forest products, typically

[8] Charcoal production and the expansion of the agriculture frontier act together as the two biggest drivers of deforestation and landscape degradation in the country. Wildlife fires are also an important driver of the loss of forest cover. According to the National Forest Inventory (2017), the annual deforestation rate in Angola is 8.2 per cent.

[9] According to the Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), in 2005, the Land-Use Change and Forestry sector represented 3% of the total emissions of the country.

limited, so there are often no good alternatives to producing charcoal to generate income[10]. Considering forest stocks are free and with low opportunity cost of both the natural resource and labour (productivity of labour is low), for rural households charcoal production is an effective way of getting immediate cash income from natural resources, even though charcoal prices in the villages are very low, the income they get is minimal and the activity probably unprofitable. Rural households produce charcoal especially but not only in the dry, idle season, when subsistence needs are greater. In this sense, traditional charcoal production is a sub-optimal economic growth and job creation activity in rural areas. It is worth noting that small-scale producers are not organized and get very little for the charcoal they produce, traders having significant margins.

The traditional carbonization process is also highly inefficient. Technology and operator skills tend to be very basic and rudimentary. Conversion efficiencies are very low (10% or lower) and process cycles are long (up to 30 days). If the wood is wet or the kiln is improperly operated, there are also significant adverse impacts on health for the producers due to the release of large emissions of methane, smoke particles and volatile organic substances. These also pollute the environment. Impacts on soil tend to be positive in the following years, with higher yields, especially for maize, but lead to degradation in the long term.

Moreover, currently the transport, storage and distribution of charcoal do not contribute to sustainability. A considerable amount of charcoal is lost in these processes. While regulation requires charcoal producers and traders to be licensed by the Institute for Forestry Development (IDF), part of the Ministry of Agriculture and Forestry (MINAGRIF), enforcement mechanisms are weak, given limited technical, human and financial means, and only a small fraction of charcoal production and trade is formalized and compliant with national regulation. Indeed, the charcoal production system is a diffuse, itinerant capital-extensive system built on informal labour. IDF officials are in fact often not very welcome by communities. Furthermore, in urban and peri-urban areas, charcoal is mostly consumed in stoves that are very inefficient and produce significant smoke, with adverse impacts on health. The project document clearly states these elements, clearly explaining the relevance of the problem at the national level.

The project focuses on the Luanda-Huambo corridor, the region covering the main centres of charcoal production and consumption in the country. The biggest city of the country by far, Luanda is a critical centre of charcoal consumption. According to International Energy Agency (IEA) estimates, demand from Luanda requires about 130,000 earth mound pits, consuming wood from 185,000 hectares (ha) of forest area. As in other cities, the storage process and consumption technologies (stoves) are far from being efficient. The Planalto Central is the main production area serving Luanda. This central plateau hosts the subtropical Miombo woodlands, a key natural resource for the development of the country's

[10] The relationship between agriculture and charcoal production is complex. While the limitations of agricultural markets leave charcoal production often as the only option communities have, there are also positive interactions in the sense that the expanding agricultural frontier creates opportunities for charcoal production and charcoal production makes the clearing of forest for agriculture more profitable. Where agriculture/horticulture focuses on irrigated areas in river basins, interest in charcoal decreases.

heartland. Charcoal is mostly produced in this area in the traditional, unsustainable way, regarding both forest management and carbonization technologies, leading to a very high deforestation with the adverse impacts mentioned above. In some areas, such as Cachindongo (in the Huambo Province), charcoal production represents about 80% of household income. The project document clearly justifies the geographic focus of the project.

The project document also presents clearly the barriers to achieve the long-term solution to the problem of unsustainable charcoal value chain in Angola in general and the Luanda-Huambo corridor in particular. The project document identifies information; policy and institutional; technological; capacity (delivery skills and business models); and financial barriers. All of them are relevant. The technological, capacity and financial barriers are mentioned above. It is worth highlighting the information and policy and institutional barriers. Unsustainable charcoal production is linked to the limited availability of key information for decision-making, lack of an adequate policy framework and limited institutional coordination, both at the national level (mostly coordination between MINAMB and MINAGRIF –IDF) and sub-national level (mostly coordination between de-concentrated institutions (at the provincial level) and decentralized institutions (at municipal and communal level)).

4.1.1.2 How effective is the selected strategy to achieve intended results? (Were lessons from previous projects integrated into project design?)

The title suggests the project adopts a value chain approach to address the problem of unsustainable charcoal. Such an approach is a highly effective way of addressing a problem, including unsustainable charcoal.

The project document identifies five steps in the value chain of charcoal: (1) forest management; (2) carbonization; (3) transport, (4) distribution (including warehousing) and retail; and (5) consumption. Despite the title, and a number of references in the project document to a value chain approach in different sections, in paragraph 18 the project document explicitly mentions that the project would focus on steps 2-5, disregarding step 1 for a number of reasons[11]. Indeed, the project document focused considerably on the technological aspects, that is, on steps 2, namely on kilns, and 5, namely on cookstoves. Overlooking forest management, or giving it a subsidiary role, would have been a huge gap.

However, a review of project activities and interviews indicate that the focus of the project was adjusted in the first phases of implementation. A community sustainable forest management component was introduced, while the technology focus was reduced to a certain extent. This seems

[11] In particular, this is proposed "considering that: (i) forest management is outside the scope of the GEF-5 CCM-2 objectives; (ii) it was previously addressed by parallel activities, including the GEF Sustainable Land Management Project (PIMS 3379), various Government programs and NGO-driven initiatives; (iii) it is impacted by systemic barriers, including land tenure and access to forest resources, which reduce the probability to achieve significant impact for a project with a short time horizon; and (iv) studies demonstrate that improved charcoal kilns and energy-efficient stoves are among the most effective measures for preserving forest stocks compared to a business as usual scenario"

reasonable, given the importance of working with communities on how many trees and which trees are cut and how they are cut, and the drivers of these decisions, such as the ownership of natural resources and the understanding of the ecosystems services they provide, including not only provision services (e.g. non-timber forest products), but also regulation services. This adjustment extended the scope of the project and increased the effectiveness of its strategy.

That being said, the project does not seem to cover all the steps in the value chain. So far[12], in the first three years of implementation, the project has focused on step 1. Progress on sustainable forest management has been substantive. Activities in all project sites include raising awareness of communities on the importance of forests and the ecosystem services they provide, to increase ownership; conducting forest inventories; and developing management plans, including which trees to cut and how. In some sites, alternative livelihoods have also been promoted, reducing the pressure to produce charcoal and, in some cases (e.g. non-timber forest products), clearly making the case for using forests sustainably. This increases the opportunity costs of labour and natural resources, and contributes to communities wanting to conserve their forests.

There has also been some work on the step 2, identifying, testing and teaching communities improved carbonization technologies. In combination with proper operator skills and pre-treatment of wood resources, these technologies can boost conversion rates from 10% to up to 25%, implying that the same amount of charcoal is produced with only 40% of the wood inputs. There has also been progress on step 5, on consumption, and to a certain extent step 4, particularly on storage. After considering several options[13], the project has designed a cookstove prototype with local professional schools (Dom Bosco and ADPP) and the University of Cordoba. The selected cookstove is sufficiently simple and cheap to be competitive on the local market but still an improvement over the local stoves - it is around 20 per cent more efficient than the local stove, with a huge improvement in health terms (particles, carbon monoxide). The project has contracted Dom Bosco, ADPP and the universities to provide the training so that the metal workers trained in those schools can produce this type of cookstove and put it on the informal market. There has also been some progress in the identification of briquetting machines, although whether they are economically viable is yet to be tested. More work is planned on these two steps during the remaining of implementation, particularly on the production of energy efficient cook stoves and the introduction of briquetting machines to produce charcoal briquettes from the charcoal that is lost during the storage phase, although alternative uses of the latter, such as making organic fertilizer out of charcoal dust, may also be considered.

However, there is room for improvement regarding step 3 on transport and key elements of step 4, regarding distribution and retail, for sustainable or more sustainable charcoal, energy efficient

[12] This section does not aim to provide a detailed assessment of the progress made by the project. This is discussed in detail in section 4.2.1. This section discusses the effectiveness of the strategy and considers progress on different elements only with the aim of assessing the comprehensiveness of the project strategy.
[13] The project considered importing improved cookstoves, such as the Gika, and putting them on the Angolan market. This option was discarded because of the intention to focus on local production of cookstoves also as a means to create jobs (even if informal ones) and because the cookstoves on offer in Angola are too cheap for imported products to compete with them.

cookstoves and to a lesser extent briquetting machines and briquettes. These elements are key parts of the value chain. While it does make sense to focus first on the production side, as sustainable charcoal can only be commercialized if it is produced in the first place, it is certainly important to find and strengthen channels for the charcoal produced in a more sustainable way to reach the market and be used in the improved cookstoves. This is indeed the whole logic of the value chain approach. Similarly, whereas certainly the aim of the project is not to increase the market for charcoal, the aim is to increase the market for sustainable charcoal in detriment of the charcoal produced in a less sustainable way. This is certainly complex, to begin with because the charcoal produced by the project is more sustainable rather than sustainable, but an important element. Regarding energy efficient cookstoves, as noted above, the project has identified the technology and the production mechanism. It has also identified the commercialization channel – the metal worker students of Dom Bosco and ADPP who will build the improved cookstoves will also sell them directly in informal markets. The focus on informal markets makes sense given that the cookstove market is highly informal. There is room however for further detailing the commercialization strategy, for instance, on how exactly will the students put the improved cookstoves on the informal market and what the relationship with existing traders, if any, will be. Although the cookstove market remains highly informal, it would also be good to have some ideas on how to commercialize the improved cookstoves on the formal market. This is important, as the adoption of improved cookstoves is challenging in most developing countries, given the increased availability of alternative fuels, particularly LPG, and cultural aspects. Commercialization is less important on briquetting machines and briquettes at the moment, since testing of technologies has not finalized, but will be an important element whatever the chosen option is (briquettes or organic fertilizer). Steps 3 and 4 are particularly complex, but critical for the impact of the project regarding both production and consumption of charcoal.

The effectiveness of the strategy to address the problem should also be assessed regarding how comprehensive it is in terms of dimensions or type of barriers it tries to overcome. This project has a comprehensive approach, as it seeks to contribute to overcome barriers related to information (component 1)[14], policies (component 1), institutional arrangements (component 1) and technical capacities of government officials (component 3), in addition to working with charcoal producers in rural areas (added to component 2) and charcoal users in urban and peri-urban areas (component 3), although the latter to a lesser extent. The comprehensiveness of the strategy makes it very efficient to address the identified problem. That being said, the extent to which some of these aspects are covered in the project is insufficient. As discussed in section 4.3.5.1, there is room for improvement in the information aspect, documenting the work conducted by the project in terms of the savings produced by the promoted technologies and the use of forests by the project itself. In this sense, land change caused by charcoal production in the project areas is not being monitored. Charcoal production and trade is also not monitored. In contrast, it is worth highlighting that the project strategy is smart in addressing some of the barriers, particularly at the institutional level given mandates in the country. While the MINAMB, which is the focal point for GEF, implements the project, the mandate over forests rests in MINAGRIF. In this context, a sustainable charcoal policy or strategy has to be developed and

[14] This includes amongst other aspects an estimation of GHG emissions from charcoal production.

championed by MINAGRIF, not by MINAMB, which is difficult for the project to ensure. To facilitate the process, the development of a white book is proposed as a way of involving MINAGRIF and IDF and encouraging them to draft their sustainable charcoal policy or strategy based on the white book, offering project support for this. In addition, the project combines a bottom-up and top-down approach, working simultaneously with communities and at the policy level.

The effectiveness of the strategy to address the problem should also be assessed regarding the involvement of key stakeholders. This is discussed in detail in section 4.3.6.1. In summary, the project involves most relevant stakeholders, with significant room for improvement regarding the involvement of MINAGRIF-IDF and other ministries at political level, municipal and communal administrations, and those in charge of transport, storage and retail of charcoal in the value chain, as well as end-consumers.

The project document shows that lessons from the Project Preparation Grant (PPG) were factored in the development of the full project document[15]. It also mentions that "Under the SE4All Global Initiative, a gap analysis on energy was completed in 2015 for Angola which includes recommendations for efficient charcoal production and utilization. The present GEF project is aligned with the recommendations on charcoal given in that report, specifically database development, efficient charcoal production kilns, efficient stoves, and awareness-building". While the project document itself does not provide clear evidence of lessons from other national or international projects being considered when designing the Angola charcoal project, the PPG files include project reports from other countries so these have most likely been taken into consideration during project design. During the inception phase, the project team talked to people involved in charcoal and cookstove projects in a number of countries, including Haiti, Mali, Mozambique and Namibia. Baseline studies that surveyed regional experiences on cookstoves and briquetting were also commissioned during implementation.

4.1.1.3 To what extent is the project responding to the national priorities and context?

The relevance of the problem addressed by the project has already been discussed in section 4.1.1.1 above. It is worth noting that the project is aligned with key national policies and strategies. In particular, the project is in tune with Angola's National Development Plan (NDP) 2013-2017, contributing to two of the four priority clusters (the ones on energy, and food production and agro-industries). The project is also in harmony with National Afforestation and Reforestation Strategy (2010) and the National Action Programme to fight Desertification (2014). Moreover, the project is congruous with the Intended Nationally Determined Contribution (INDC) to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC). Reforestation and arguably forest conservation and restoration are one of the two sectors prioritized by Angola for its contribution to climate change mitigation. According to the INDC, avoiding deforestation, alone, has the potential to contribute to

[15] The project document indicates that limited individual and institutional capacities affected the smooth implementation of the PPG phase. To overcome this, the project document (1) increased attention on human resource development through a dedicated Outcome 3; (2) introduced a senior Technical Advisor as Project Team member; (3) allocated resources for expert technical assistance for pilot implementation; and (4) strengthened reporting mechanisms and accountability through Responsible Parties.

more than 35 million tons in CO_2 emission reductions every year in the country. In this context, through its INDC, Angola committed to increase carbon sequestration from the forestry sector from 3 million tons of CO_{2e} in 2005 to 5 million tons of CO_{2e} per year by 2030. The INDC also identifies forests as one of the sectors most affected by climate change. In this sense, the INDC highlights the importance of improving forest management.

That being said, as noted, the project aims to fill a gap on the policy framework, which does not fully recognize the importance of a sustainable charcoal value chain. As noted in the project document, traditional biomass as such is not covered by the national energy policy, such as the Action Plan for the Energy and Water Sector 2013-2017.

4.1.1.4 In your opinion, were all people affected or concerned by the project consulted during project design?

The project document does not document which stakeholders were consulted during the design of the project. Most of the stakeholders currently engaged with the project, and consulted during the MTR, did not participate in the design phase. Interviews suggest all affected and concerned people were consulted during project design. Importantly, project design included the organization of an inception workshop within 4 months after project commencement with all key stakeholders. The aim of this workshop was to help stakeholders to better understand the objectives, the technical and administrative aspects of project management, the work plan, and project activities. The Inception Workshop was held on October 28, 2016. 43 people from different key institutions attended it. Section 4.3.6.1 analyses the involvement of stakeholders during project implementation.

4.1.1.5 To what extent are gender issues taken into account during project design and implementation?

The project document analyses in a rather general way the different roles that women and men play along the charcoal value chain. Linked to the original focus of the project, the analysis is more detailed for the steps 2-5 of the value chain, with little information on step 1 on forest management. The absence of a detailed gender analysis is in part explained by the systemic lack of socio-economic data, let alone gender-disaggregated data, in the geographic focus of the project, the Luanda-Huambo corridor.

Nevertheless, the project document provides useful information. It argues that tree felling, charcoal production and transport is male-dominated. Distribution and retail in urban and peri-urban areas is differentiated according to location and purchase power of consumers. Formalized supermarkets serve the wealthier consumers, a market that is male-dominated. Women dominate the market serving low-income households, typically through street vending of small packages at high unit price. This market is informal, with minimum standards in terms of safety, labour conditions and environmental externalities, and limited income level, which make women very vulnerable. This structure points out to the difficulty for women of controlling capital assets, and accessing external finance and professional

training, which pushes them to informal occupations, often related to trading. Authorities involved in charcoal also tend to be men. Women retailers source the charcoal directly from their communities of origin and trade partly develops along family ties. They store charcoal themselves. Women combine work outside the house with the traditional care for children and elderly. On the consumption side, women are traditionally responsible for cooking and thus are the main users of cookstoves and the most exposed to indoor air pollution. It is worth noting that men tend to dominate the value chain of products related to charcoal, such as companies related to kilns and cookstoves.

The project document highlights that these systemic elements may compromise the ability of the project to contribute significantly to gender equity, economic and social benefits not reaching the most vulnerable stakeholders, particularly rural women.

To mitigate this key risk, the project document refers to a gender analysis to be conducted in the first year of implementation (outputs 1.1 on baseline studies and 4.1 on designing and implementing a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) plan). This analysis was expected to facilitate gender mainstreaming throughout project implementation, to ensure a gender-neutral or gender-positive approach. Budget was allocated for this. Besides, the project document refers to management-related activities. In particular, on annual project monitoring, performance on gender-specific criteria would be assessed and recommendations for corrective action would be made, as and if appropriate. It is worth noting that this is far from providing a detailed action plan. This is any case reasonable in the absence of a detailed gender assessment. The Strategic Results Framework (SRF) for the project includes gender-differentiated indicators when applicable. The UNDP social and environmental screening template was completed.

During implementation, as planned, a detailed gender assessment was conducted. Recommendations were also provided[16]. The assessment was a bit late, but again this is reasonable as the project had to build first a relationship with the communities participating in the project.

Available evidence suggests the project is contributing to gender equality. The addition of the forest management component has been critical on this. Although the participation of women in community consultation was rather low at the beginning of the project, they are participating more and being more active more recently, in part as a result of taking into consideration women's time, as they are also in charge of domestic work and taking care of children. Women are also participating in key project activities, such as nurseries and carbonization. Importantly, they participate in the groups promoted by the project as community leaders on forestry. These groups have an equal participation of women and men. In some villages, the project has promoted alphabetization, empowering women, as their low levels of education has been identified as one of the main challenges in terms of their involvement. In some villages alternative livelihoods are being promoted. Women are playing a central role in most of these livelihoods, such as gardening, forest fruits, honey and mushrooms. In rural areas, women benefit

[16] 1) establish participatory/equitable spaces in the communities; 2) create a community space for women only; 3) increase female literacy; 4) take into consideration women's time for the project's activities.

equally to men on the environmental benefits of increased ecosystem services. Although there has not been much progress yet on the consumption side, women in urban and peri-urban areas will particularly benefit from improved cookstoves in terms of more time, more disposable income and a reduction on indoor air pollution. Moreover, women will particularly benefit from the promotion of briquetting, as they will be able to use charcoal dust and earn an extra income from that. It is worth noting however that there is an important gap as, apart from briquetting, the work of the project on the transport and distribution and retail of charcoal is weak and it is unclear how the gender aspects mentioned above will be addressed.

Overall, the contribution of the project to a fair, or at least fairer, sharing of resources and benefits by both women and men along the chain is satisfactory, with room for improvement on the market side.

4.1.1.5 To what extent are human rights taken into account during project design and implementation?

The project document indicates how the project mainstreams the human rights based approach. This is done as part of the completion of the UNDP Environmental and Social Screening Template. Otherwise, human rights are not prominent in the analysis of the context or the impacts of project activities. That being said, project activities do promote human rights in four ways. The most important contribution to human rights is the protection of access to land and resources, in this case natural resources and more specifically forests. In rural areas, households tend to lack a formal property title over land. Interviews suggest that with the oil crisis many urban Angolans have gained interest on land, and a lot of land grabbing is taking place. While the project is not providing any formal individual property titles, interviews suggest that the sustainable forest management plans developed through the project protect the rights of participating communities to access and use these forests. These plans safeguard the rights of these communities over land and ensure nobody is going to violate them, including through concessions. In addition, the project promotes the right to equal participation, engaging women and men, as well as stakeholders of different ages, with no discrimination. Moreover, the project focuses on poor households both in rural and peri-urban settings, seeking to deliver environmental, social and economic benefits to them, including improved access to basic energy services, increased income, increased food security and better health. Besides, the project promotes labour rights to a certain extent. One of the criteria prioritized to define sustainable charcoal is not having child-labour. There could be room to further consider labour related rights along the value chain. There is also room for more detailed monitoring and reporting on human rights. Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) have a section on social and environmental standards. No social risks are identified in the PIRs that have been completed, despite land grabbing being a concern.

4.1.2. Results framework

4.1.2.1 How clear, practical and feasible are project's objectives, components, outcomes and outputs?

Table 4 presents the project objective, outcomes and activities. The objective is clear and feasible. The project outcomes would clearly contribute to achieve the objective, by working in the policy, technology, knowledge and institutional aspects. The project outcomes are mostly clear and feasible, although the human capacity element of outcome 3 is unclear and, depending on the interpretation, unfeasible – it is feasible if it refers to technical capacities of individuals, and unfeasible if it refers to the number of officials in public institutions.

The definition of activities has important deficits. The formulation of some activities (1.2, 2.4, 3.1) is vague. In some activities (2.1, 2.2) some previous activities are missing, in particular the identification of the technologies the project seeks to introduce. In many cases (1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5) it would be good to disaggregate the activities in sub-activities. There is also duplication between a large number of activities: 1.5 and 2.6, 2.1 and the first part of 2.3 and 2.6, the second parts of 2.2 and 2.6, and 3.1 and 3.3. In this sense, the same activities are allocated to different outcomes. At the same time, some important activities on outcome 3, later implemented in the field, in some of the sites, are not included, namely the development of land use plans, inventories and management plans, the creation and maintenance of nurseries, the plantation of trees, and the identification and promotion of alternative income generating activities. Indeed, as noted above for the strategy, the technology element is a bit overrepresented and the forest governance element underrepresented[17].

[17] Steps 3 and 4 of the value chain (transport and distribution and retail) are embedded in both the activities and the results framework. The gap in this regard refers more to project implementation than to project design, which is partly related to the shift on the focus of the project during implementation, mentioned in section 4.1.1.2.

Table 4. Project objective, outcomes and activities

Objective	Outcomes	Activities
To reduce the current unsustainable and GHG-intensive mode of charcoal production and utilization from Angola's Miombo woodlands via an integrated set of interventions in the national charcoal value chain	Outcome 1. The policy framework to support a sustainable charcoal value chain in Angola has been strengthened	1.1. Baseline information updated and completed covering energy, forestry, economic, environmental, social, and gender aspects of the charcoal value chain
		1.2. Inter-institutional coordination enhanced to strengthen governance of charcoal sector
		1.3. Preparation and endorsement of a national white paper on sustainable charcoal production
		1.4. Design of a certification scheme for sustainable charcoal including a mechanism for monitoring, reporting and verification (MRV) of charcoal production, distribution and commercialization
		1.5. Incorporation of certified, sustainable charcoal and fuel-efficient stoves into national poverty reduction and rural development programs under application of MRV mechanism
		1.6. National conference and field visits implemented for key stakeholders to discuss and disseminate results and prospects for sustainable charcoal in Angola and region
	Outcome 2. The benefits of sustainable charcoal production technology, briquetting and energy-efficient charcoal stoves, have been accepted by producers and peri-urban consumers	2.1. Demonstration and introduction of improved charcoal kilns among selected rural communities in the Huambo-Luanda corridor
		2.2. Demonstration and introduction of energy-efficient technologies (briquetting and efficient stoves) in selected peri-urban municipalities of Luanda
		2.3. Integration of improved charcoal production technology in sustainable forest management and rural development initiatives in communities in the Huambo-Luanda corridor
		2.4. Targeted technical assistance and equipment to support charcoal pilots and enhance facilities of project partners
		2.5. Detailed documentation and systematization of project experiences, and generation of recommendations for policy development, and design of financing production and business models
		2.6 Introduction of energy-efficient charcoal kilns in selected rural communities, and of briquetting technology in selected peri-urban areas, on a cost-sharing basis
		2.7. Dissemination of certified charcoal and energy-efficient charcoal stoves among low-income households through government poverty reduction and/or market development programs
	Outcome 3.	3.1. Technical assistance and capacity building activities for IDF in Huambo Province.

	Institutional and human capacities for sustainable charcoal production and utilization have been strengthened through partnerships for knowledge transfer and professional training	3.2. Design and implementation of a training program and extension work on efficient charcoal production for student teachers and community workers
		3.3. Training activities conducted for relevant government staff on sustainable charcoal production, charcoal policy, financing and monitoring, verification and reporting systems
		3.4 Training activities targeting professional charcoal retailers in peri-urban markets on the establishment of sustainable charcoal supply chains, and technical assistance for briquetting micro-enterprise development
Monitoring and Evaluation	The Monitoring & Evaluation plan for the Project has been implemented	4.1. Design and implementation of a Monitoring and Evaluation plan, including reporting on progress indicators and targets
		4.2. Implementation and reporting of Mid-term Review and Terminal Evaluation
		4.3. Execution of project audits

4.1.2.2 How effective are the logframe's indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification to measure effects from the project?

The indicators, baselines and targets are to a great extent quantitative: 10 of the 15 indicators in the SRF are quantitative. This is particularly the case at the objective level (5 out of 6) and for outcomes 2, on technology (the 3 existing indicators) and 3, on knowledge (the 2 existing indicators). Quantitative indicators include achieved direct and indirect GHG emissions reductions (Aa and Ab); number of people with improved energy access (that is, with access to improved cookstoves), including percentage of female-headed households (Ba and Bb); average monetary savings by households using sustainable charcoal in efficient stoves (Bc); number of improved charcoal kilns and briquetting machines effectively in use (2a); annual volume of certified, sustainable charcoal delivered to consumers (2b); number of energy-efficient charcoal stoves delivered to peri-urban consumers (2c); number of persons skilled (3a); and number of partnerships (3b). While it does make some sense to include quantitative indicators, not only is it difficult for a development project like this one to measure most of the quantitative impacts considered in the SRF (Aa, Ab, Ba, Bb, Bc), some of them (Ab) referring to impacts only in the post-project influence period, but some of the targets (Ba, Bb, Bc)[18] seem too ambitious given the time and budget allocated to the project, the institutional challenges in developing countries and the complexity of value chains in general, and the charcoal value chain in particular, especially on the production side, with poor communities engaged in unsustainable use of forests. As noted, during implementation the focus of the project was slightly shifted to better consider the barriers on the production side, at the expense of the commercialization and consumption sides. While this shift compromises the achievement of most quantitative targets, it is probably more realistic in terms of overcoming existing barriers for a sustainable change. In this sense, the project's logframe's indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification are not fully effective to measure the effects of the project. Section 4.3.4.1 on M&E discusses more specific elements on the indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification of the SRF of the project.

[18] Without a baseline it is not possible to assess how ambitious targets Aa and Ab are.

With its great focus on technology aspects, the results framework does not include important development and environmental impacts of the project. Regarding development aspects, the SRF does not consider impacts on health and social capital and has a limited approach to the contribution of the project to poverty reduction, considering only savings from improved cookstoves. Regarding the environment, the SRF considers the reduction of GHG emissions, but does not consider other important aspects related to the sustainable use of forests, from contribution to reduce soil erosion to conserve biodiversity. From the GEF point of view the absence of these elements in the results frameworks is consistent with the fact that the project was approved as a standalone climate change project. The absence of these elements also has to do with the approach of the project. A more comprehensive approach, including among other income generating activities, would have better addressed the problem, and would have required reflecting at least the development aspects in the results framework. From the project perspective and its implementation and executing partners perspective it would have made sense to complement the GEF results framework with some additional indicators on land degradation and biodiversity-related benefits, or consider them at least through other monitoring and reporting tools, such as the Project Implementation Reports (PIRs).

4.2. Progress towards results

4.2.1. To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved so far?

There are at least three ways of assessing the progress of a project. One option is to assess its progress in achieving the targets included in its results framework. Within this option, there are two options when the results framework includes both mid-term and end-of-project targets. One option is to assess the achievement of mid-term targets by mid term. Another option is to assess the likelihood at mid-term of achieving end-of-project targets by the end of the project. These are two different criteria: a project may not achieve its mid-term targets at mid-term and likely achieve its end-of-project targets by the end of the project; or vice versa. The nature of the assessment is also substantially different: assessing achievement of mid-term target by mid-term is a factual, more objective analysis; assessing the likelihood of achievement of end-of-project targets by the end of the project at mid-term is a more speculative, subjective and uncertain exercise. Besides these two options, both considering the targets included in the results framework, a third option is to assess the importance of the results of the project. This is also a different assessment criterion: a project can have very important impacts and be far from achieving planned targets, if targets are very ambitious or do not reflect the actual activities and impacts of the project. Although less likely, a project can have little impact and be close to achieving planned targets, if these are not ambitious enough. This review considers the three assessment options.

The results framework of this project includes 6 objective level indicators[19] and 9 outcome level indicators. As noted in section 4.3.4.1 on M&E, there are issues with some of these indicators. Progress on four objective level indicators (Aa, Ab, Bb and Bc) cannot be assessed.

The assessment will first consider the likelihood of achieving end-of-project targets by end of the project, with the information available at mid-term. From that perspective, as of 31 October 2019, progress is moderately satisfactory in achieving the target of one indicator, and moderately unsatisfactory in the other objective level indicator. At outcome level, progress has been satisfactory in 7 indicators and unsatisfactory in 2 indicators. More specifically, progress has been highly satisfactory in 2 indicators, satisfactory in 3 indicators, moderately satisfactory in 2 indicators and moderately unsatisfactory in 2 indicators. Overall, therefore, this project will likely achieve its planned end-of-project targets, with some important shortcomings

It is also important to consider the achievement of mid-term targets by mid-term. As of 31 October 2019, the mid-term targets at objective level have not been met. At outcome level, two mid-term targets (2b and 4b) do not add value. Of the other 7 mid-term targets, the project has met 3 (3a, 3b, 4a) by mid-term, and has not achieved 4 (1a, 1b, 2a, 2c) by that period. Overall, therefore, this project is far from achieving its mid-term targets. Table 5 provides the details, including the justification for ratings, which consider the likelihood of achieving end-of-project targets by the end of the project. A number of reasons explain difficulties to achieving mid-term targets at mid-term: a modification in the approach (see section 4.1.1.2), some very ambitious targets (see section 4.1.2.2), barriers to implementation (see section 4.2.2) and some gaps in project management (see section 4.3.1.1).

[19] The text refers to sets of indicator, baseline, targets and means of verification. To improve the flow of the text, the term indicator is used to refer to this whole set.

Table 5. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of Outcomes against End-of-Project Targets)

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Mid-term level (level at 31 October 2019) (Assessment and justification of rating)	Achievement Rating
Objective: To reduce the current unsustainable and GHG-intensive mode of charcoal production and utilization from Angola's Miombo woodlands via an integrated set of interventions in the national charcoal value chain	(Aa) Achieved direct GHG emission reductions over lifetime (ton CO2eq);	Aa) 0 ton CO2eq;	Aa) 0 ton CO2eq;	(Aa) 209k ton CO2eq;	Unknown – Overall, it can be argued that the project is contributing to a more sustainable use of forests, leading to reduced deforestation and therefore GHG emissions reductions. As of 31 October 2019, it is not possible to confirm this contribution, let alone quantify it, as the carbon emission baseline is under implementation and has not been completed and the use of forests is not closely monitored to assess the carbon emissions impacts of the project. Given that mid-term targets are 0, it can be assumed that those targets have been exceed by mid-term. For the reasons mentioned above, it is not possible to assess whether the project is on track to achieve these end-of-project targets.	-
	(Ab) Estimated indirect GHG emission reductions over lifetime (ton CO2eq);	(Ab) 0 ton CO2eq;	(Ab) 0 ton CO2eq;	(Ab) 1.2 M ton CO2eq		-
	(Ba) Number of people with improved energy access as a result of UNDP-supported intervention.	Ba) 0	(Ba) 200	Ba) 10,000	The project has made progress on preparatory activities, such as the identification of improved cookstoves. It has also defined a scheme for producing them. There is also a rather broad commercialization strategy. At mid-term, the mid-term target has not been met, as nobody has accessed improved cookstoves as a result of the project. Given production beyond testing and commercialization have not started, and therefore tested, it is difficult to assess the likelihood of achieving the end-of-project target. While the national presence of Dom Bosco and ADPP will help commercialize improved cookstoves, the quantitative target seems difficult to meet by the end of the project.	MU
	(Bb) Percentage of	(Bb) 25%	(Bb) 50%	(Bb) 50%	This indicator cannot be assessed as nobody has	-

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Mid-term level (level at 31 October 2019) (Assessment and justification of rating)	Achievement Rating
	households benefitting from improved access to energy which are female- headed households				accessed improved cookstoves as a result of the project and there is no information to project the percentage of female-headed households that will benefit from the project in that aspect.	
	(Bc) Average monetary savings by households using sustainable charcoal in efficient stoves (US$/(household–year).	(Bc) 0 US$/(hh-y)	(Bc) 100 US$/hh-y)	(Bc) 100 US$/hh-y)	As noted above, at mid-term nobody has accessed the cookstoves identified by the project as a result of it. The project does not seem to have a structure to monitor savings of households benefiting from cookstoves accessed as a result of the project. In this sense, at mid-term, the mid-term target has not been achieved. The cookstove promoted by the project increases efficiency in 20 per cent, but it is not possible to assess the likelihood of achieving the end-of-project target by the end of the project.	-
	(C) Policy and regulatory framework for sustainable charcoal sector supported.	C) Rated "1" (no policy/regulation/ strategy in place)	Rated "2" (policy/ regulation/strategy discussed and proposed)	Rated "4" (policy/ regulation/strategy adopted but not enforced)	The project considers three main steps regarding the policy and regulatory framework: i) development of 5 studies[20]; ii) development of a white book; and iii) development of a policy, which in turn would include drafting, discussing, adopting and enforcing it. As of 31 October 2019, the project has completed 4 of the 5 studies[21] and launched the procurement process for the development of the white book. A contract has not been awarded and the development of the white	MS

[20] 1) Gender strategy and monitoring and evaluation plan for charcoal production; 2) Development of sustainable criteria for sustainable charcoal production; 3) Commercialization and opportunities of charcoal production; 4) Strategy to incorporate sustainable charcoal and improved stoves into poverty reduction programs in the country; 5) baseline GHG emissions derived from deforestation, forest degradation and land use change.

[21] In particular the following studies have been completed: 1) Gender strategy and monitoring and evaluation plan for charcoal production; 2) Development of sustainable criteria for sustainable charcoal production; 3) Commercialization and opportunities of charcoal production; 4) Strategy to incorporate sustainable charcoal and improved stoves into poverty reduction programs in the country.

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Mid-term level (level at 31 October 2019) (Assessment and justification of rating)	Achievement Rating
					book has not started. The policy has been replaced by a strategy, for good reasons. At mid-term the mid-term target has not been met. It is difficult to say whether the end-of-project target will be met by the end of the project. Given that the process has been agreed with IDF leadership, it is likely that the strategy is adopted by the end of the project. Its enforcement seems less likely given the difficulty to enforce this type of strategies.	
Objective level overall rating					Available data does not allow assessing progress in four of the six objective level indicators. As of 31 October 2019, in the other two, by mid-term, the mid-term targets have not been met. It is difficult to assess the likelihood of achieving the end-of-project targets by the end of the project. Available evidence suggests the quantitative targets in one indicator will not be met, probably by far; in the other indicator the target will likely be achieved with significant shortcomings (a strategy would be adopted but not enforced).	**MS**
Outcome 1: The policy framework to support a sustainable charcoal value chain in Angola, has been strengthened	(1a) white paper on sustainable charcoal, endorsed by Government (-);	1a) no concept for white paper (0);	1a) concept for white paper presented (0);	1a) white paper completed and endorsed (1);	As noted above, 4 of the 5 planned studies have been completed. These studies will feed the white paper. The definition of the sustainable charcoal criteria is particularly relevant. The procurement process for the white paper has been launched. However, the development of the white paper has not started. In this sense, at mid-term the mid-term target has not been met. Given its collaborative and consultative nature, the development of the white paper will be a rather long process. It will likely take some time until the concept for the white paper is presented.	S

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Mid-term level (level at 31 October 2019) (Assessment and justification of rating)	Achievement Rating
					Completion and endorsement will likely take also considerable time. However, given the agreement with leadership at IDF, the end-of-project target is likely to be achieved by the end of the project, without major shortcomings. Nevertheless, it is too early to say whether this could be considered a good practice.	
	(1b) no certification and no MRV mechanism designed nor implemented (0,0);	1b) no certification and no MRV mechanism designed nor implemented (0,0);	1b) certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal production chain designed (1,0);	1b) certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal designed and implemented in government programs (1,2)	The project has defined the sustainable charcoal criteria. An institution has been contracted to identify key points in the charcoal value chain where incentive and control mechanisms need to be implemented for the adoption of such criteria. These steps are important. Nevertheless, they are far from resulting in the design and implementation of a certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal. At mid-term the mid-term target has not been met, and, given the change in the approach, it is unlikely that the project will meet its end-of-project target by the end of the project.	MU
Outcome 1 overall rating					One indicator has HS and the other one MU. An overall MS can be given.	**MS**
W	(2a) Number of improved charcoal kilns and briquetting machined effectively in use;	(2a) No improved charcoal kilns (0), nor briquetting machines in use (0)	(2a) 18 improved kilns and 3 briquetting machines	(2a) 270 improved kilns and 10 briquetting machines;	The project has identified improved kilns and trained 423 charcoal producers on how to produce and use these kilns. Available data suggests that as of 31 October 2019 the project has produced 12 kilns (COSPE and ADPP 6 each). It is worth noting that the kilns and some of the materials used (chimneys, barrels) have a specific lifespan[22]. It is not clear how the use of improved kilns will be scaled up, beyond the training element.	MS

[22] This indicator is not SMART. See section 4.3.4.1 for details on this.

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Mid-term level (level at 31 October 2019) (Assessment and justification of rating)	Achievement Rating
					The project has identified briquetting machines. The strategy to disseminate them has not been defined, or implemented. At mid-term the project has not met the mid-term targets. It is too early to assess adoption of kilns. While communities have learned the benefits and how to produce them, the quantitative end-of-project targets may be difficult to achieve by the end of the project.	
	2b) Annual volume of certified, sustainable charcoal delivered to consumers (ton/yr);	2b) No certified, sustainable charcoal delivered (0 ton.yr);	(2b) No certified, sustainable charcoal delivered (0 ton.yr)	2b) 3,024 ton/yr certified, sustainable charcoal delivered per year	As noted for 1b, the design and implementation of a certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal is not close. The project has not defined a strategy to commercialize charcoal produced in a more sustainable way. The project has not conducted a baseline of how much charcoal the selected villages produce, so it is not possible to assess how close the project is from achieving the quantitative target even considering "charcoal produced by project beneficiaries in line with the sustainable charcoal criteria" instead of "certified charcoal delivered".	MU
	2c) Number of energy-efficient (EE) charcoal stoves delivered to peri-urban consumers (-).	2d) No EE charcoal stoves delivered (0);	(2c) 3,000 EE charcoal stoves delivered	(2c) 10,000 EE charcoal stoves delivered.	The project has identified EE charcoal stoves. It has also defined a scheme for producing them. There is also a rather broad commercialization strategy. At mid-term, the mid-term target has not been met, as improved cookstoves have not been delivered as a result of the project. Given production beyond testing and commercialization have not started, and therefore tested, it is difficult to assess the likelihood of achieving the end-of-project target. While the national presence of Dom Bosco and ADPP will help commercialize improved cookstoves, the quantitative target seems difficult to meet by the end of the	MS

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Mid-term level (level at 31 October 2019) (Assessment and justification of rating)	Achievement Rating
					project	
Outcome 2 overall rating					Two of three indicators have a moderately satisfactory rating, and one moderately unsatisfactory rating.	**MS**
Outcome 3. Institutional and human capacities for sustainable charcoal production and utilization have been strengthened through partnerships for knowledge transfer and professional training	(3a) Number of persons skilled in sustainable forest management and charcoal technology (male, female);	(3a) No persons skilled in charcoal technology (0 male, 0 female)	(3a) 40 persons skilled (20 male; 20 female)	(3a) 150 persons skilled (75 male; 75 female)	As of 31 October 2019, the project has trained 2,120 people (1,429 men, 691 women)[23]. Assuming trainings have raised skills of trainees, the end of the project target has been exceeded. Additional individuals will be trained.	HS
	(3b) Number of partnerships strengthened and active	(3b) 1 partnership in place	(3b) 2 active partnerships	(3b) 3 active partnerships	As of 31 October 2019, the project has four partnerships. A fifth one is being developed[24].	HS
Outcome 3 overall rating					The two indicators have highly satisfactory ratings	**HS**
Outcome 4. The	(4a) Mid-term review (1) and follow-up on	4a) No Mid-term Review (0)	4a) Mid-term Review	4a) Follow-up on MTR	At mid-term the MTR is completed.	S

[23] Trainings involve community members and IDF officials. As of 31 October 2019, the project had trained 41 communities, with 2,012 people (1,348 male and 664 women). It has also trained 108 IDF officials (81 male, 27 female).

[24] This assessment assumes implementers are partners. As of 31 October 2019, there were the following partnerships: MINAM - IDF, the project – University of Cordoba (UCO) – University Jose Eduardo dos Santos (UJES), the project - Cooperation for the Development of Emerging Countries (COSPE by its initials in Italian), the project - Development Aid from the People for the People (ADPP by its initials in Portuguese). The project was developing a partnership with ADPP and professional schools Dom Bosco.

Project strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Mid-term level (level at 31 October 2019) (Assessment and justification of rating)	Achievement Rating
Monitoring & Evaluation plan for the Project has been implemented	recommendations (1) on gender mainstreaming and sustainability of project results	and no recommendations (0)	completed (1)	recommendations completed (1)		
	(4b) Terminal Evaluation document (-)	(4a) No Terminal Evaluation (0).	(4a) No Terminal Evaluation (0).	(4b) Terminal Evaluation completed (1)	As expected, at mid-term the terminal evaluation is not completed. Arguably this will be completed at the end of the project.	S
Outcome 4 overall rating					The rating for the two indicators is satisfactory	**S**

In this context, it is worth assessing the impacts of the project in a more narrative way, indicating what has been done, what benefits have been provided and what is missing in the plan as of 31 October 2019. On outcome 1, on strengthening the policy framework, the project has completed very relevant studies, including the definition of the sustainable charcoal criteria, although an important study on GHG emissions is under implementation and has not been completed. The inventories conducted by the three implementers in target communities also provide valuable information. The procurement process for the white book has been launched. However, the development of the white paper has not started. Its drafting, completion and endorsement may take time. Also the development and approval of a sustainable charcoal policy will not be straightforward from an endorsed white paper. The process has however been recently agreed with IDF leadership, which is key to ensure ownership of both the white book and the sustainable charcoal strategy, which will be developed relatively in parallel. The ToR for the development of the strategy will be launched soon. The certification target is being reconsidered, given that this would make sustainable charcoal very expensive and would not cover the whole market. Instead an improved system of licencing is favoured. The project has made important steps for promoting the inclusion of more sustainable charcoal along the value chain, particularly through the definition of the sustainable charcoal criteria. The work of Cooperation for the Development of Emerging Countries (COSPE by its initials in Italian) on identifying key points in the value chain where incentive and control mechanisms need to be implemented for the adoption of such criteria, now starting, will also add value. As of 31 October 2019, it is however unclear which these points will be and what the impact of the project can be on commercialization of sustainable charcoal, even if formal certification is excluded and licensing is rather promoted. The project will design an MRV system on GHG emissions from forestry and land use change (LULUCF).

On outcome 2, on the adoption of improved kilns and cookstoves and briquetting machines, the project has identified technologies in the three fronts. The identified kilns and cookstoves are more efficient, thus requiring less materials (less time to get wood and produce charcoal, less time to get charcoal and cook, with more time for other economic and non-economic activities, and more disposable income). They also improve health. In fact, the numbers for reduction of particles and CO from the improved stove are much more impressive than those for energy savings although the latter are also significant. Given the low price of charcoal, it may indeed be more convincing to advertising them as health cookstoves with climate benefits than advertising them as climate stoves with health benefits. On kilns, a significant number of charcoal producers have been trained on how to produce and use them. The project has also trained on this a number of IDF technicians who will provide extension services to communities, and primary school teachers who will take these techniques to the communities where they will be posted. It has also worked with NGOs that will upscale these achievements in other projects. All these impacts are very relevant. However, beyond training, there is not a clear scaling up strategy for kilns, ensuring the materials needed for these kilns will be readily available to charcoal producers. Regarding energy efficient cookstoves, as noted above, the project has identified the technology and the production mechanism. It has also identified the commercialization channel,

although there is room for further detailing it. Some further testing is needed on briquetting machines, which are working well in countries such as Uganda and Zambia[25]. Alternative uses of charcoal dust, namely organic fertilizer, are also being considered. Adoption of these technologies, let alone achieving the quantitative targets included in the SRF, could be challenging, given the increased availability of alternative fuels, particularly LPG, and cultural aspects. Achieving numbers on delivery of certified sustainable charcoal brings the certification problem mentioned above. The project promotes a licencing system that applies (in theory) to everybody, and not a certification system that only applies to a section of the market, in the understanding that with a strengthened licencing system sustainable charcoal would progressively become the rule and unsustainable charcoal would disappear from the market. An awareness campaign would be needed, but it is not that clear whether the project will be able to do this in a sound way, as this is easier done when some successful examples of sustainable charcoal production and consumption can be point out to, which links to previous discussions.

On outcome 3, on capacities for sustainable charcoal production and utilization through partnerships, progress has been very substantive. Not only a large number of community members have been trained, but focus groups suggest these trainings have had the envisioned impact: communities demonstrate increased awareness on the importance of using the forest sustainably and seem to have gained knowledge on how to do this, particularly on the types of trees to cut and how to cut them. This result is very significant in terms of increased ecosystems services, including, but not limited to, reduced GHG emissions, although scientific evidence on this is not available. In addition, the project has trained IDF officials, which has also relevant results. Much of the capacity building has been done by the public university, University Jose Eduardo dos Santos (UJES), which in the process was itself strengthened through the cooperation with University of Cordoba (UCO). UJES is the faculty that trains almost all forestry staff in Angola, so, arguably, this will be a lasting benefit to the country. There is room for extending capacity building to other government officials, particularly decentralized officials. The outcome refers to human capacities but it is unclear how the project can actually strengthen this if referred to number of government officials. So far there is no progress at that regard. The project is working with three key institutions in the country (Development Aid from the People for the People (ADPP by its initials in Portuguese), COSPE, and UJES in partnership with UCO) and starting to work with another relevant national player (Dom Bosco). It is not clear however whether these relationships are partnerships or contracts, and therefore whether these relationships will survive once the project closes, even though some of them, particularly COSPE, will likely continue promoting sustainable forest management in the country. On the other hand, in 2 out of 6 communities (or 33 per cent of communities) (in those managed by UCO-UJES) the project is building trust between communities and IDF officials, an important result for the future regarding continued technical assistance and commercialization of charcoal produced in a more sustainable way.

[25] In Zambia, the briquettes are made of agricultural residues and cassava and are used both as a cooking fuel and as a fuel for dryers. The dryers are used to dry cassava, mushrooms, and other vegetables. Anecdotal evidence suggests beneficiaries make more money selling briquettes than charcoal: for a 25 kg bag of briquettes they can obtain 100 Kwacha (~$6.8), whereas for a 50 kg bag of charcoal, they would only receive 25 Kwacha (~$1.7).

The project plans to extend this to all sites in the future, and has been included in the contract of the implementers for the second phase. However, the charcoal produced with the support of this official project has not yet been produced with official permits.

It is worth noting that, in the field, the project has also made important contributions on aspects not reflected in the results framework. Not only has the project contributed to reduce deforestation, but it has also actively promoted reforestation, further contributing to increased ecosystem services (resulting in reduced vulnerability to climate change) and reduced GHG emissions. The project has also identified alternative income generating activities that reduce incentives to cut trees to produce charcoal. In two of the six communities and 12 of the 44 villages the implementation of these alternative economic activities has already started, in some cases providing micro-loans. There is also some work on wild fire prevention, which will further contribute to conserve forests. Besides, in all communities, the project has created community structures to manage forests in a more sustainable manner, increasing social capital and promoting collective action. Moreover, in 12 out of 44 villages (or 27 per cent of them), the project (through ADPP) has promoted alphabetization with a specific focus on increasing the participation of women. Furthermore, in the same number of villages, in partnership with another project, access to energy has been improved, through solar panels. These impacts are very substantive.

It is worth highlighting that many of the project benefits at provincial and community level depend on which implementer is taking the lead, as the three implementers (ADPP, COSPE, UCO-UJES) have very different approaches. The three implementers have provided training on sustainable forest management, conducted inventories and defined management plans. The three have worked on nurseries, although with different level of progress. ADPP and COSPE have trained communities on improved kilns – the universities have not. ADPP has facilitated the development of a land use plan, promoted alphabetization and improved access to energy, through solar panels – COSPE and the universities have not worked on these aspects. Table 6 summarizes the differences in the approaches favoured by the three project implementers.

Table 6. Provincial and community approaches by implementers[26]

	Coverage	Creation of sustainable forest management structures	Capacity building on forest management	Capacity building on improved kilns	Land use plans	Forest inventories [27]	Sustainable management plans	Nurseries	Reforestation	Alternative income generating activities	Access to energy	Alphabetization	Improved links between communities and IDF	Presence in the field
ADPP	2 provinces, 2 communities, 12 villages, and 22,994 people	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes[28]	Yes[29]	Yes	Yes[30]	Yes, forests, houses and gardens[31]	Yes, agriculture and carpentry[32]	Yes, 150 households[33]	Yes, 570 people have learned to read[34]		Very high
COSPE	1 provinces, 2 communitie	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	Yes, but very small and in poor	Yes[36]	Yes, honey and jam production				Mediu m

[26] Where the implementers do not work on a particular area the box has left blank instead of writing "no", to facilitate the analysis.
[27] Information on the extension of the inventory is not available for all communities.
[28] This is called "Plan de Biomasa Forestal", but is in reality a land use plan. The whole community participated, and it took one year to develop it. It defined an area for forest conservation, an area for forest restoration, an area for forest use (cut), an area for agriculture, an area for housing and infrastructure, and an area for sport infrastructure.
[29] It is worth noting that COSPE and the universities will use the forests where the inventories were conducted, but ADPP plans to conserve it. ADPP and the universities assessed the number of trees and their species and classified those that were not native or fruit trees on their potential to be cut, according to the thickness of their trunk (a proxy for their age). COSPE assessed the number of trees and the species and classified all trees on their potential to be cut according to the thickness of their trunk, regardless of the specie.
[30] In Calonga, as of 31 October 2019, 1,364 trees of 11 species (4 fruit species (maracuya, lemon, avocado, papaya, moringa), 2 for charcoal, 3 for shadow, eucalyptus and jacaranda for shadow and timber).
[31] In total, 36,976 trees. In Calonga,in 2018, they planted 568 trees.
[32] Only in Calonga, 44 new households are doing agriculture. Production has increased for those who already practiced it. Around 70 per cent of the harvest is sold. 6 people have received carpentry materials. They produce doors, windows and stools.
[33] Each panel can be used for 3 lamps and 3 mobile phones. Houses are not connected to the electricity grid, so they could not charge the mobile phones and could use only candles and flashlights in all-year-long long nights of these areas.
[34] Morning and afternoon classes, 2 hours per day, 5 days a week. In two weeks attendants know the letters, in 6 months they know how to read. Lessons include health, environmental, and economic topics. The courses are mostly attended by women.

	s, 26 villages, and 32,127 people							conditions [35]						
Universities	1 province, 2 communities, 26 villages, and 12,949 people[37]	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes	Initial stage[38]					Yes	Limited

[36] In total 740 trees.
[35] In Cajombe, 23 plants, some of which did not look very healthy.
[37] Note that there is an important difference in the approach: COSPE and ADPP work with a limited number of villages in a rather intensive way, while universities work with a large number of villages in a less intensive way.
[38] Universities prepare plants in two steps. Only the first had been conducted as of mid October 2019.

Although the project does not work with national poverty programmes as planned, because these were dysfunctional when the project initiated, the project is contributing to poverty reduction, directly through a more efficient production of charcoal, and indirectly through increased ecosystem services. In 27 per cent of the communities, the implementation of alternative economic activities has already diversified and increased income. The implementation of such activities in other rural communities will further contribute to this. It is worth noting that charcoal production is a badly paid job[39]. The production of briquettes in peri-urban and urban areas will help diversify and increase income of charcoal traders. The access to improved cookstoves will reduce expenses, and increase disposable income. Furthermore, to further promote poverty reduction, the project will produce fuel-efficient cook stoves in country rather than importing one of the many models on the international market. New ideas for the poverty component will be put forward once the proposals for the cookstoves and briquetting component have been received, as these may offer the strongest links to urban poverty programmes.

On outcome 4, on implementation of M&E, the project is on track regarding the key aspects, namely this MTR. Other aspects are discussed in section 4.3.4 focusing specifically on M&E.

As discussed in the same section, deficits in the tool and important differences in its completion compromise the usefulness of the GEF Tracking tool to assess the progress made by the project. On objective 2 (energy efficiency), in the capacity building section, it can be argued that rating has increased from "no capacity built" (1) at baseline to "institutional/human capacity strengthened" (4) at mid term. Progress has also been made regarding other objectives. Progress has been made on objective 1 (transfer of innovative technologies), where rating on the status of technology demonstration/deployment has upgraded from "no suitable technologies are in place" (0) at baseline to" technologies have been demonstrated on a pilot basis" (2) at midterm. It can also be argued that the project has made progress on objective 5 (Land Use, Land Use Change and Forestry (LULUCF)). On "carbon stock monitoring system established", the rating has arguably upgraded from "no action" at baseline to "mapping of forests and other land areas" at mid-term. Progress on other aspects is more controversial. These are discussed in section 4.3.4.2 on reporting.

4.2.2. What are the main barriers to address to achieve expected results? What are the main opportunities to leverage?

Three types of barriers can be identified. The first type of barriers refers to both the national and provincial level results. The second type of barriers refers to the national level results. The third type of barriers refers to the provincial level results.

<u>Barriers to both national and provincial level results</u>

[39] The production process is long and burdensome. Producers sell it at a very low price, as traders have a big margin on the final price.

The first barrier refers to the complexity of the problem addressed by the project. Charcoal is a very complex value chain, with many players and many interests. It is also highly informal. As discussed in section 4.1.1.1, there is huge demand in urban and peri-urban areas, few alternatives to produce it in rural areas and it is very difficult to control it. This hinders the capacity of a USD 4,620,00 project to affect the value chain in a significant way.

In addition, there has been institutional instability. At the end of 2017, the national government changed, which resulted in some changes in key directions. IDF had a new director. The director of the environment office in Huambo has changed three times since the project start. This has affected the project, as there is a need to raise awareness, strengthen capacity and build trust each time these changes occur. Moreover, as indicated in section 4.3.2.1, procurement processes tend to be very long, both at UNDP and especially on the government side. Furthermore, sustainable forest management and especially efficient charcoal production and consumption technologies are new topics in Angola. There are not many players in that market. For that reason, it has been difficult to receive good candidates for certain consultancies. Sometimes the PMU has received only one application and it was not robust, so it had to launch the procurement process again.

Barriers to the national level results

The main barrier at this level is of institutional nature and refers to the distribution of competences. MINAMB executes the project, as with all GEF projects in Angola. This is reasonable as the project focuses on environmental sustainability. However, in the country, forestry, and thus forest management, is a competency of MINAGRIF and, within this, IDF. This implies that the project needs to involve both ministries, especially on those activities related to policy. For instance, MINAGRIF in general and IDF more specifically are responsible for any adjustments to the forestry policy and/or the development of a national sustainable charcoal policy. Not engaging them would actually be counterproductive. MINAMB, UNDP and the project team have been trying to engage MINAGRIF but this has not been easy, as there has historically been competition between these two ministries. The project has a Project Steering Committee (PSC). A representative of IDF is member of the PSC. This person is a technician. This has had advantages, such as provision of sound technical inputs and continuity. On the other hand, this has compromised the engagement of decision-makers from IDF, who have a critical role to play for different expected project results, including the policy. These difficulties explain mostly delays on the policy aspects (outcome 1). It is worth noting that the relationship with IDF at the provincial level is strong and has been important to achieve some of the project objectives at that level.

Barriers to the provincial level results

At the provincial level, the main barrier refers to project management. As noted, three implementers carry out activities at that level: ADPP, COSPE and UCO-UJES. As also noted, these implementers have very different approaches. The PMU has a regular interaction with them, but at the time of writing had not established a common approach, asking the three of them to comply with some ambitious

minimum standard requirements. As illustrated above, this has compromised results in the field on several fronts. For instance, implementers do not have targets regarding ha to be covered in inventories, in management plans or to be planted (only one of the three implementers has targets for number of trees to be planted), or in terms of alternative economic activities.

On the production side, there is another key critical element. The charcoal produced by the project does not have permits issues by IDF. In this sense, despite being an institutional initiative, the project does not follow institutional processes.

Across all sites, there is room for improvement in the identification of the members of the forest management groups, which would strengthen their authority in contributing to manage forests in a more sustainable way. Management of forest could also be improved with the provision of equipment, such as GPS, and training on how to use it. Across sites, alphabetization is also a barrier, although ADPP is addressing this, with goods results, in 2 of 6 communities and 12 of the 44 villages where the project is working. In addition, native tree species take very long to grow. While planting fruit trees and exotic species of fast growth (eucalyptus, cedar) would also provide environmental benefits, these benefits would be smaller than planting native species, at least from a biodiversity point of view. On the development side, charcoal producers lack basic equipment to protect them from the heat and the smoke produced by the improved kilns.

Opportunities

In the short term, for the activities of the project, especially at the national level, there are opportunities for synergies with two projects. UNDP is starting to implement a new GEF project focusing on rural energy access. In addition, the Food and Agriculture Organisation of United Nations (FAO) is developing a pilot project on dry forests in Angola. UNDP has already agreed with FAO to collaborate in this project. An exchange visit to a FAO led charcoal project in Zambia is also being discussed. In addition, as noted, there is an opportunity to link up with other UNDP-supported sustainable charcoal projects in the region to exchange information and share lessons and best practices. The Regional Centre could help to make these connections. Availability of additional funding for the sustainability of project results is discussed in section 4.4 on sustainability.

4.3. Project implementation and adaptive management

4.3.1. Management arrangements

4.3.1.1 How effective are the management arrangements?[40] 4.3.1.2 What is the quality of execution of the project by the executing agency and the implementing partner?

Internally at UNDP, the management of the project is very good. At the country office, the Resident Representative follows up the project closely, and has visited the field and met communities. Within the environment division, the management of the programme involves a senior expert coordinating a number of GEF projects, but with a very close supervision of this project. He also leads UNDP engagement at higher level in MINAMB and MINAGRIF. The team also includes a more junior expert, with relevant experience in forestry, who is in charge of daily support to the management of the project by the project coordinator and the other members of the Project Management Unit (PMU) sitting at MINAMB. This more junior UNDP expert is an international United Nations Volunteer (UNV) paid by the project. Two different UNVs have held this position. In addition, at UNDP Angola support to project management involves an M&E and communication specialist, and a financial officer. In addition, management from the UNDP side comprises the support of a regional technical adviser that also assists other projects on sustainable charcoal in the region, although a visit to the project is still pending. Roles are clear in this management structure, and executed at high standards, following as well UNDP's internal procedures, such as the use of the Atlas and transparency platforms of the agency.

The interaction between UNDP and the MINAMB is overall also good. UNDP manages the funds (supports the preparation of the tenders and the management of the contracts) and provides technical support, while the ministry and particularly the National Project Director, ultimately makes all the decisions. This structure is highly efficient, UNDP's financial management and technical oversight clearly contributing to a robust implementation, while the ministry keeps the decision-making capacity. Transferring full implementation to the government, as done in other projects, would likely affect negatively project delivery. While transferring the whole implementation to countries contributes to building capacity in the long term, it has been demonstrated that developing countries often lack the required capacities, including procurement aspects, to ensure the smooth implementation of internationally funded climate change projects in the short term. In the charcoal project, there is room for improvement regarding the decision-making pace at MINAMB, in part related to delegation of authority of very busy government officials. Within the management structure, involving a UNV on day-to-day basis is also an efficient strategy, as this allows continued technical backstopping at a rather limited cost, while a more senior Chief Technical Advisor would provide only interrupted support,

[40] For this see also section 4.3.6.1 on stakeholder engagement.

sometimes on top of many other things and with a less intense engagement. The project conducts regular implementation committee meetings involving UNDP, MINAMB and the PMU.

Notwithstanding the former, there is room for improvement in the management of the activities conducted in the field, that is, the work carried out by the three implementers: ADPP, COSPE and the universities. Each of them strong and committed, as shown in Table 6, these implementers have very different scopes and approaches, with distinct impacts. While there is some exchange of lessons between them through channels promoted by the project, the PMU is not doing enough to identify, compile and share lessons; define a road map with ambitious indicators and targets based on a systematic and strategic analysis; and monitor delivery to ensure the three implementers comply with more ambitious and specific minimum requirements.. The three implementers were contracted through a public tender based on a ToR. Each of them presented a project proposal, which was evaluated and, if necessary, revised before they were contracted. Each implementer needs to deliver what they have promised and have to report on this. These reports are available. Unless they do what they have promised and were contracted to do, implementers are not be paid. However, the development of the ToR and the preparation of contracts assumed that, because the objective was to educate communities about sustainability in forest management and charcoal production and trade, targets as ha reforested, number of trees planted or quantity of charcoal to produce could not be considered. Available evidence shows that targets were not defined neither for that nor for income related activities or other aspects, as shown in Table 6. A more systematic and strategic coordination of the work of implementers would also be important to assess performance and make decisions on which implementer(s) would be considered in consequent phases. A more close management would also involve more frequent field visits. The specific communities that are visited should also change from time to time. Having a regional coordinator in Huambo, with a vehicle to reach the field easily, could help monitor the work of the implementers and better systematize and exchange lessons learned.

4.3.2. Work planning

4.3.2.1 Have there been any delays in implementation? If so, why?

There have been some delays, particularly at the beginning of the project. The first year the project did not contract anything. The delays were mostly due to i) decision-making done at a very high political level, by overbooked individuals, the National Director having no delegation of authority from the Minister to contract any activities until mid 2017; ii) the need to reach consensus between two ministries (MINAMB and MINAGRIF) with a communication that is not particularly smooth; and iii) significant turn over on key government positions. It is worth noting that most of these aspects affect the whole GEF portfolio in Angola and not only the charcoal project. Factor i has improved; the project is working on ii and to the extent possible on iii. There have also been some other delays, such as, due to an internal crisis, some implementers (i.e. COSPE) not sending reports (i.e. a report on commercialization) five months after the deadline, although this has been solved.

4.3.3. Finance and co-finance

4.3.3.1 Have there been any variations between planned and actual expenditures? If yes, why?

As of October 2019, the project had spent USD 1,466,111, that is, 54 per cent of the planned budget 2017, 2018 and the 9 first months of 2019 . Total actual expenditure as of October 2019 represented 32 per cent of total GEF Trust Fund funding, when more than 58 per cent of the implementation time had been spent - the project had spent 42 months of the 72 moths of implementation time. Interviews suggest around 2/3 of the total budget have in any case already been contracted and an important tender had been launched as of 31 October 2019, indicating more substantive disbursements in the near future.

By year, the project did not spend in 2016, and had a relatively good expenditure in 2017: more than 80 per cent of planned expenditure for that year in the project document and the revision. Expenditure was very low (around 50 per cent of planned budget) in 2018 and in 2019, although in the latter expenditure in the last quarter is not included.

As of October 2019, expenditure was low in all outcomes, although slightly better on outcome 3, related to interventions in the field. Actual expenditure was about 50 per cent of planned in outcomes 1 and 2, and 67 per cent of planned expenditure in outcome 3. Expenditure on outcome 4 has been very limited but this is reasonable as the budget refers to the MTR and the final evaluation.

Regarding Project Management Costs (PMC), as of October 2019, actual PMC for the implementation period summed up USD 148,293, that is, very slightly above (109 per cent of) planned PMC for that period. As of October 2018, actual PMC for the implementation period represented 10 per cent of total actual implementation costs in that period, when according to the budget in the project document they would represent 4.7 per cent of total project costs. This is a significant divergence, as, according to GEF guidelines, PMC should be below 5 per cent. Two factors explain this. The administration assistant works partially for this project – he supports a number of GEF projects at the same time. Accordingly, only a fraction of his salary is paid by the project. In financial terms, the approach is to pay his whole salary for a fraction of the implementation period, versus the alternative of paying a fraction of his salary for the whole implementation period. In this case, the charcoal project has paid his full salary in the beginning of the implementation of the project, contributing to high PMC. However, this salary is no longer paid by the project, which will not cover it either for the remaining implementation time, contributing to lowering PMC during the second half of the project. High PMC are linked more importantly to direct project costs, that is, project costs UNDP charges in relation to the execution of the project, regarding imports, procurement and buying cars, amongst others. The total amount is fixed. More than half of this amount has been spent because more administrative activities are needed at beginning. As the total amount is fixed, the share of this costs in the PMC will decrease, contributing to reducing PMC during the second half of project implementation. It is worth noting that having an international UNV raises the quality of project management for rather limited costs.

Tables 7 and 8 provide the detailed financial information of the project.

Table 7. Cumulative project finance

	Cumulative (Sept 2016-October 2019)					Total project budget	
	Planned		Actual	Percentage		Planned	Percentage over total budget
	Prodoc	Revision		Over Prodoc	Over Rev		
Outcome 1	812,000	897,940	440,409	54	49	1,220,000	36%
Outcome 2	1,055,500	1,053,000	499,372	47	47	1,940,000	26%
Outcome 3	572,000	550,000	367,287	64	67	1,040,000	35%
Outcome 4	137,000	85,000	10,751	8	13	200,000	5%
PM	135,940	126,500	148,293	109	117	220,000	67%
Total	2,712,440	2,712,440	1,466,111	54	54	4,620,000	32%

Source: PMU

Table 8. Project finance per year

	2017					2018					2019				
	Planned		Actual	Percentage		Planned		Actual	Percentage		Planned		Actual (1 Oct)	Percentage	
	Prodoc	Revision		Over Prodoc	Over Rev	Prodoc	Revision		Over Prodoc	Over Rev	Prodoc	Revision		Over Prodoc	Over Rev
Outcome 1	148,000	229,000	104,595	70.7	45.7	839,000	843,940	178,899	52.8	52.0	825,000	825,000	156,915	48.3	48.3
Outcome 2	272,500	230,000	175,418	64.4	76.3	891,500	891,500	127,963	82.7	82.7	891,500	431,500	195,991	50.1	45.4
Outcome 3	102,000	100,000	220,167	215.8	220.2	221,000	241,000	122,928	55.6	51.0	249,000	209,000	24,192	9.7	11.6
Outcome 4	62,000	10,000	3,386	5.5	33.9	25,000	25,000				50,000	50,000	7,365	14.7	14.7
PM	45,940	26,500	1,359	3.0	5.1	45,000	55,000	92,788	206.2	168.7	45,000	45,000	54,146	120.3	120.3
Total	630,440	595,500	504,925	80.1	84.8	1,021,500	1,056,440	522,578	51.2	49.5	1,060,500	1,060,500	438,608	41.4	41.4

Source: PMU

4.3.3.2 To what extent is the project leveraging its planned co-financing?

As of October 2019, the project had mobilized 12 per cent of total planned co-financing when more than 58 per cent of the implementation time had been spent. Of the five sources of co-financing, two (ADPP and COSPE) had already provided or exceeded planned co-financing. ADPP has provided in kind contribution of infrastructure, vehicles and staff. COSPE provided co-financing through the project "Integrated Program for the Protection and Development of Angolan Coastal Forests", funded by Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs - Direction for International Cooperation and which ended in 2017. UNDP has provided 89 per cent of planned co-financing, consisting of cash and technical support. UCO has provided over 30 per cent of planned co-financing. It had committed significant co-financing in the understanding that a complementary project funded by the European Union (EU) named "African network for education in energy resources" would take place at the same time as the charcoal project. However, the charcoal project had delays on approval, and the EU project was only active in the first period of the implementation of the charcoal project (the EU project phased out in 2017). The university is trying to mobilize additional funding for Angola. If they manage they can count this as co-financing, but there is nothing imminent. The main reason for the low mobilization of planned co-financing refers to co-financing from the Government of Angola, which represented 86 per cent of planned co-financing. The problem here is not with the implementation of complementary activities, as the government expenses related to the project do happen. The problem is with estimating how much these activities cost, as the numbers provided by the government are unreliable – they are incredibly high and fluctuate extremely from one year to the next. Tables 9 and 10 present co-financing numbers.

Table 9. Co-financing of the project as of October 1st

Institution	Actual				Planned	Percentage Actual / Planned
	2017	2018	2019	Cumulative (Sept 2016 - March 2019)		
Government of Angola	0	0	0	0	16,000,000	0
University of Cordoba	200,469	0	0	200,469	650,000	31%
ADPP	0	0	0	1,000,713	1,000,000	100%
COSPE	222,600	0	0	222,600	186,700	119%
UNDP-TRAC	226,322	306,615	248,138	781,076	875,000	89%
Total	**649,391**	**306,615**	**248,138**	**2,204,858**	18,711,700	12%

Source: project team

Table 10. Co-financing table with additional information

Source of co-financing	Name of co-financier	Type of co-financing	Investment mobilized	Amount (USD)
Civil Society Organization	University of Cordoba	Grant	Investment mobilized	200,469
Civil Society Organization	ADPP	Grant	Investment mobilized	1,000,713
Civil Society Organization	COSPE	Grant	Investment mobilized	222,600
GEF Agency	UNDP-TRAC	Grant	Recurrent expenditures	781,076
				2,204,858

Source: project team

4.3.4. M&E

4.3.4.1 Is the M&E system operational and effective?

The project document includes an M&E plan in accordance with the established procedures of both UNDP and GEF. The plan defines clear roles and responsibilities, rightly indicates that the SRF would be the reference for monitoring the project's implementation and for evaluations of performance and impact, and specifies the tasks to be conducted. These tasks include an inception report, where the SRF could be reviewed; quarterly monitoring and reporting, in the UNDP enhanced results based management platform and the Atlas platform; bi-annual monitoring, through a status survey questionnaire to indicate progress and identify bottlenecks as well as technical support needs; and annual monitoring and reporting, through the templates of UNDP ("Annual Project Review (APR) considering January – December) and GEF (Project Implementation Reports (PIR), considering July-June)". The M&E plan also includes annual field visits. The M&E plan in the project document comprises as well a MTR and a terminal evaluation. A project terminal report would also be prepared during the last three months of the project[41]. The M&E plan also includes audits, to be conducted annually or other frequency as per UNDP audit policies. The M&E plan, which was not modified during the inception workshop, is comprehensive and robust. It is worth noting however that the use of the GEF Tracking tool is not integrated in the plan. Sufficient financial resources are allocated to implement the plan: USD 200,000 through GEF and USD 145,000 through UNDP, mostly for complying with internal M&E standards.

As noted in section 4.1.2.1, the SRF has important caveats. Some objective level indicators (C) are in reality activity level indicators. Some indicators (4a) are not comprehensive. A number of indicators (Ba, Bc, 2a, 3a, 3b) are not specific enough. There are also indicators (2a) combining two different aspects, which does not help for monitoring and reporting. Overall, but particularly for indicators Aa, Ab and 3a, means of verification are not detailed. The links between some indicators (C and 1a) are not clarified. In some cases (3b) time references are not properly provided and in some others (4a and 4b)

[41] As per UNDP-GEF policy, the final PIR along with the terminal evaluation report and corresponding management response now serve as the final project report package.

the phrasing is not adequate. Table 11 provides the details.

In addition, the GEF tracking tool could be improved. Guidelines to complete it are not always clear. The guideline for Objective 6 on enabling environment ("please specify the number of enabling activities for the project") is not clear: does it refer to the documents the project has contributed to develop or the documents to which it is aligned? Adding a column for clarifying and nuancing the contribution of the project would also be relevant.

Table 11. Comments on the SRF

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Comments
Objective: To reduce the current unsustainable and GHG-intensive mode of charcoal production and utilization from Angola's Miombo woodlands via an integrated set of interventions in the national charcoal value chain	(Aa) Achieved direct GHG emission reductions over lifetime (ton CO2eq);	Aa) 0 ton CO2eq	Aa) 0 ton CO2eq	(Aa) 209k ton CO2eq	The methodology for estimating these emissions should be specified in the PIRs, not only in the project document.
	(Ab) Estimated indirect GHG emission reductions over lifetime (ton CO2eq);	(Ab) 0 ton CO2eq	(Ab) 0 ton CO2eq	(Ab) 1.2 M ton CO2eq	
	(Ba) Number of people with improved energy access as a result of UNDP-supported intervention.	Ba) 0	(Ba) 200	Ba) 10,000	The indicator is not specific: what does it mean to have improved energy access? Does it refer only to cookstoves? And what does it mean here "as a result of the project"? That the project will give them?
	(Bb) Percentage of households benefitting from improved access to energy which are female- headed households	(Bb) 25%	(Bb) 50%	(Bb) 50%	Same as above.
	(Bc) Average monetary savings by households using sustainable charcoal in efficient stoves (US$/(household–year).	(Bc) 0 US$/(hh-y)	(Bc) 100 US$/hh-y)	(Bc) 100 US$/hh-y)	The indicator is not totally specific: does this refer to stoves promoted or provided by the project? Which households will be considered to estimate the average?
	(C) Policy and regulatory framework for sustainable charcoal sector supported.	C) Rated "1" (no policy/regulation/ strategy in place)	Rated "2" policy/ regulation/strategy discussed and proposed)	Rated "4" (policy/ regulation/strategy adopted but not enforced)	The indicator is an activity one, and not an outcome one. Supporting does not necessarily imply an impact. The targets clarify the impact.

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Comments
Outcome 1: The policy framework to support a sustainable charcoal value chain in Angola, has been strength-ened	(1a) white paper on sustainable charcoal, endorsed by Government (-);	1a) no concept for white paper (0);	1a) concept for white paper presented (0);	. 1a) white paper completed and endorsed (1);	.
	(1b) no certification and no MRV mechanism designed nor implemented (0,0);	1b) no certification and no MRV mechanism designed nor implemented (0,0);	1b) certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal production chain designed (1,0);	1b) certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal designed and implemented in government programs (1,2)	
Outcome 2: The benefits of sustainable charcoal production technology, briquetting and energy-efficient charcoal stoves, have been accepted by producers and peri-urban consumers	(2a) Number of improved charcoal kilns and briquetting machined effectively in use;	(2a) No improved charcoal kilns (0), nor briquetting machines in use (0)	(2a) 18 improved kilns and 3 briquetting machines	(2a) 270 improved kilns and 10 briquetting machines;	The indicator is unclear: does it refer to the kilns used during the project, or the kilns available by project closure (kilns cannot be used a number of times, but they have a lifespan)
	2b) Annual volume of certified, sustainable charcoal delivered to consumers (ton/yr);	2b) No certified, sustainable charcoal delivered (0 ton.yr);	(2b) No certified, sustainable charcoal delivered (0 ton.yr)	2b) 3,024 ton/yr certified, sustainable charcoal delivered per year	
	2c) Number of energy-efficient (EE) charcoal stoves delivered to peri-urban consumers (-).	2d) No EE charcoal stoves delivered (0);	(2c) 3,000 EE charcoal stoves delivered	(2c) 10,000 EE charcoal stoves delivered.	

Project objective and Outcomes	Description of indicator	Baseline level	Mid-term target	End-of-project target	Comments
Outcome 3. Institutional and human capacities for sustainable charcoal production and utilization have been strengthened through partnerships for knowledge transfer and professional training	(3a) Number of persons skilled in sustainable forest management and charcoal technology (male, female);	(3a) No persons skilled in charcoal technology (0 male, 0 female)	(3a) 40 persons skilled (20 male ; 20 female)	(3a) 150 persons skilled (75 male ; 75 female)	The indicator is not specific enough: which type of persons? What does it mean "skilled"? How is this measured, just by considering the activity (training) and not the results of the activity? In addition, the outcome refers to human capacities, but the indicator does not consider it or at least it does not clarify its scope. Human capacity could refer to technical capacities but also to number of staff of key government institutions, such as IDF.
	(3b) Number of partnerships strengthened and active at project termination;	(3b) 1 partnership in place (UCO-UJES)	(3b) 2 active partnerships	(3b) 3 active partnerships	The indicator is inappropriate, as it has a temporal dimension (at project termination) when there are targets at mid term and at project termination. The indicator is also vague: what do they refer by partnerships? Are project implementers / contractors partners?
Outcome 4. The Monitoring & Evaluation plan for the Project has been implemented	(4a) Mid-term review (1) and follow-up on recommendations (1) on gender mainstreaming and sustainability of project results	4a) No Mid-term Review (0) and no recommendations (0)	4a) Mid-term Review completed (1)	4a) Follow-up on MTR recommendations completed (1)	4a. A verb is missing. An action plan should be developed for all aspects, not only for gender and sustainability.
	(4b) Terminal Evaluation document (-)	(4a) No Terminal Evaluation (0).	(4a) No Terminal Evaluation (0).	(4b) Terminal Evaluation completed (1)	4b. A verb is missing.

4.3.5. Reporting

4.3.5.1 Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?

Monitoring and reporting has mostly taken place in accordance to the M&E plan included in the project document and agreed in the inception workshop. The project has produced PIRs in 2018 and 2019, and narrative and financial APRs in 2017 and 2018. Although the evaluator has not had access to UNDP's platforms, interviews suggest these platforms have been used as planned for quarterly and annual reporting. Besides, the project updated the GEF Tracking Tool at mid term. In addition, the project is using an M&E tool at activity level, which was prepared in February and October 2019.

Overall, quality of reports is good with room for improvement on certain aspects. First of all, a baseline on GHG emissions should have been defined before interventions started in the field. As of 31 October 2019, that is, almost three years after official start of the project, this baseline had not been completed. Moreover, in the PIRs reporting on indicators is not always clear. In indicators 1a and 1b steps and links are not mentioned, making it difficult to understand progress[42]. In some cases (2a and 2b) reporting does not explain progress on the indicator[43]. Furthermore, assessments tend to be overly optimistic. At the objective level, the 2019 PIR indicates "on track" when there is no progress in two of the three indicators (or 5 of the 6 indicators) and progress on the other indicator is limited. Rating of progress on outcome 2 also seems overly optimistic. This outcome has four elements to which the following rating could be given: i) improved kilns: progress on identification and training, but not to achieve target: moderately satisfactory; ii) briquetting: moderately unsatisfactory; iii) certification: moderately unsatisfactory; iv) cookstoves: moderately unsatisfactory. Despite this, the 2019 PIR rates progress in outcome 2 as "on track". Besides, completion of section G on overall assessments is not fully aligned with the spirit of GEF reporting. Analyses tend to focus on the number of activities that have been conducted and the importance of their results, not fully taking into account the extent to which expected targets are being achieved or in the process of being achieved. A PIR should first indicate this and only then the number and relevance of the activities implemented – see the discussion on this in

[42] Indicator 1a: the report should indicate the steps and links (studies, white paper, policy), and report clearly on that basis. Indicator 1b: again links should be established: The relationship between identifying key points for incentives and control mechanisms to apply a set of sustainable charcoal criteria and designing a certification and MRV mechanism is not fully clear.

[43] Indicator 2a: The report does not really respond to the indicator, offering information not related to it. There is no information on the number of improved kilns effectively in use. Improved kilns have been identified in a non-systematic manner and promoted through training, but the dissemination of these kilns has not started in a systematic way. It does not seem that such a systematic plan exists to meet the target: implementers are not measured on that. For instance how will the project go from training to kilns regarding materials (e.g. chimneys). It is unclear how briquetting machines will be promoted so that they are effectively in use. Indicator 2b: again the report does not refer to the indicator: the indicator refers to delivery of certified charcoal and the PIR to the definition of sustainable production criteria, when the project does no longer plan to create a certification system. It would be good to introduce the discussion on certification, indicating that the project no longer plans to establish a certification scheme and therefore will not help deliver certified charcoal. The project does not seem to be building a mechanism to monitor how much charcoal targeted communities' produce, and how much of this complies with the sustainable production criteria.

section 4.2.1[44]. In addition, as noted above, reporting on human rights could improve. Similarly, as discussed in more detail in section 4.4.1, reporting on risks should be strengthen and a bit less optimistic.

The completion of the GEF tracking tool has some caveats. Filling out at the baseline level was in some cases inaccurate[45]. This, and differences in criteria, have meant that completion at baseline and mid-term are not always comparable. Completion at mid-term is mostly robust, with some fields not being completed (reduction of GHG emissions given the absence of a baseline) and controversial ratings on objectives 2, 3 and 5[46]. Objective 6 should not be completed.

As noted the project is using a tool to monitor progress at activity level. This was not included in the M&E plan in the project document. Its use following recommendations to another projects speaks very well of the interest of UNDP, MINAMB and the PMU to manage the project closely. It is also a useful tool. Notwithstanding this, there is room for improvement in the structure of the tool. More specifically, it would be good to break activities into sub-activities or steps (particularly for 1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5), indicate which sub-activities or steps have been completed and which ones not, and add a column for next steps, indicating planned completion dates to use as a reference in future monitoring and reporting. There is also room for improvement on the information that is provided. In particular, it would be good to explain the relevance of some of the sub-activities conducted (1.2 meetings of the Commission); clarify the current objective on certification; report on all aspects of a particular activity (reporting on activities 2.3 and 3.2 is not complete)[47], but only on aspects related to that activity[48]; provide specific answers instead of providing the same information for different activities (2.1 and 2.3 and 2.5 and 1.3); and be more specific (3.4).

In addition, and related to the previous point, as noted in section 4.2.1.2, there is room for improvement in monitoring the work conducted by the three implementers. Currently, the project does not have indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification regarding the work of these players. Implementers do not seem to have targets regarding key aspects, such as ha to be covered by

[44] These are two very different ways of measuring progress. A PIR focuses on whether the activities implemented allow meeting the expected targets. For instance, in one of the boxes in the 2019 PIR, the assessment is summarized as follows: "As the project is approaching its mid-term, most key activities are under implementation or in an advanced stage of preparation" (p. 16). But at mid term, should the activities be in advanced stage of preparation, under implementation or in advanced state of implementation? And, more importantly, does this progress at activity level allow meeting the expected targets?

[45] The document indicated that it contributes to phase-out ozone depleting substances.

[46] Objectives 2 and 3: policy and regulatory framework: from policy/regulation/strategy proposed but not adopted (3) at baseline to policy/regulation/strategy adopted but not enforced (4) at mid-term. However, it is not clear the project has promoted such a change. As noted it has developed studies, including the development of sustainable charcoal criteria, which has been discussed, but this is far from being a policy/regulation/strategy and has not been adopted. Objective 3: Whether charcoal can be considered a renewable energy is controversial. In theory it can, as trees can grow. The key issue is that cutting of trees to produce charcoal is done at a rate that allows trees that replace them to grow. Objective 5: At mid-term on "good management practices developed and adopted", the rating is "development of national standards for certification" (3). This is debatable, as it is not clear the sustainable charcoal criteria can be considered "national standards for certification". That being said, this is the most accurate of the possible ratings.

[47] On 2.3 the report does not refer to rural development initiatives. On 3.2 the report does not refer to community workers.

[48] For 3.3 the report mentions aspects not considered in that activity.

inventories and management plans, ha to be reforested and/or number of trees to be planted, number of kilns to be developed for demonstration purposes and/or material to be provided for communities to build kilns, volume of sustainable charcoal produced, and number of individuals to be involved in alternative income generating activities. In this context, as of 31 October 2019, the PMU did not know the contributions of the implementers in these fronts. The absence of such a results framework hinders monitoring and evaluation and ultimately the impact of these activities. As arguably the activities carried out by implementers contribute to the achievement of the project targets, the absence of such a monitoring framework makes it more difficult to monitor and evaluate the achievements of the project, and affects negatively meeting project targets as included in the SRF.

It is also worth noting the more basic things are not monitored either. Implementers and the PMU do not monitor how many and what type (species and size) of trees are cut and how they are cut as part of the project, for instance for building kilns during the demonstrations. It is also not monitored how many of these trees are replaced, or how well they regenerate, which takes some time. In this sense, there is no continuity in the inventories. Forest management groups lack equipment, such as GPS, that could help them better monitor the status of the forests. Importantly, demonstrations on kilns in communities can hardly be called demonstrations, as the exercises do not document the inputs (kg of trees) and the outputs (kg of charcoal), thus not assessing the performance of the tested kilns.

4.3.5.2 Does the project have the appropriate financial controls to make informed management decisions regarding the budget and flow of funds?

The project seems to have adequate financial management. A financial officer with large experience on GEF projects is responsible for this, with support from expert overall management. Financial information was readily available when requested. Financial audits have been conducted as planned.

4.3.6. Stakeholder engagement, communications and lesson learned

4.3.6.1 To what extent were effective partnership arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country, district and community councils?

The project document indicated the creation of a Project Board (PB) and a PSC. The PB would be composed of MINAMB, UNDP, MINAGRIF and the Ministry of Energy and Water (MINEA), and would provide political oversight and guidance to the PSC and ensure integration with broader climate and other national policies. Chaired by MINAMB, it would meet once or twice a year.

The project document indicates the overall role of the PSC[49] and that it would meet 3-4 times per year,

[49] In a nutshell, the PSC "is the group responsible for making by consensus management decisions for a project when guidance

but does not indicate its composition. The inception report of October 2016 did not indicate either the composition of the PSC, just providing the same information as the project document. There was a launching workshop in December 2017, but this did not clarify either the composition of the PSC. Presentations were made only by MINAMB, UNDP, the Province of Huambo and implementers (ADPP, COSPE and universities). Only one person from MINAGRIF-IDF at the national level participated and there was no representation from MINEA or other ministries.

As of 31 October 2019, the PB does not seem to have been created. At least, it has not met. This is not a trivial issue as this structure has a fundamental role to play, and those that were supposed to take part on it are not likely to participate in a more technical structure, such as the PSC[50]. As of 31 October 2019, the PSC has met 3 times: November 2017, October 2018 and August 2019. According to their minutes, only representatives of the MINAMB, UNDP, the provinces and the implementers have attended these meetings. A technical representative of IDF at the national level participated in the 2018 and 2019 meetings, while representatives of IDF offices at provincial level have participated in the three meetings[51]. Some few other stakeholders participated also in the 2019 meeting.

The engagement of stakeholders seems in this context limited. Unlike planned, the PB has not met. The PSC has met significantly less than planned: 3 times instead of at between 9 and 12. While all the institutions that have participated in PSC meetings are relevant, and the involvement of the provincial level is very positive, many relevant institutions have not been engaged. As noted, decision-makers at IDF at the national level have not been engaged, in this case despite the project making some efforts. The lack of a political coordination structure may at the same time be the cause and the reason for this. The engagement of an IDF technical person in the PSC has ensured stability (there is turnover in political spheres) and good technical input, but it is certainly not enough to ensure the achievement of the expected results of this project. A recent change in minister at MINAGRIF could help increase the engagement of IDF. Other stakeholders from MINAGRIF have not been engaged either, even though this would be important from the alternative income generating activities perspective. Besides, other ministries such as MINEA and the Ministry of Commerce, have not been involved when the project clearly works in the energy sector and commercialization is critical for charcoal itself and the technologies for producing and more importantly consuming them, as well as for the briquetting machines. IDF only gives permits for one year, longer permits involving the Ministry of Commerce. On a positive note, the project has supported meetings of the Climate Change and Biodiversity Commission. This is an inter-sectoral mechanism that can play a key role for discussing and adopting a sustainable charcoal policy once this is being drafted, discussing national approaches to reduce GHG emissions from LULUCF, NDC targets…, although there are some concerns regarding its continuity.. The link with

is required by the Project Coordinator, including recommendation for UNDP/Implementing Partner approval of project plans and revisions".

[50] The term PSC may be a bit misleading. Instead of a political PB and a technical PSC, many projects have a political PSC and Technical Advisory Committee.

[51] Implementers participated only in 2018 and 2019, arguably because they had not been selected earlier.

the project is also not that clear. The project is also starting to engage the Ministry of Education, promoting teachers as a scaling-up mechanism, following ADPP's approach.

Moreover, there is room for further involving the local administration, that is, the municipal and communal administration. This is increasingly important, as Angola is undergoing a decentralization process. Now administrators are appointed at the central level, but there will be elections and municipalities will be responsible for land use planning. This could be an important driver of sustainability, as municipal and communal officials have a strong interest in social and environment issues in general, and fire control and non-timber forest products in particular. The project has engaged to a certain extent with municipal governments, including adding a new commune following its request. However, trainings have overlooked their role, considering only IDF provincial officials, which will need to work with municipal and communal administrators given the extension of the areas they need to cover and the limited availability of infrastructure (roads, cars) and financial means (DSA). In addition to contributing to strengthening monitoring of the work conducted by implementers, having a regional coordinator in Huambo could facilitate the interaction between the project and local governments.

The project has done some efforts to engage the private sector. At the suggestion of IDF Kwanza Sul, the project team visited a number of sawmills to see if their residues could be used for producing sustainable charcoal and briquettes. The universities followed up this visit as part of their briquetting study. The private sector has also been invited to workshops. Despite these efforts, at the time of writing, engagement of the private sector is limited. For instance, private sector has not shown up in project workshops. Indeed, this is difficult, as charcoal is a largely predatory sector that works as much as it can under the radar of IDF, and the safety and labour practices of other key industries, such as sawmills, do not fully comply with international standards. However, private sector would need to play a crucial role in the value chain, including transport and commercialization of charcoal and briquettes, production and commercialization of cookstoves and briquetting machines, and commercialization of the outputs of the alternative income generating activities. As of 31 October 2019, there is room for improvement in the engagement of those players as well as end-users of sustainable charcoal, briquettes and improved cookstoves.

On the positive side, in the field, the project has made important efforts to engage the communities in all sites, but especially in ADPP sites and to a lesser extent in the sites managed by the universities, given their different levels of presence in the villages.

4.3.6.2 How were lessons derived from the adaptive management process documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners?

Lessons learned are important in three moments: during project design, during project implementation and during project closure. Collection, systematization, integration and exchange of lessons learned should involve all project stakeholders: project designers, implementing partners at the global, regional and national levels, and executing partners at the national and sub-national levels. Collection,

systematization, integration and exchange of lessons should consider other relevant national and international projects, especially at the regional level, as well as the implementation of the project itself, in a two-way flow of information: from peer projects to the project, and from the project to peer projects.

Section 4.1.1.2 discusses the extent to which the design of the project factored in lessons learned. In design, two of the project outputs focus on collecting, systematizing and exchanging lessons. Output 1.5 focuses on drawing lessons from two programmes implemented by the Government of Angola, more precisely by the Ministry of Commerce[52]. It was expected that both programmes would produce a host of valuable lessons for the verification of sustainable charcoal value chains in a future, more market-oriented context. Output 2.5 refers to drawing lessons from the project itself. The project document indicates sometimes that this would be conducted throughout project implementation, but it sometimes reduces it to project closure (the last year of project implementation). For the latter the project document focuses on external consultancies. Not linked to any output, the project document considers two-way exchanges with peer projects at the regional and global levels.

During implementation, there has been no progress on drawing and considering lessons from other national projects. Available data suggests the two programmes mentioned in Output 1.5 were never fully operational and had closed by the time the charcoal project actually started.

As of 31 October 2019, exchanges with similar projects or initiatives at the regional and global levels have been limited within UNDP. This organisation supports a cohort of sustainable charcoal projects in Sub-Saharan Africa, including projects in Uganda, Sierra Leone and Nigeria[53]. As of 31 October 2019, exchanges between these projects and the Angola project had not taken place. UNDP's Sub-Saharan Africa Regional Service Centre plans to create a community of practice, facilitating connections between project managers, in 2020, with a workshop being considered for later. In contrast, the project has exchanged experiences with similar projects in Haiti, Mali, Mozambique and Namibia. The manager of a World Bank implemented charcoal project was invited to a multi-stakeholder workshop organized by the Angola charcoal project. In addition, exchanges with the FAO at the regional level are starting to take place. In November the project had a call with FAO Zambia and Rome to exchange lessons on charcoal. At the time of writing, the project was preparing an exchange visit and participation in a workshop with Zambia involving FAO.

[52] These programmes are Agricultural Products Acquisition Programme (PAPAGRO by its initials in Portuguese) and Loja Kikuia. PAPAGRO procured agricultural produce from rural communities and sold this to eligible families at preferential prices, thereby linking supply and demand. Loja Kikuia consisted of a voucher system for low-income families for periodic supplies of basic food and other articles at a subsidized price. It was envisaged to create an additional "energy basket" including efficient charcoal stoves and, possibly, supplies of certified charcoal.

[53] A project in Rwanda on forest landscape restoration, which is expected to start in early 2020, also has a charcoal component. UNDP also has an energy access project in Somalia in the pipeline with a component on sustainable charcoal production.

As of October 2019, collection, systematization, integration and exchange of lessons learned from the project itself have been limited. Workshops have somehow contributed to that purpose[54]. The development of the white book will also contribute to systematizing and exchanging lessons learned. However, UNDP, the PMU and implementers do not collect and systematize lessons learned regularly, as part of their implementing and executing processes. Reporting documents do not document lessons learned[55]. This is also linked to the absence of robust monitoring of project processes as mentioned in section 4.3.4.2 above.

As noted, the project document allocates resources for a final compilation of lessons learned. This would also involve translating the lessons into "recommendations for effective charcoal policy development in Angola, the design of Government programs, market development and business models, and financing of the private sector". This exercise would consider "the advances towards a regional charcoal policy for Sub-Saharan Africa". This is welcome.

4.3.6.3 How effective are communications to ensure stakeholder awareness about the project? Are effective external communication mechanisms in place?

The project has made efforts to raise awareness of the problem it addresses and the activities it is undertaking to address it. Workshops have been organized, and media invited to attend them. In addition, the project has been presented in the radio. In January 2019 the project manager did an interview on a national radio station (Luanda Antena Comercial) in the program entitled Onda Natural na nossa vida, which focuses on the environment. In the interview, the project was introduced and described the different activities undertaken in the two provinces. Furthermore, UNDP Headquarters produced a video about the project[56] in 2019, as part of the 'Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) implementation in practice' communication initiative. This was posted on Youtube. A short reportage about the project was also shown in the afternoon and evening news in the Angolan National Television. Moreover, information about the project has been included in a number of websites, not only of UNDP Angola and UN Angola, but also of other institutions such as ministries (Ministry of Petroleum), and national and international media - Jornal de Angola (2 articles), O Pais and Lusa (Portugal).

There are plans to further strengthen communications. UNDP Angola is considering creating a web site for the portfolio of GEF projects it manages. In collaboration with the communications department of MINAMB, the project is working on a new video. The project team is also thinking about communicating the project through social media. In addition, the project team plans to organize an

[54] COSPE learned about the clean cut from ADPP; ADPP learned about classifying trees by colours from COSPE; and universities learned the improved Angolan kiln from ADPP in terms of digging.

[55] In reality, to be effective, documentation and systematization of lessons learned should be a continuous process, including this reflexion exercise in project monitoring documents, internally and with implementers. Of course, lessons have to be systematized at the end, but it is very important that project stakeholders have this reflective approach throughout the project – drawing lessons learned is not something that can be done by an external consultant at the end).

[56] https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=4vnmKVM8pas&feature=youtu.be

event with the universities of Luanda and Huambo to encourage master students to do their dissertations and thesis on sustainable forest management and efficient charcoal production and consumption technologies.

While work on communication is very good, there is room for improvement. The video produced in 2019 does not clearly present the problem and the activities of the project to address it, and it is thus unclear on the value added of the project and its results. The contribution to achieve the SDGs is not clear either. Furthermore, some of the aspects of the project will need a strong communication strategy, namely the promotion of improved cookstoves in Luanda and other cities.

4.4. Sustainability

4.4.1. Are the risks identified in the project document the most important? Are they still up to date?

The project document identifies 9 risks: 1 strategic, 4 development, 2 operational, 1 sustainability and 1 financial[57]. All relevant risks seem to be included, although the risk on stakeholder mapping goes beyond gender. None of the risks has great probability and impact[58]. Overall management responses are adequate. However, there are some important gaps. The project document does not provide an adequate mechanism to ensure adequate governance and political support, simply expecting that this will exist during project implementation.

During project implementation, some of the risks identified in the project document have materialized. This is the case for weak governance and low political support, particularly regarding MINAGRIF – IDF, as discussed above. The 2018 PIR takes note of this, and mentions that difficulties in engaging IDF seem to have been overcome. The 2019 PIR argues that those difficulties had been resolved. However, as indicated above, at the time of writing, this problem seems to persist. In addition, although not mentioned in the PIRs, and despite the inclusion of a good mitigation strategy in the project document, the risk on low decision-making has materialized, although at the time of writing this has mostly been resolved. It is too early to assess the probability of some other risks, given the current level of

[57] Strategic: Weak governance structures and political support would hamper the implementation of sustainable charcoal in Angola. Operational: slow decision- making processes would impede timely delivery of project activities and procurement of goods and services; Identified constraints in human and institutional capacity would affect the quality and successful execution of Project activities Development: Beneficiaries would reject improved charcoal technology due to technical, socio-economic, or other reasons; the proposed improved charcoal kilns would not perform as expected due to technical or operational factors: low levels of association and poor credit- worthiness of rural farmers would impede effective upscaling of sustainable charcoal schemes; Inadequate mapping of actors and mechanisms in the charcoal value chain would lead impede of affect empowerment of women. Financial: Changes in global carbon and REDD+ markets would reduce the prospects for external financing of sustainable charcoal production. Sustainability: The implementation of EE charcoal kilns would lead to increase pressure on native forest.

[58] Two risks have a great probability (1), 3 a 2 category probability, 3 a 3 category probability, and 1 a 4 category probability. Two risks have have a 2-levlel impact, 3 a 3 category impact, 3 a 4 category impact and 1 a 5 category impact.

implementation on aspects related to them. In particular, this is the case for rejection of charcoal improved technologies, lower than planned performance of improved kilns, and difficulties for effective upscaling of sustainable charcoal schemes. For the future, the risk related to stakeholder mapping is relevant, specifically regarding the involvement of municipal and communal administrations. PIRs do not identify risks related to social and environmental standards, which is reasonable in this project, although land grabbing could be perhaps mentioned.

4.4.2. What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being available once the GEF assistance ends?

Available information suggests the availability of financial and economic resources once the GEF assistance ends is moderately likely. Forestry conservation does not seem to be the highest priority of the government, more attention being paid to agriculture and other sectors. Forestry conservation does not seem to be either the highest priority of donors. This does not mean that forestry will be neglected and that no activities will take place in the sector. The government will continue some activities. In some occasions, follow up funds have been provided for similar initiatives, such as Kisama National Park, managed by the biodiversity institute of the country. Development partners may also support some efforts. Nevertheless, this will not likely happen at a great scale, and forestry may be set aside if there are conflicts with other sectors. That being said, the project is trying to raise interest on forest conservation, disseminating the relevance of the project, with a workshop in English being planned.

If the project is successful, sustainable charcoal production and alternative income generating activities, such as non-timber forest products, can generate financial and economic resources for the sustainable use of forests. Defining the approach on certification and working on this and commercialization would however be important for increasing economic opportunities. In this sense, given the limited negotiation power of producers, with very high margins on the side of traders, the lack of cooperatives is a risk for generating sustainable financial and economic resources for communities to use forests sustainably. The lack of storage infrastructure and difficulties for transport are a similar problem. In tune with this, while in principle there would be a market for cookstoves and briquetting machines, it would be important to implement a value chain approach for ensuring the market actually works. At household level, savings would contribute to people buying improved cookstoves and using increased disposable income for other purposes.

In the short term, the project could exploit synergies with two projects. UNDP is starting to implement a new GEF project focusing on rural energy access. In addition, FAO is developing a pilot project on dry forests in Angola. This shows some interest at the regional and global levels and Angola is interested in being seen as an international player, which is also an opportunity for mobilizing international resources for sustainable forest management.

4.4.3. 4.3 Are there any social risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?

Alphabetization will contribute to sustainability. The creation of bank accounts and increased familiarity with their use are also positive factors. The positive impacts on health can also contribute to sustainability. Expansion of LPG in peri-urban and urban areas is also a positive factor, given that it would reduce the use of charcoal and promote that it comes from sustainable sources. However, research shows that when countries become richer not necessarily charcoal consumption goes back. Conflicts over land could negatively affect sustainable forest management and charcoal production. As noted, the development of sustainable forest management plans protects communities' control over land and therefore contributes to sustainability. IDF is also favouring this process over large concessional permits. At more local level, lack of identification elements, such as t-shirts and/or cards, for the members of the forest management groups affects negatively their capacity to control the use of forests and enforce sustainable practices.

4.4.4. Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize the sustenance of project benefits?

At the institutional level, as mentioned in section 4.6.3.1, the engagement of MINAMB, provincial governments and communities, and the creation of Community Forest Groups, will contribute to sustainability. In contrast, the limited involvement of MINAGRIF and IDF at political level, as well as other line ministries, such as MINEA and Ministry of Commerce, is a risk for sustainability of project results. Decentralization is an opportunity for sustainability, as municipal and communal administrations are concerned by the loss of forest resources. The project could do more to exploit this opportunity, given the limited involvement of municipal and communal administrations. It is worth noting that in addition to shifting mandates, IDF at provincial level does not have the human and material capacity to provide regular technical support to targeted communities, and control their charcoal production. Human resources are not commensurate with the number of areas and their remoteness. Municipal and communal administrations have a technical person on agriculture but he/she is not in charge of forests, and does not know how to use forestry related documents. Prevalence of corruption also does not help. That being said, the project could do more to build trust between IDF and communities, which so far is only done substantively in the communities supported by the universities. Similarly, there is room for improvement in the engagement of the private sector, perhaps with public-private partnerships, although as noted this is difficult given the informal and predatory nature of the charcoal sector.

At policy level, the project will contribute to improve the enabling environment. The extent to which this will be done is uncertain. Studies are already an important contribution, in terms of data to inform decision-making. For instance, the baseline could help identify where the highest magnitude of emissions comes from and what are the drivers. The project will very likely be able to develop a white book, providing important criteria and recommendations built collectively. This is crucial. Given political challenges, it is uncertain whether a sustainable charcoal strategy will be prepared and endorsed, although recent agreements with IDF leadership suggest it will likely be prepared and endorsed. Enforcement will be more challenging. The contribution regarding certification is also yet to be defined. These elements are important to support other policies and comply with international commitments (i.e. INDC), which will any way promote sustainable forest management.

At community level, sustainable forest management plans will also contribute to sustainability. It is worth noting however that there are some issues regarding the extent to which these plans will guide action, in terms of defining how many trees to cut by when, with the risk of all trees of the green category being cut in one year. There are also concerns regarding which types of trees can be cut. According to the management plans, charcoal trees of between 15 and 20 years (green trees) can be cut and older (red) trees cannot be cut, because they provide seeds and therefore contribute to other trees growing naturally. However, if all green trees are cut, these will never become red trees, and as red trees will die at some point of age or illnesses, they will not be replaced. The forest will survive with tree species that cannot be cut, such as fruit trees, but charcoal trees may no longer be available in the medium term.

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

Climate change is an important factor that could affect sustainability negatively. Prolonged and severe drought and heavy rains, as well as wildfires becoming more regular and less controllable are a risk. Positively, there is increased awareness and capacity to adapt, including less use of fire by communities and a better management of it when it is used. There is in any case room for strengthening this, particularly on fire prevention and control.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

5.1. Conclusions

Project strategy

The problem addressed by the project is highly relevant. Already very important, charcoal production and consumption are predicted to exponentially increase in Angola up to 2030. The five steps of the charcoal value chain, that is, forest management, carbonization, transport, distribution (including warehousing), and consumption, are unsustainable in the country. The project focuses on the Luanda-Huambo corridor, the region covering the main centres of charcoal production and consumption in the country. The project document clearly explains the relevance of the problem at the national and sub-national levels. The project document also presents clearly the barriers to achieve the long-term solution.

Despite the reference in the title to a value chain approach, the project document focuses on steps 2-5, and mostly on steps 2 and 5 on technology, disregarding step 1, on forest management. The focus of the project was adjusted in the first phases of implementation, to introduce a community sustainable forest management component (step 1), reducing the technology focus to a certain extent. This adjustment increased the effectiveness of the project strategy. During implementation the scope of the project has been reduced. So far, in the first three years of implementation, the project has focused on step 1. There has also been some work on the step 2, on carbonization. Some preparatory work has been conducted on step 5, on consumption, and to a certain extent step 4, on storage. More work is planned on these two steps. However, there is room for improvement on step 3 on transport and key elements of step 4, regarding distribution and retail for sustainable or more sustainable charcoal, energy efficient cookstoves and to a lesser extent briquetting machines and briquettes. These elements are key parts of the value chain. The project has a comprehensive approach, in terms of dimensions or type of barriers it tries to overcome, with room for improvement on the information aspect. The project strategy is smart in addressing the institutional barrier. The project combines a bottom-up and top-down approach. The design of the project was informed by lessons from the PPG and a report produced by another project, as well as, arguably, by lessons from projects from other countries. During implementation, lessons from other countries were also considered.

The project is in line with national policies and Angola's international commitments, particularly the INDC. That being said, the project aims to fill a gap on the policy framework, which does not fully recognize the importance of a sustainable charcoal value chain. Available information does not allow confirming whether all people affected or concerned by the project were consulted during project design, but suggests this was the case.

The project document analyses in a rather general way the different roles that women and men play along the charcoal value chain, in part due to the systemic lack of socio-economic data. To promote gender equity, the project document refers to a gender analysis to be conducted in the first year of implementation and management-related activities. During implementation, a detailed gender assessment was conducted. The project is contributing to gender equality, with room for improvement on the market side.

Human rights are not prominent in the analysis of the context or the impacts of project activities. Project activities do promote human rights by protecting access to land and resources, respecting the right to equal participation, focusing on poor households, and promoting labour rights, although these should be further considered along the value chain. There is room for more detailed monitoring and reporting on human rights.

The objective of the project is clear and feasible. The outcomes would clearly contribute to achieve the objective. The outcomes are mostly clear and feasible. The definition of activities has important deficits, regarding lack of specificity, duplication and absence of some key activities, particularly on forest management.

The indicators, baselines and targets are to a great extent quantitative. While it does make some sense to that type of indicators, not only it is difficult for a development project like this one to measure most of the quantitative impacts considered in the SRF, but some of the targets seem too ambitious. While the shift towards forest management during project inception compromises the achievement of most quantitative targets, it contributes to overcoming existing barriers for a sustainable change. With its great focus on technology aspects, and given the fact the GEF approved it as a standalone climate change project, the SRF does not include important environmental and development impacts of the project.

Progress towards results

Overall, as of October 2019, this project is far from achieving its mid-term targets, but will likely achieve its planned end-of –project targets by the end of the project, with some important shortcomings. Table 5 provides the details, including the justification for ratings. A number of factors have affected the project negatively: a modification in the approach (see section 4.1.1.2), some very ambitious targets (see section 4.1.2.2), barriers to implementation (see section 4.2.2) and some gaps in project management (see section 4.3.1.1).

Section 4.2.1 assesses the impacts of the project in a more narrative way, indicating what has been done, what benefits have been provided and what is missing in the plan as of 31 October 2019. It is worth noting that, on the field, the project has made important contributions on aspects not reflected in the results framework, although these benefits depend to a relevant extent on which implementer is taking the lead.

Deficits in the tool and important differences in its completion compromise the usefulness of the GEF Tracking tool to assess the progress made by the project. Progress has been made on objective (2 (energy efficiency). Different barriers have compromised progress. Table 12 summarizes them (see section 4.2.2 for details).

Table 12. Summary of barriers to project progress

Type	Subtype	Summary
At national and provincial level	Complexity of the problem addressed	Huge demand for charcoal in urban and peri-urban areas, few alternatives to produce it in rural areas and great difficulties to control it
	Institutional instability	Changes in IDF at the national and provincial levels
	Novelty of the topic	Existence of few experienced players
At national level	Weak inter-sectorial coordination	Tensions between MINAMB and MINAGRIF – IDF at the political level
At provincial level	Absence of a common approach by implementers	Absence of ambitious and specific minimum standard requirements
	Limited engagement with IDF	Charcoal produced by the project not having permits
	Lack of identification elements for the members of the forest management groups and lack of equipment	
	Low alphabetization rates	
	Native tree species take very long to grow	
	Lack of basic equipment to protect charcoal producers from the heat and smoke produced by improved kilns	

In the short term, there are opportunities for synergies with a new GEF -UNDP project focusing on rural energy access and a FAO project on dry forests, both in Angola, as well as with projects implemented by UNDP and FAO in other countries in the region.

Project implementation and adaptive management

UNDP's support to the management of the project is very good. It involves a large number of people. Roles are clear and executed at high standards, following GEF and UNDP procedures. The interaction between UNDP and the MINAMB is efficient. UNDP helps manage the funds and provides technical oversight, while the ministry makes all the decisions. Transferring full implementation to the government, as done in other projects, would likely affect negatively project delivery. Notwithstanding the former, there is room for improvement in the management of the activities carried out by the three implementers.

There have been some delays, particularly at the beginning of the project. The delays were mostly due to decision-making done at a very high political level, by overbooked individuals; the need to reach consensus between ministries with a communication that is not particularly smooth; and significant turn over on key government positions. The project is trying to address these factors.

As of October 2019, the project had spent USD 1,466,111, that is, 54 per cent of the planned budget for 2017, 2018 and the 9 first months of 2019. Total actual expenditure represented 32 per cent of GEF funding, when more than 58 per cent of the implementation time had been spent. Interviews suggest around 2/3 of the total budget have already been contracted and an important tender had been launched, indicating more substantive disbursements in the near future.

As of October 2018, actual PMC represented 10 per cent of total actual implementation costs. The way the financial officer is charged and direct project costs explain this. At mid-term, there are good perspectives PMC will be below 5 per cent of total project costs by the end of the project. Having an international UNV raises the quality of project management for rather limited costs.

As of October 2019, the project had mobilized 12 per cent of total planned co-financing when more than 58 per cent of the implementation time had been spent. Of the five sources of co-financing, two (ADPP and COSPE) had already provided or exceeded planned co-financing. UNDP-TRAC has provided around 90 per cent of planned co-financing. UCO has provided over 30 per cent of planned co-financing, and remaining planned co-financing is not likely. The Government of Angola is responsible for 86 per cent of total planned co-financing. The problem here is not with the implementation of complementary activities, but with estimating how much these activities cost.

The project document includes an M&E plan in accordance with the established procedures of both UNDP and GEF. The M&E plan is comprehensive and robust, although it does not integrate the use of the GEF Tracking tool. Sufficient financial resources are allocated to implement the plan. However, the SRF has important caveats, some indicators not being specific, not defining clear means of verification, or having inadequate time references. Table 11 provides the details. The structure and guidelines of the GEF Tracking tool could be improved.

Monitoring and reporting has mostly taken place in accordance to the M&E plan included in the project document and agreed in the inception workshop. In addition, the project is using an M&E tool at activity level. Overall, quality of reports is good with room for improvement regarding development of baselines, clarity on reporting on indicators and the nature of overall assessments, which tend to report on activities and impacts rather than achievement of targets and tend to be overly optimistic. Completion of the GEF tracking tool at mid-term is mostly robust, with some fields not being completed and some controversial ratings. The tool to monitor progress at activity level is a useful addition, but there is room for improvement in the structure of the tool and the information that is provided. In addition, as noted, there is room for improvement in monitoring the work conducted by the three implementers. The project seems to have adequate financial management.

The project document planned the creation of a PB, of political nature, and a PSC, of a more technical nature. The composition of the PSC was not defined in the project document, in the inception report or the launching workshop. Unlike planned, the PB has not met. The PSC has met significantly less than planned. The project has engaged relevant institutions: MINAMB, de-concentrated institutions, implementers and communities, although the latter to a heterogeneous extent. There is room for further engaging many relevant institutions, namely high-level decision-makers at MINAGRIF-IDF; other ministries, such as MINEA and the Ministry of Commerce; municipal and communal administrations; and the private sector, although efforts to engage some of them have been made.

In design, two of the project outputs focus on collecting, systematizing and exchanging lessons. During implementation, there has been no progress on drawing and considering lessons from other national

projects. As of 31 October 2019, exchanges with similar projects or initiatives at the regional and global levels have been limited within UNDP. In contrast, the project has exchanged experiences with similar projects in Haiti, Mali, Mozambique, Namibia and Zambia and exchanges with the FAO at the regional level are starting to take place. As of October 2019, collection, systematization, integration and exchange of lessons learned from the project itself have been limited.

The project has made efforts to raise awareness of the problem it addresses and the activities it is undertaking to address it, through a variety of means: workshops, an interview on the radio, a video on Youtube, a reportage on TV and news on websites. There are plans to further strengthen communications, including a website, one more video, social media and a workshop to encourage research. Some of the aspects of the project will need a strong communication strategy, namely the promotion of improved cookstoves in Luanda and other cities.

Sustainability

Overall, identification and rating of risks and management responses in the project document were good, with some important gaps. Despite project reporting indicating differently, the weak governance and low political support risk seems to persist. For the future, the risk related to stakeholder mapping is relevant, specifically regarding the involvement of municipal and communal administrations.

The availability of financial and economic resources once the GEF assistance ends is moderately likely. Forestry conservation does not seem to be the highest priority of the government or donors. If the project is successful, sustainable charcoal production and alternative income generating activities can generate financial and economic resources for the sustainable use of forests. For this to take place at the scale needed, the project would need to strengthen its work on certification/licensing and commercialization, including the promotion of cooperatives and considering storage and transport infrastructures, to the extent possible. In the short term, the project could exploit synergies with the UNDP-GEF and FAO projects mentioned above.

Alphabetization, access to financial services, positive impacts on health, and expansion of LPG will contribute to sustainability of project outcomes. Conflicts over land could affect it negatively, but forest management plans and IDF's vision mitigate this risk. On the other hand, the lack of identification elements for the members of the forest management groups could affect their ability to enforce sustainable forest practices.

At the institutional level, the engagement of MINAMB, provincial governments and communities, and the creation of Community Forest Groups, will contribute to sustainability. In contrast, the limited involvement of MINAGRIF and IDF at political level and other line ministries is a risk for sustainability of project results – recent progress on this is very welcome. The project could do more to exploit the opportunity that decentralization brings and, at the same time, build trust between IDF and communities. Similarly, there is room for improvement in the engagement of the private sector.

The extent to which the project will improve the enabling environment is uncertain. Studies are already an important contribution, in terms of data to inform decision-making. The project will very likely be able to develop a white book, which is crucial. Recent agreements with IDF leadership suggest a sustainable charcoal strategy will likely be prepared and endorsed. Enforcement will likely be more challenging. The contribution regarding certification is also yet to be defined. At community level, sustainable forest management plans will contribute to sustainability, with some concerns on some key aspects. Climate change could affect sustainability negatively. Positively, there is increased awareness and capacity to adapt.

5.2. Recommendations

Recommendation 1. Define a road map and strengthen implementation on policy, certification, kilns, cookstoves and briquetting machines and briquettes

Based on the discussion from the Project Strategy, Progress Towards Results and Financial management sections above, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

The project should define a road map and strengthen implementation on the following aspects:

1.1 Policy level

UNDP and the PMU should award the contracts for the development of the white book urgently. The project should fast-track delivery to the extent possible, taking into account that in this case the process is at least as important as the content. In this sense, MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should ensure the process is collaborative and consultative on all critical aspects and in all the steps (drafting, validation and completion), and advocate for MINAGRIF – IDF to at least co-chair some of the discussion groups. It would also be important to ensure some sort of cohesion between the different chapters, even if a single will not put the book together. MINAMB, UNDP and MINAGRIF – IDF should take this role.

1.2 Certification and commercialization of sustainable charcoal

MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should clarify in a planning document (e.g. a PIR) what the approach to commercialization and certification of sustainable charcoal is: i) indicate the new final target(s), explaining how this/these is/are different from the original targets and what are the reasons for the

change[59]; ii) indicate how the project plans to achieve the new target(s), including the definition of steps and the indication of timelines. More specifically, they should clarify what will come after COSPE's consultancy on identification of key points in the charcoal value chain where incentive and control mechanisms need to be implemented for the adoption of sustainable charcoal criteria. In this sense, define how the project will promote a supply chain that promotes charcoal that has been produced in a more sustainable way, linking production and consumption of sustainable charcoal. This should look at step 3, on transport, and step 4, on distribution and retail, in the value chain.

1.3 Improved kilns

MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should define what the strategy of the project is to scale up the use of improved kilns, beyond training. This should consider how materials (chimneys, barrels) needed for these kilns will be readily available to charcoal producers during and after the project. Again, this would probably involve exploring and addressing the commercialization issue. The project should provide safety equipment for those using the improved kilns.

1.4 Improved cookstoves

The project should finalize testing of improved cookstoves, systematically documenting the experiments. MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should define the approach to commercialization of the identified improved cookstoves. When doing this, they should i) strengthen the gender and human rights dimensions, particularly on labour rights; ii) consider poverty reduction impacts, linking to the extent possible with other urban poverty reduction programmes; iii) create a structure to monitor savings of households benefiting from cookstoves accessed as a result of the project, to be able to report on indicator Bc. Strategic planning is here critical: the project should work on the consumption side, but may rethink the scope of its work on this. In this sense, the project should assess how funds on consumption could be best used: through the promotion of technologies, which could be difficult and may not have visible impacts in the short term, or through other activities such as the preparation of studies, considering the impact that the project can have with the resources and time it has. Targets in the SRF should be revised accordingly.

1.5 Briquetting machines and briquettes

The project should finalize testing of briquetting machines, systematically documenting the experiments. MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should define the approach to commercialization of the identified briquetting machines as well as the briquettes. Consider points i, ii and iii mentioned for cookstoves.

[59] The project document includes two targets on certification: the design and implementation of a certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal (1b); and 3,024 ton/yr of certified, sustainable charcoal delivered to consumers per year (2b).

Recommendation 2. Strengthen forest management related activities

Based on the discussion from the Project Strategy, Progress Towards Results and Project Implementation and Adaptive Management (finance) sections above, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

The project should strengthen forest management related activities. To that end, the PMU should conduct a systematic and strategic analysis, identifying and compiling lessons; define a road map for common, ambitious minimum standards, establishing accordingly indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification for each implementer[60], to the extent possible related to already existing indicators in the SRF; and monitor delivery to ensure the three implementers comply with the road map. The PMU should identify, compile and exchange lessons on a regular basis.

Ambitious minimum activities should include i) training on sustainable forest management, ii) creating community structures to manage forests; iii) conducting inventories; iv) defining management plans; v) developing and maintaining relatively large and diverse nurseries; vi) reforestation with trees from the nurseries and some native trees bought from outside when necessary; vii) training communities on improved kilns; and viii) identifying and implementing alternative income generating activities, promoting those that have a positive impact on gender equality, human rights and poverty reduction and are likely to be sustainable, including considerations of production, storage and commercialization. In addition, the project should explore the possibility of expanding efforts on alphabetization and access to solar panels – this would not be a minimum requirement. It would have been very important to conduct the inventories and define management plans in the framework of the development of land use plans. It is probably too late for the project to work on this now, given the time these plans take, the current availability of inventories and management plans, and the need to focus on the implementation of the management plans, the promotion of income generating activities and the other steps of the charcoal value chain.

Recommendation 3. Strengthen management

Based on the discussion from the Progress Towards Results and Project Implementation and Adaptive Management sections above, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

MINAMB should explore ways to fast-track internal decision-making, increasing delegation of authority, as and if appropriate.

[60] Indicators could include ha to be covered by inventories and management plans, ha to be reforested and/or number of trees to be planted, number of kilns to be developed for demonstration purposes and/or material to be provided for communities to build kilns, volume of sustainable charcoal produced, and number of individuals to be involved in alternative income generating activities.

UNDP's regional technical adviser should organize a mission to the country to meet with stakeholders and visit sites.

As noted above, the PMU should improve the management of the activities carried out by the three implementers. The PMU should also do more frequent visits to the field, and change the communities that are visited from time to time.

Although the work of the current members of the PMU should be strengthened, MINAMB and UNDP should consider hiring a regional coordinator, based in Huambo. This coordinator would 1) monitor the work of the three consortia of implementing partners; 2) facilitate the documentation and exchange of lessons learned; and 3) facilitate the interaction between the project and local governments (provincial, municipal, communal). To this end, the project should consider purchasing a second vehicle, in addition to the one that is needed for the activities in Luanda. Funds from budget lines 13 and 20 for "rental and maintenance of premises" could be used, as they have so far not been used. The regional coordinator could be based within Centre for Tropical Ecology and Climate Change (CETAC by its initials in Portuguese), which is a climate research institute belonging to MINAMB in Huambo and has some unused space.

Recommendation 4. Strengthen accounting of co-finance

Based on the discussion from the Project Implementation and Adaptive Management (Finance) section above, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

The PMU should find a way to estimate the cost of the complementary activities undertaken by the government. The GEF would consider this in its assessment, and given that complementary activities do take place and the share of government's co-financing in total co-financing, the assessment would be misleading without taking them into account. Accounting could highlight this is an estimate, and outline the difficulties to reflect the real cost of the activities.

Recommendation 5. Strengthen M&E

Based on the discussion from the Project implementation and Adaptive Management (M&E) section above, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

Recognizing that objective-level indicators cannot be adjusted in a significant way, MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should revise the SRF:

- Ensure comprehensiveness (4a) and specificity (Ba, Bc, 2a, 3a, 3b) of and links between (c and 1a) indicators and clarity of means of verification (Aa, Ab and 3a)
- Add qualitative indicators and targets to complement the quantitative indicators and targets.

MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should revise the list of activities, for the activity-level M&E tool

- Be more specific (activities 1.2, 2.4, 3.1)

- Disaggregate activities in sub-activities (1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3, 2.5) and indicate previous activities (2.1, 2.2)
- Remove duplications
- Add activities that are being conducted but are not included in the list of activities: the development of inventories and management plans, the creation and maintenance of nurseries, the plantation of trees, and the identification and promotion of alternative income generating activities

Regarding the PIR, MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should

- Ensure that reporting focuses first on achievement of the targets included in the SRF and only then on the number and relevance of the activities implemented, avoiding overly optimistic assessments in sections C and G
- Clarify steps and links to make it easier to understand the progress made (1a and 1b)
- Ensure reporting refers to the specific indicators (2a and 2b)
- Define indicators for some of the environmental and development impacts of the project currently not included in the SRF. Given that funding was approved under the climate change mitigation focal area, and it is only the GHG emission reduction potential that made it eligible, it would not be consistent with GEF policies and procedures to include these other environmental and development impacts in the SRF. Yet they are very important. Indicators for these impacts could be developed, monitored and reported upon in the PIRs. More specifically:
    - Regarding the environment, explore the inclusion of aspects related to the sustainable use of forests, from contribution to reduce soil erosion to conserve biodiversity.
    - Regarding development aspects, explore the inclusion of impacts on poverty, health and social capital
- Strengthen monitoring and reporting on human rights, particularly in the section on social and environmental standards, for instance, regarding land grabbing and labour rights.

Regarding the GEF Tracking tool, the PMU should

- Add a column for clarifying and nuancing the contribution of the project, which will provide context to controversial ratings

Regarding the activity level M&E tool, the PMU should

- Structure
    - Break activities into sub-activities or steps (particularly for 1.1, 1.4, 2.1, 2.2, 2.3 and 2.5)
    - Indicate which sub-activities or steps have been completed and which ones not
    - Add a column for next steps, indicating planned completion dates
- Reporting itself:
    - Explain the relevance of the some of the sub-activities conducted (1.2 meetings of the Commission);
    - Clarify the current objective on certification;
    - Report on all aspects of a particular activity, but only on aspects related to that activity;
    - Provide specific answers instead of providing the same information for different activities

(2.1 and 2.3 and 2.5 and 1.3; 3.4)

As noted in recommendation 2 above, the PMU should strengthen monitoring of the activities conducted in the field.

- How many and what type (species and size) of trees are cut and how they are cut as part of the project, for instance for building kilns during the demonstrations; how many of these trees are replaced – conducting inventories at the end. The PMU should monitor land change caused by charcoal production in the project areas
- Document the inputs (kg of trees) and the outputs (kg of charcoal) of testing kilns

Others

- Fast-track the completion of the GHG emissions baseline
- Conduct a baseline of how much charcoal the selected villages produce and trade
- Conduct financial audits

Recommendation 6. Strengthen the engagement of stakeholders, further involving some players and engaging new players.

Based on the discussion from the Progress towards Results and Project implementation and Adaptive Management (stakeholder engagement) sections above, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

MINAMB and UNDP should create a PB, involving high-level decision-makers at the national level, as originally planned. This could be a good strategy to involve high-level decision-makers from MINAGRIF – IDF. MINEA and probably the Ministry of Commerce should also be involved. The PB would complement the PSC, of a more technical nature.

At the same time, MINAMB and UNDP should ensure that the PSC meets at least twice a year, and not just once a year. They should also advocate for the IDF technical focal point to be officially appointed.

MINAMB, UNDP, the PMU and implementers should involve IDF provincial officials in all sites, to build trust between them and communities. The project should obtain permits so that all the charcoal produced under the umbrella of the project fully complies with national regulations.

MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should further involve decentralized institutions, making them more aware of the project and more importantly building the capacity of municipal and communal administrators on sustainable forest management and charcoal production. It would be important as well to strengthen the links between these officials and IDF officials in the region, and train municipal and communal administrators in completing IDF documents and forms. The approach could include training municipal and communal administrators on a summary of the modules already developed,

organizing bilateral meetings with project staff and holding meetings between IDF and local administrators, in that sequence.

MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should further involve the private sector, regarding sustainably produced charcoal, materials for improved kilns, cookstoves, briquetting machines, briquettes, and outputs from alternative income generating activities. Links with existing cooperatives and, in some cases, creation of cooperatives should be promoted, and opportunities for transport, distribution and retail, as well as production in the case of some technologies, should be explored and supported, as and if appropriate, given the complexity of the charcoal value chain. Public-private partnerships should be encouraged, when applicable.

MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should clarify the role of implementers, distinguishing between partnerships and contracts. Together with implementers, they should define how the collaboration will remain once the project phases out.

In line with recommendation 1, MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should define how those in charge of transport, storage and retail of charcoal, and end-users of sustainable charcoal, briquettes and improved cookstoves would be engaged in the project.

MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should exploit synergies with other projects, including, but not limited, to the new UNDP/GEF and FAO projects. This is relevant across outcomes, but perhaps particularly urgent regarding the development of a sustainable charcoal policy and thus further engaging MINAGRIF / IDF, and the activities on the ground, especially on alternative income generating activities.

Recommendation 7. Further document and exchange lessons

Based on the discussion from the Project implementation and Adaptive Management (lessons) section above, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

UNDP's Sub-Saharan Africa Regional Service Centre should create a community of practice around sustainable charcoal, facilitating connections between managers of UNDP/GEF projects working on this or with component on this in Uganda, Sierra Leone, Nigeria and Rwanda. A lessons learned exchange workshop should also be organized. Visits should also be considered.

UNDP, MINAMB and the PMU should continue exchanging with other relevant projects, institutions and individuals beyond UNDP, such as WB Mozambique and FAO. The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) could be an interesting player.

The PMU and implementers should collect and systematize lessons learned regularly, as part of their implementing and executing processes. Reporting documents should include a section on lessons learned.

Recommendation 8. Strengthen communication

Based on the discussion from the Project implementation and Adaptive Management (communication) section above, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

UNDP, MINAMB and the PMU should continue efforts on this, trying to provide a more comprehensive picture of the problem and the strategy, and its contribution to SDGs.

Recommendation 9. Strengthen sustainability

Based on the discussion from the Sustainability section above, the mid-term review has the following recommendations:

MINAMB and UNDP should continue raising awareness of the importance of sustainable forest management with donors, in synergy with UNDP/GEF and FAO projects. They should further advocate for a Green Climate Fund proposal on this.

MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should explore and promote ways in which the activities of the project, including alternative income generating activities, can sustainably generate financial and economic resources for the sustainable use of forests. In line with recommendations 1 and 2 above, this would involve defining the approach on certification and working on this and commercialization, including the promotion of cooperatives, storage infrastructure and transport arrangements.

The PMU should strengthen forest management community groups. It should provide them materials for the identification of the members of these groups, which would strengthen their authority in contributing to manage forests in a more sustainable way. The PMU should explore the possibility of giving forest management community groups tools to better monitor forests, such as GPS, and training them on how to use them.

MINAMB, UNDP and the PMU should revise the forest management plans, ensuring at least 20 per cent of green trees are not cut, so they become red. It would also be good to define a quantitative plan, despite the difficulty given the low levels of alphabetization, to better contribute to sustainability and avoid that all green trees are cut in just one year.

The PMU should strengthen the capacity of communities to adapt to climate change, particularly on strengthening capacity on fire prevention and control.

6. Annexes

6.1. Evaluation Matrix

Table 13. Evaluation Matrix

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
1. Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership and the best route towards expected results?			
1.1 Project Design			
1.1.1. Is the problem addressed by the project relevant to its context and to the identified assumptions?	• Relevance of the problem in project sites - consistency with human development needs of the country and the intended beneficiaries • Level of alignment between key assumptions made in the prodoc and situation on project sites	• Project planning documents • Local executing team and executing partners • Government stakeholders	• Desk review • Interviews • Field visits
1.1.2. How effective is the selected strategy to achieve intended results?	• Extent to which selected method of delivery appropriate to the development context • Level of coherence between planned activities and expected outputs and outcomes • Evidence of planning documents utilizing lessons learned/ recommendations from previous projects as input to planning/strategy process	• Project planning documents • Local executing team and executing partners • Government stakeholders	• Desk review • Interviews • Field visits
1.1.3. To what extent is the project responding to the national and sub-national priorities and context?	• Level of alignment of the project outcomes and outputs with national and local priorities (a) at project inception; (b) at midterm	• Project planning documents • National and subnational policies, strategies and plans • Local executing team and executing partners • Government stakeholders	• Desk review • Interviews
1.1.4. Were perspectives from all relevant stakeholders taken into account during project	• Number and types of stakeholders consulted during project design • Evidence of concerns expressed being used to	• Local executing partners, including community members and groups, government stakeholders and	• Desk review • Interviews • Field visits

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
design?	adjust project strategy	other local stakeholder groups • Workshop/planning meeting minutes and action items	
1.1.5. To what extent were gender issues taken into account during project design?	• Number and types of activities undertaken during project design to assess gender-related needs for the project • Evidence of incorporation of these needs into the project document	• Local executing partners, including community members and groups, government stakeholders and other local stakeholder groups (non-government) • Workshop/planning meeting minutes and action items	• Desk review • Interviews • Field visits
1.2 Results Framework / Logframe			
1..2.1 How clear, practical and feasible are project's outcomes and objectives? How realistic are the targets and timeframes?	• Coherence/difference between stated targets, outcomes and objectives • Implementing entities' staff understanding of objectives, targets and timeframe • Local implementing partners' understanding of objectives, targets and timeframe	• Project planning documents, baseline report, monitoring reports • Local executing team, UNDP staff, MFRSC staff, other implementing partner's staff	• Interviews • Desk review • Focus groups • Field visits
1.2.2 How effective are the logframe's indicators, baselines and targets to measure effects from the project?	• Use of SMART indicators and targets • Relevance and validity of indicators to assess intended outputs and outcomes • Use of gender-disaggregated indicators and targets • Evidence of effects of the project on development or environment not measured by current indicators.	• Project planning documents, baseline report, monitoring reports • Local executing team, UNDP staff, MFRSC staff, other implementing partner's staff	• Interviews • Desk review • Field Visit
2. Progress towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved so far? (effectiveness)			
2.1 To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved so far?	• Extent to which the stated objectives, outcomes and outputs have been achieved • Progress between the most recent GEF Tracking Tool and its Baseline version	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners • Local and national stakeholders	• Focus groups • Field visits • Interviews • Desk review
2.2 What are the main barriers to address and the main opportunities	• Nature and extent of barriers hindering progress towards results	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports	• Focus groups

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
to leverage based on current progress towards results?	• Nature and extent of opportunities generated by most successful achievements to date	• Local executing team and executing partners • Local and national stakeholders	• Field visits • Interviews • Desk review
3. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management: Has the project been implemented efficiently, cost-effectively, and been able to adapt to any changing conditions thus far? To what extent are project-level M&E systems, reporting and project communications supporting the project's implementation? (efficiency)			
3.1 Management Arrangements			
3.1.1 How effective are the management arrangements?	• Evidence of clear roles and responsibilities established • Evidence of timely and transparent decision making • Level of responsiveness of project team and of respective implementing bodies to changing project needs	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.1.2 What is the quality of execution of the project by the executing agency and the implementing partner?	• Level of alignment in actual and planned amount of budget and staff time devoted to the project • Perceived quality of management response to project team members' inquiries, needs • Quality of supervision of IA and EA (rating on a scale), respectively • Quality of risk management by IA and EA (rating on a scale) • Quality of social and environmental management by IA and EA (rating on a scale) • Number of innovative techniques and best practices used in the project management	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.2 Work Planning			
3.2.1 Have there been any delays in implementation? If so, why?	• Timing and sequence of outputs against work plan • Cause and total delays (in months)	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.2.2 Are work-planning processes	• Proportion of results-based planning and reporting	• Project planning, progress reports,	• Desk review

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
results-based?	documents	and monitoring reports	
3.2.3 Was the logical framework used during implementation as a management and M&E tool?	• Extent of management use of the log frame (number and type of usage)	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.3 Finance and co-finance			
3.3.1 To what extent are the outputs being achieved in a cost-effective manner?	• Cost per output compared to costs of similar projects from other organizations • Level of alignment between planned and incurred implementation costs and nature of divergences • Cost associated with delivery mechanism and management structure compared to alternatives	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.3.2 Is there any variance between planned and actual expenditures? Why?	• Planned budget per year, activity • Actual budget execution per year, activity	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.3.3 Does the project have the appropriate financial controls to make informed management decisions regarding the budget and flow of funds?	• Number and proportion of financial reports available • Quality and timeliness of available financial reports • Availability of yearly audit reports	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports	• Desk review
3.3.4 To what extent is the project leveraging its planned co-financing?	• Amount of resources that project has leveraged since inception (and source(s)) • Number and difference between planned and actual executed co-financing activities • Degree of integration of externally funded components into overall project strategy/design	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners • Management teams from co-financing projects	• Interviews • Desk review
3.4 Project-level M&E systems			
3.4.1 Is the M&E system operational	• Existence and quality of: ○ Roles and responsibilities;	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring	• Interviews

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
and effective?	○ Budget and timeframe/ work plan • Proportion and types of M&E reporting materials submitted a) correctly and b) on time • Quality of M&E reporting materials • Evidence of consultation of all relevant stakeholders, including women and vulnerable populations • Proportion of executed M&E budget against planned amount • Degree of adherence of the implementation of the M&E plan to intended timeline • Extent to which the monitoring and evaluation systems that the project has in place helped to ensure that programmes are managed for proper accountability of results	reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Desk review
3.5 Stakeholder Engagement			
3.5.1 To what extent were effective partnership arrangements established for implementation of the project with relevant stakeholders involved in the country, district and community councils?	• Number and types of partnerships developed between project and local bodies/organizations • Extent and quality of interaction/exchange between project implementers and local partners	• Meetings/workshop minutes (Steering Committee) • Local executing partners • Project beneficiaries • Local executing team • UNDP Staff	• Interviews • Desk review • Field visits • Focus groups
3.5.2 To what extent is the project country-driven?	• Appreciation from national stakeholders with respect to adequacy of project design and implementation to national realities and existing capacities • Existence and use of mechanisms to ensure national government stakeholders have an active role in project decision-making	• Project planning and management documents • Key national project partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.5.3 To what extent is the public /community stakeholders aware and supportive of the project's	• Number and type of public awareness activities • Number of people reached by these activities • Perceived benefits of the project by the public	• Monitoring reports • Community stakeholders	• Desk review • Field visits

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
objectives?			
3.6 Reporting			
3.6.1 Were progress reports produced accurately, timely and responded to reporting requirements including adaptive management changes?	• Quality and timeliness of progress and reports • Level of alignment with GEF reporting requirements	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.6.2 How were lessons derived from the adaptive management process documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners?	• Proportion of adaptive management processes documented • Proportion of these processes shared with partners • Evidence of use of lessons from these reports by partners	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.7 Communications			
3.7.1 How effective are communications to ensure stakeholder awareness about the project?	• Existence of an internal communication plan, communication protocols, and feedback mechanisms • Perceived level of awareness about project outcomes and activities by stakeholders	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Desk review
3.7.2 Are effective external communication mechanisms in place?	• Number and type of external communication mechanisms or activities implemented • Perceived usefulness of communications by stakeholders	• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports • Local executing team	• Interviews • Desk review
4. Sustainability: To what extent are there financial, institutional, socio-economic and/or environmental risks to sustaining long-term project results?			
4.1 Are the risks identified in the project document the most important? Are they still up to date?	• Existence of an exit strategy • Robustness of the exit strategy • Level of alignment of risk identified in the project document with (a) actual risks at project inception and (b) current risks	• Local executing team and executing partners • Project document and progress reports	• Interviews • Document Review
4.2 What is the likelihood of financial and economic resources not being	• Type and cost of activities that would require continued financial support after the end of the	• Local executing team and executing partners	• Interviews • Document

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
available once the GEF assistance ends?	project to maintain outcomes • Existence of potential alternative sources of funding for these activities	• Project document and progress reports	Review
4.3 Are there any social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes?	• Existence and type of political and social conditions potentially affecting the sustainability of direct outcomes • Existence of champions that could promote the sustainability of project results	• Local implementation partners • Local communities • Project monitoring and reporting documents/data • Government stakeholders	• Interviews • Desk review
4.4 Do the legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize the sustenance of project benefits?	• Existence and type of frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that may jeopardize project benefits • Type of frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes currently lacking to ensure sustainability of project benefits	• Local implementation partners • Government stakeholders, technical staff • Policy documents	• Interviews • Desk review
4.5 Are there any environmental risks that may jeopardize sustenance of project outcomes?	• Existence and intensity of biophysical conditions affecting the sustainability of project outcomes	• Local implementation partners • Government stakeholders, technical staff • Policy documents	• Interviews • Desk review

6.2. List of reviewed documents

- Project Identification Form
- Project Document
- Project Inception Report
- Project Implementation Reports
- Annual Reports
- Activity level M&E tool
- Annual work plans
- GEF focal area Tracking Tool at CEO endorsement and at midterm
- Oversight mission reports/ Monitoring reports
- Minutes of the PSC
- Communication tools
- Project activities and studies
- National and sub-national policies, strategies and plans (e.g. INDC)

6.3. List of interviewees[61]

Table 14. Stakeholder at the national level

Table 15. Stakeholders at the sub-national level

Table 16. Participants in focus group discussions

[61] To be completed for the final evaluation report in collaboration with the PMU.

6.4. Overview of interview protocols

The table below provides an overview of the questions to be asked during interviews, and who they will be asked to. Before conducting the interviews, they will be separated into specific interview protocols per type of stakeholder. Some questions may then be rephrased to adapt to the type of stakeholder interviewed.

Table 17. Interview protocols

Questions	PMU/CTA	UNDP Lesotho	MFRSC	PSC	Key partner institutions	District and local authorities	Consultants	Baseline projects staff	Communities
Introduction									
What is your position?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	
What is your relationship to the project and for how long have you been involved?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
1. Project strategy									
1.1 Project Design									
1.1.1 How important is the problem addressed by the project for the three Community Councils?	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	
1.1.1 Have the assumptions made during project design proven relevant? Have they evolved? (How?)	x	x	x	x	x	x			
1.1.2 How effective is the selected strategy to achieve intended results? (Were lessons from previous projects integrated into project design?)	x	x	x	x	x	x			
1.1.3 To what extent is the project responding to the national and sub-national priorities and context? Has this changed since project design?	x	x	x	x	x	x		x	
1.1.4 In your opinion, were all people affected or concerned by the project consulted during project design?		x	x	x	x	x	x		x
1.1.5 To what extent were gender issues taken into account during project design? *(Were any activities undertaken to assess gender-related needs for the project during project design?)*		x	x		x	x	x		x
1.2 Results Framework/ Logframe									
1..2.1 Could you please explain in your own words the objectives of the project, its targets and their related timeframes? (for consultants: focus only on those related to their involvement in the project)	x	x	x	x	x		x		
1.2.1 How realistic are they?	x	x	x	x	x		x		
1.2.2 Are there effects on development or on the environment that are not measured by current indicators?	x	x	x	x	x				
2. Progress towards results									
2.1 To what extent have the expected outputs, outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved so far? (provide list, as needed)	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
2.2 What are the main barriers to address to achieve expected results? What are the main opportunities to leverage?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
3. Project implementation and adaptive management									
3.1 Management arrangements									
3.1.1 Are the roles and responsibilities of the PMU, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC and other partners clearly established?	x	x	x	x	x				

Questions	PMU/CTA	UNDP Lesotho	MFRSC	PSC	Key partner institutions	District and local authorities	Consultants	Baseline projects staff	Communities
3.1.1 In your opinion, is decision-making timely and transparent? How responsive are partners to changing needs of the project?	x	x	x	x	x				
3.1.2 How would you describe the quality of management responses to project team members' inquiries and needs?	x	x	x	x	x				
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of supervision by UNDP? Why? (1=poor; 2=fair; 3=good; 4=excellent)	x		x	x					
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of supervision by MFRSC? Why? (same scale)	x	x		x					
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of risk management by UNDP and by MFRSC? Why? (same scale)	x	x	x	x					
3.1.2 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of social and environmental management by UNDP and by MFRSC? Why? (same scale)	x	x	x	x					
3.2 Work Planning									
3.2.1 Have there been any delays in implementation? If so, could you describe their cause and how many months of delay occurred?	x	x	x	x					
3.2.3 How often do you use the project's logframe for management and/or M&E? How do you use it?	x	x	x	x					
3.3 Finance and co-finance?									
3.3.1 Is the project being implemented in a cost-effective manner? If not, why?	x	x	x	x					
3.3.2 Have there been any variations between planned and actual expenditures? If yes, which ones and why?	x	x	x	x					
3.3.3 What (and how much) co-financing is the project leveraging? How has this evolved since project design?	x	x	x	x				x	
3.4 Project-level M&E systems									
3.4.1 Is the M&E system operational and effective?	x								
3.5 Stakeholder Engagement									
3.5.1 How frequently do you interact/exchange with project staff / local partners?	x				x	x	x		x
3.5.1 On a scale of 1 to 4, how would you rate the quality of your interactions? (1=poor; 2=fair; 3=good; 4=excellent)	x				x	x	x		x
3.5.2 Is the project as it is implemented appropriate to your realities and capacities?					x	x			x
3.5.2 Are you aware of any mechanisms being in place for you to influence project decision-making?					x	x			
3.5.3 In your opinion, is the project beneficial to your community? If so, what are its benefits?						x			x
3.6 Reporting									
3.6.1 How many lessons from adaptive management processes were shared with partners? Which partners?	x	x	x	x					
3.6.1 Did you receive any documentation about lessons drawn from adaptive management processes undertaken by the project?					x	x			
3.6.2 Could you provide examples where these lessons were used by your organization?					x	x			
3.7 Communications									
3.7.1 Could you please tell me what the project expected outcomes and its						x		x	x

Questions	PMU/CTA	UNDP Lesotho	MFRSC	PSC	Key partner institutions	District and local authorities	Consultants	Baseline projects staff	Communities
activities are?									
3.7.2 What communication mechanisms or activities have been implemented by the project? Who has been targeted?	x								
3.7.2 How have you received information about the project? Was this information useful?					x	x		x	x
4. Sustainability									
4.1 Have the risks assessed during project design proven relevant? Have they evolved? (How?)	x	x	x	x					
4.2 Which activities would require continued financial support after the end of the project for project outcomes to be maintained?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
4.2 Which outcomes should normally be maintained without additional resources?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
4.3 What social and/or political conditions could affect the sustainability of project outcomes? How?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
4.4 What frameworks/policies/governance structures/processes could potentially affect the sustainability of project benefits? How?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
4.4 What frameworks/policies/governance structures/processes are lacking to ensure the sustainability of project benefits? Why?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		
4.5 Are there any biophysical that could affect the sustainability of project outcomes? How?	x	x	x	x	x	x	x		

6.5. Terms of Reference

1. INTRODUCTION

This is the Terms of Reference (ToR) for the UNDP-GEF Midterm Review (MTR) of the full -sized project titled **Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach** (PIMS #5331) implemented through the Ministry of Environment of the Government of Angola. The 6-year project started on April 1st, 2016 and is at the beginning of its third year of implementation. In line with the UNDP-GEF Guidance on MTRs, this MTR process was initiated at the start of the second Project Implementation Report (PIR) process. This ToR sets out the expectations for this MTR. The MTR process must follow the guidance outlined in the document Guidance For Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects (http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/mid-term/Guidance_Midterm%20Review%20_EN_2014.pdf).

2. PROJECT BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The project is funded by the Global Environment Facility (GEF) and is implemented by UNDP. This ToR relates to the evaluation of the UNDP implemented components of the project.

The Project aims to introduce energy-efficient charcoal technologies in Angola and trigger market demand for certified, sustainable charcoal. Through selected Responsible Partners, energy-efficient charcoal kilns, briquetting machines and efficient stoves will be transferred to rural and peri-urban beneficiaries, thereby adding value along the chain while creating opportunities for income and job creation. Environmental benefits are attained by mitigation of baseline greenhouse gas emissions, reduction of local pollution, and saving of forest-based biomass resources. The Project will deliver key elements for building and financing a sustainable charcoal sector, including a policy white paper and sustainability criteria and verification mechanisms. The Project will further build relevant human resources at all levels for implementing and sustaining low-emission development strategies in Angola, with a focus on charcoal and rural biomass utilization. Finally, the Project will mainstream sustainable charcoal into existing Governmental poverty reduction and rural development programs.

Energy end-use in Angola clearly reflects the economic and geographical divide between the social strata. Overall access to electricity is about 37% (2010-2014) but almost non-existing in rural areas. The use of oil products is limited to the urban areas. Firewood and charcoal represent over 57% of total energy consumption, followed by petroleum products (41.7%) and LPG (less than 1%) . Charcoal is the main source of energy in peri-urban areas of the main coastal cities (Luanda, Benguela); rural dwellers rely on firewood. Population growth and increasing energy demand has triggered charcoal production in the interior of Angola, where it often represents the only opportunity to generate cash income. It is estimated that around 100,000 people are involved in the activity of wood collection and charcoal production. Only a small fraction of charcoal production and trade is formalized and compliant with national regulation.

Charcoal demand is having a particularly adverse impact on the natural Miombo woodlands of Huambo Province, leading to losses in forest stock, biodiversity and opportunities for rural livelihoods. Moreover, environmental degradation exacerbates the effects of global climate change, increasing vulnerability of settlements. Persistent floods and drought exacerbate erosion and loss of soils, thereby accelerating deforestation and losses of livelihood. In spite of substantial progress over the last decade, there are challenges of institutional coordination, data management, institutional capacity, the need to work across sectors, and insufficient tools and capabilities to prepare and carry out public or private works, and to translate policy objectives into effective governance. The absence of a corps of capable human resources as a direct result of the conflict, is a great limiting factor.

Charcoal has the potential to be a sustainable and affordable (transition) fuel. To attain sustainability, improvements are needed along each step of the value chain: (1) forest management; (2) carbonization; (3) transport, (4) distribution (including warehousing) and retail; and (5) consumption. UNDP believes that it is important to improve the production and use of charcoal as well as aim at achieving sustainability across its entire value chain. Doing so will address multiple goals and generate important co-benefits. Providing people with cleaner charcoal that is produced in a low-carbon manner and used more efficiently (in improved stoves) will have critical environmental dividends (in the form of reduced greenhouse gas emissions and reduced deforestation); can professionalize the value chain and create jobs and livelihoods; and will be beneficial to the end-users (health-wise but also resulting in cost-savings and hence will have a positive impact on household budgets).

The project executed by the Ministry of the Environment (MINAMB) of Angola with support from UNDP is divided into four main components:

- Component 1: Strengthen the policy framework to support a sustainable charcoal value chain in Angola;
- Component 2: Transfer of sustainable charcoal technology to agents along the charcoal value chain;
- Component 3: Strengthen of human capacities and institutions;
- Component 4: Monitoring and Evaluation.

3. OBJECTIVES OF THE MTR

The MTR will assess progress towards the achievement of the project objectives and outcomes as specified in the Project Document and assess early signs of project success or failure with the goal of identifying the necessary

changes to be made in order to set the project on-track to achieve its intended results. The MTR will also review the project's strategy and its risks to sustainability.

4. MTR APPROACH & METHODOLOGY

The MTR must provide evidence-based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The MTR consultant 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 consultant will review the baseline GEF focal area Tracking Tool submitted to the GEF at CEO endorsement, and the midterm GEF focal area Tracking Tool that must be completed before the MTR field mission begins.

The MTR consultant is expected to follow a collaborative and participatory approach[62] 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[63]. Stakeholder involvement should include interviews with stakeholders who have project responsibilities, including but not limited to MINAMB and UNEP; executing agencies, senior officials and task team/ component leaders, key experts and consultants in the subject area, Project Board, project stakeholders, academia, local government and CSOs, etc.

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.

5. DETAILED SCOPE OF THE MTR

The MTR team will assess the following four categories of project progress. See the Guidance for Conducting Midterm Reviews of UNDP-Supported, GEF-Financed Projects for extended descriptions.

i. 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?

[62] For ideas on innovative and participatory Monitoring and Evaluation strategies and techniques, see UNDP Discussion Paper: Innovations in Monitoring & Evaluating Results, 05 Nov 2013.
[63] For more on 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/Logframe:

- Undertake a critical analysis of the project's logframe 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.

ii. Progress Towards Results

Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:

- Review the logframe 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" (red).
-
-

Table. Progress Towards Results Matrix (Achievement of outcomes against End-of-project Targets)

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline Level	Level in 1st PIR	Mid-term Target	End-of-project Target	Midterm Level & Assess-ment	Achieve-ment Rating	Justifica-tion for Rating

Objective: To reduce the current unsustainable and GHG-intensive mode of charcoal production and utilization from Angola's Miombo woodlands via an integrated set of interventions in the national charcoal value chain	(Aa) Achieved direct GHG emission reductions over lifetime (ton CO2eq); (Ab) Estimated indirect GHG emission reductions over lifetime (ton CO2eq); (Ba) Number of people with improved energy access as a result of UNDP-supported intervention. (Bb) Percentage of households benefitting from improved access to energy which are female-headed households (Bc) Average monetary savings by households using sustainable charcoal in efficient stoves (US$/(household–year). (C) Policy and regulatory framework for sustainable charcoal sector supported.	(Aa) 0 ton CO2eq; (Ab) 0 ton CO2eq; (Ba) 0; (Bb) 25% (Bc) 0 US$/(hh-y) (C) rated "1" (no policy/regu	On track	(Aa) 0 ton CO2eq; (Ab) 0 ton CO2eq; (Ba) 200; (Bb) 50% (Bc) 100 US$/hh-y) (C) rated "2" policy/ regulation/s trategy discussed and proposed)	(Aa) 209k ton CO2eq; (Ab) 1.2 M ton CO2eq (Ba) 10,000; (Bb) 50% (Bc) 100 US$/hh-y) (C) rated "4" (policy/ regulation/s trategy adopted but not enforced)			

Outcome 1: Information and strengthening of the policy framework for sustainable charcoal	(1a) white paper on sustainable charcoal, endorsed by Government; (1b) certification and MRV mechanism designed and implemented	(1a) no concept for white paper (1b) no certification and no MRV mechanism designed nor implemented (0,0);	On track	(1a) concept for white paper presented (1b) certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal production chain designed (1,0);	(1a) white paper completed and endorsed (1b) certification and MRV mechanism for sustainable charcoal designed and implemented in government programs (1,2)			

Outcome 2: The benefits of sustainable charcoal production technology, briquetting and energy-efficient charcoal stoves, have been accepted by producers and peri-urban consumers	(2a) Number of improved charcoal kilns and briquetting machined effectively in use; (2b) Annual volume of certified, sustainable charcoal delivered to consumers (ton/yr); (2c) Number of energy-efficient (EE) charcoal stoves delivered to peri-urban consumers.	(2a) No improved charcoal kilns (0), nor briquetting machines in use (0) (2b) No certified, sustainable charcoal delivered (0 ton.yr); (2d) No EE charcoal stoves delivered	On track	(2a) 18 improved kilns and 3 briquetting machines (2b) No certified, sustainable charcoal delivered (0 ton.yr); (2c) 3,000 EE charcoal stoves delivered	(2a) 270 improved kilns and 10 briquetting machines; (2b) 3,024 ton/yr certified, sustainable charcoal delivered per year (2c) 10,000 EE charcoal stoves delivered.			
Outcome 3: Institutional and human capacities for sustainable charcoal production and utilization have been strengthened through partnerships for knowledge transfer and professional training	(3a) Number of persons skilled in sustainable forest management and charcoal technology (male, female); (3b) Number of partnerships strengthened and active at project termination;	(3a) No persons skilled in charcoal technology (0 male, 0 female) (3b) 1 partnership in place (UCO-UJES)	On track	(3a) 40 persons skilled (20 male ; 20 female) (3b) 2 active partnerships	(3a) 150 persons skilled (75 male ; 75 female) (3b) 3 active partnerships			

Outcome 4: Monitoring & Evaluation plan	(4a) Mid-term review (1) and follow-up on recommendations (1) on gender mainstreaming and sustainability of project results (4b) Terminal Evaluation document	(4a) No Mid-term Review and no recommendations (4a) No Terminal Evaluation	On track	(4a) Mid-term Review completed (4b) No Terminal Evaluation	(4a) Follow-up on MTR recommendations completed (4b) Terminal Evaluation completed			

- **Indicator Assessment Key**

Green= Achieved	Yellow= On target to be achieved	Red= 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 the Midterm Review.
- 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.

iii. Project Implementation and Adaptive Management

Management Arrangements:

- 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/ logframe 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 Evaluation 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 and UNDP requirements? 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 evaluation budget. Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and evaluation? 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 UNDP/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.

iv. 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 consultant will include a section of the report setting out the MTR's evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings.[64].

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 consultant should provide specific findings, lessons learned and recommendations for accelerating the implementation of the project and for ensuring that project deliverables can be achieved by the end of the project.

[64] Alternatively, MTR conclusions may be integrated into the body of the report.

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.

MTR Ratings & Achievement Summary Table for Promotion of Sustainable Charcoal in Angola through a Value Chain Approach

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project Strategy	N/A	
Progress Towards Results	Objective Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: (rate 6 pt. scale)	
	Outcome 4 Achievement Rating: (rate 6pt. scale)	
Project Implementation & Adaptive Management	(rate 6 pt. scale)	
Sustainability	(rate 4 pt. scale)	

6. TIMEFRAME

The total duration of the MTR will be approximately 25 days over a time period of 12 of weeks starting August 2019 and shall not exceed five months from when the consultant is hired. The tentative MTR timeframe is as follows:

DATE	ACTIVITY	RESPONSIBLE
13 August 2019	Handover of Project Documents	UNDP CO
14 – 16 August 2019 (3 days)	Document review and preparing MTR Inception Report	Consultant
22 August 2019	Finalization and Validation of MTR Inception	Consultant, UNDP CO,

(1 day)	Report- latest start of MTR mission	UNDP Regional Office
30 August – 10 September 2019 (8 days in Luanda)	MTR mission: stakeholder meetings, interviews, field visits	Consultant with UNDP CO support
10 September 2019	Mission wrap-up meeting & presentation of initial findings- earliest end of MTR mission	Consultant
11 – 25 September 2019	Preparing draft report	Consultant
09 - 10 October 2019 (2 days)	Incorporating audit trail from feedback on draft report/Finalization of MTR report	Consultant
11 October – 25 October 2019	Preparation & Issue of Management Response	UNDP CO
08 November 2019	Expected date of full MTR completion	Consultant, UNDP CO, UNDP Regional Office

7. MIDTERM REVIEW DELIVERABLES

#	Deliverable	Description	Timing	Responsibilities
1	**MTR Inception Report**	MTR team clarifies objectives and methods of Midterm Review	No later than 2 weeks before the MTR mission: 22 August 2019	MTR team submits to the Commissioning Unit project management and RBM Unit
2	**Presentation**	Initial Findings	End of MTR mission: 10 September 2019	MTR Team presents to project management the Commissioning Unit and RBM Unit
3	**Draft Final Report**	Full report (using guidelines on content outlined in Annex B) with annexes	Within 3 weeks of the MTR mission: 25 September 2019	Sent to the Commissioning Unit, RBM Unit, reviewed by RTA, Project Coordinating Unit, GEF OFP
4	**Final Report***	Revised report with audit trail detailing how all received comments have (and have not) been addressed in the final MTR report	Within 1 week of receiving UNDP comments on draft: 08 November 2019	Sent to the Commissioning Unit

*The final MTR report must be in English. If applicable, the Commissioning Unit may choose to arrange for a translation of the report into a language more widely shared by national stakeholders.

8. MTR ARRANGEMENTS

The principal responsibility for managing this MTR resides with the Commissioning Unit. The Commissioning Unit for this project's MTR is UNDP Angola.

The commissioning unit will contract the consultant and ensure the timely provision of per diems and travel arrangements within the country for the MTR consultant. The Project Team will be responsible for liaising with the MTR consultant to provide all relevant documents, set up stakeholder interviews, and arrange field visits.

9. TEAM COMPOSITION

An independent consultant will conduct the MTR - (with experience and exposure to projects and evaluations in other regions globally). The consultant cannot have participated in the project preparation, formulation, and/or implementation (including the writing of the Project Document) and should not have a conflict of interest with project's related activities.

The selection of consultant will be aimed at maximizing the overall qualities in the following areas:

- Criterion A: Work experience in climate change mitigation, energy, capacity development or environment, economics and/or development related field for at least 7 years – max points: 10;
- Criterion B: Recent experience with result-based management evaluation methodologies – max points: 10;
- Criterion C: Experience working with the GEF or GEF-evaluations and experience applying SMART indicators and reconstructing or validating baseline scenarios – max points: 10;
- Criterion D: A Master's degree in environmental sciences, environmental policies, social sciences, economics, business administration, international relations, or other closely related field – max points: 10;
- Criterion E: Fluency in English and Portuguese – max points: 10;
- Criterion F: Experience in southern-central Africa – max points: 10;
- Criterion G: Experience in gender sensitive evaluation and climate change analysis – max points: 10;
- Criterion H: Competence in adaptive management, as applied to climate change mitigation (fill in GEF Focal Area): 10;
- Criterion I : Demonstrable analytical skills: 10;
- Criterion J: Project evaluation/review experiences within United Nations system will be considered an asset: 10.

10. PAYMENT MODALITIES AND SPECIFICATIONS

20 % of payment upon approval of the final MTR Inception Report and approval of work plan
30% upon submission of the draft MTR report
50% upon finalization of the MTR report

11. APPLICATION PROCESS

Recommended Presentation of Proposal:

a) **Letter of Confirmation of Interest and Availability** using the template[65] provided by UNDP;
b) **CV** and a **Personal History Form** (P11 form[66]);
c) **Brief description of approach to work/technical proposal** of why the individual considers him/herself as the most suitable for the assignment, and a proposed methodology on how they will approach and complete the assignment; (max 1 page)
d) **Financial Proposal** that indicates the all-inclusive fixed total contract price and all other travel related costs (such as flight ticket, per diem, etc), supported by a breakdown of costs, as per template attached to the Letter of Confirmation of Interest template. If an applicant is employed by an organization/company/institution, and he/she expects his/her employer to charge a management fee in the process of releasing him/her to UNDP under Reimbursable Loan Agreement (RLA), the applicant must indicate at this point, and ensure that all such costs are duly incorporated in the financial proposal submitted to UNDP.

All application materials should be submitted to the address Edifício Rosalinda, Luanda, Angola in a sealed envelope indicating the following reference "MTR Consultant for Coastal Adaptation MTR" or by email at the following address ONLY: aguiar.cuiundana@undp.org before the announced deadline. Incomplete applications may be excluded from further consideration.

Criteria for Evaluation of Proposal: Only those applications which are responsive and compliant will be evaluated. Offers will be evaluated according to the Combined Scoring method – where the educational background and experience on similar assignments will be weighted at 70% and the price proposal will weigh as 30% of the total scoring. The applicant receiving the Highest Combined Score that has also accepted UNDP's General Terms and Conditions will be awarded the contract.

65 https://intranet.undp.org/unit/bom/pso/Support%20documents%20on%20IC%20Guidelines/Template%20for%20Confirmation%20of%20Interest%20and%20Submission%20of%20Financial%20Proposal.docx
66 http://www.undp.org/content/dam/undp/library/corporate/Careers/P11_Personal_history_form.doc

6.6. Signed UNEG Code of conduct form

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: Jon Garcia

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

Signed at London on December 9 2019

Signature: 

6.7. Signed MTR final report clearance form

6.8. Mid-term tracking tools

6.9. MTR Audit trail