**SUMMARY**

| **Criteria**  | **Rating of this project**  | **Remarks**  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **IA&EA Execution:** Satisfactory (S) |
| Overall quality of project implementation/execution  | Satisfactory  | There was strong management by the Board, which provided adequate oversight role and policy direction and included representatives from key stakeholders. However, coordination roles and responsibilities were not sufficient, especially between upstream national Implementing Partners with downstream Local governments. |
| Implementing Agency execution  |  Satisfactory  |
| Executing Agency execution  | Satisfactory  |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E)**:  |
| Overall quality of monitoring and evaluation  | Moderately Satisfactory  | Whereas monitoring and evaluation endeavored to follow the UNDP GEF guidelines, the management hiccups as a result of National Implementation Modality (NIM) weakened the effectiveness of the M&E function. Whereas there was a Project Management Unit (PMU), decisions on project processes followed government structures and systems, which is often too slow for a project with a tight deadline. Combined with the fact that there was no M&E Officer for the project, this weakened effectiveness of the M&E system. However, provision of an M&E tool by the PMU mitigated some of the weakness, and became an innovative step that augmented the M&E systems. |
| M&E design at project start up  | Moderately Unsatisfactory  | The design of the project M&E system fell short of the requirements as per GEF guidelines. This is because it had too many indicators with weak links between indicators, baseline values and targets. In addition, there was no provision for a project-specific M&E officer who would have refined the M&E system during the project implementation or consolidated the knowledge management for the project. |
| M&E plan implementation  | Satisfactory  | Various Stakeholders were involved UNDP, MEMD, MWE, NFA, DLGs and Political arm (Office of the President). Notwithstanding the inadequacies in M&E, the project management and Board were able to mitigate the weaknesses and risks, to deliver the project results in a Satisfactory manner.  |
| **Relevance**: Relevant (R), Not Relevant (NR) |
| Overall relevance of the project  | Relevant  | The Green Charcoal project was highly relevant to the development needs of Uganda, given the importance of charcoal as a source of energy and the need to reduce deforestation from the charcoal value chain, through a managed process combining adoption of efficient technologies and inclusion of energy plantations as part of natural resources management at the household and forestry sector levels.  |
| GEF and UNDP strategic alignment  | Relevant  | The Green Charcoal project is highly relevant to GEF and UNDP strategic objectives. It contributed to three GEF Focal Areas (Climate Change Mitigation, Sustainable Forest and Land Management), contributing to four Focal Area Objectives and seven outcomes (Table 9). It contributed to Outcome 2 of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for 2012-2014[[1]](#footnote-1) and outcome 2.3 of the 2010-2014 UNDP CPAP[[2]](#footnote-2) |
| National policy frameworks and ownership  | Relevant  | The Green Charcoal project as indicated extensively in the prodoc is relevant to various national regulatory, policy, strategic and development plans such as the National constitution, NDP, National Environment Act, National forestry act, Local government Act, Land act, National Forestry and Tree planting, National forest plan as well as all relevant policies etc. |
| **3.** Assessment of Outcomes |
| Overall Quality of Project Outputs and Outcomes | Satisfactory  | To overcome the challenge of evaluating the twelve outcomes of the project, the TE reconfigured 4 core outcomes, which it used to assess performance (Table 6). The project has delivered on all the majority of outputs (75% implementation level) and delivered satisfactorily on outcomes. As a result, 120,741 metric tons of wood have been saved from the adoption of the casamance kiln and skills. This translates to 6,674 ha of avoided deforestation. Although both achievements are at 84.2% of the target, the TE Team concurs with the MTR that these targets were too ambitious. 30,621 hectares of forest land (natural and planted forest lands) (84.2% of target) have been put under improved management, enhancing carbon sequestration of 1,310,872 metric tons of carbon equivalent, delivering 84.2% of the target tCO2eq so far. A total of 800 beneficiaries including 240 women in the pilot districts have been equipped with skills to efficiently utilize the improved charcoal production technologies and conservation agriculture practices. Adoption of climate smart agriculture (61% women) has led to over 100% increase in yields of annual crops and 28% for perennial crops. Approximately 300,000 households (2.5 million persons – M:1,700,00; F:800,000) have been sensitized on charcoal regulatory frameworks and guidelines through 116 live radio talk-shows and radio spot messages, community meetings and multi-stakeholder dialogues facilitated by the project. |
| Outcome 1: Knowledge systems established and used to provide up to date information for planning for the charcoal sub-sector | Satisfactory | National charcoal assessment completed. Both BEST and NAMA have utilized the information provided;The sustainable charcoal research laboratory has been established and equipped; it is undertaking research using staff and graduate students. Analogue database in place (needs to be digitized); land cover maps have been provided; but they need to be converted to land use maps.  |
| Outcome 2: Institutional coordination and legal provisions established to mainstream sustainable charcoal production process into relevant district and national policies and programs (increasing funding for charcoal value chain). | Satisfactory | National level stakeholder coordination put in place; District Charcoal Action Plans in place and mainstreamed into District Development Plans (sustainable charcoal is recognized in the District budgets of the four districts); national charcoal standards have been approved and district charcoal ordinances have been finalized; more than 30 million US dollars have been raised to support the work of the new Renewable Energy department and priorities of BEST; NAMA completed which is likely to add over 60 million USD when funded, $50 million from the private sector. |
| **Outcome 3:** Adoption of technologies for sustainable charcoal production and climate smart agriculture, supported by local capacities and institutions | Moderately Satisfactory | 337 casamance and 15 retort kilns disseminated; dissemination of the Adam retort kiln rightly stopped after the first 15 failed to function fully;Forty Charcoal Associations with over 800 members (40% women) have been established and registered across the 4 project districts.28% increase in income per bag of charcoal produced via casamance100% increase in yields of annual crops and 28% in perennial crops. |
| Outcome 4**:** Sustainable forest management and tree cropping support sustainable charcoal production | Moderately Satisfactory  | About 5,888 hectares of well grown planted sustainable charcoal woodlots of mainly eucalyptus tree species have been established in the four pilot districts. This acreage is determined after planting 6,542,000 seedlings and factoring in the seedling survival rate of 72% and considering farmer practices.About 1,800 tree planters growing trees, 18% of whom are women.30,621 hectares of forest land (natural and planted forest lands) across four pilot districts have been brought under improved multi-functional forest management |
| **Effective and efficiency**:  |
| Effectiveness  | Satisfactory  | At the output levels a number of indicators and targets were realized all above 75% |
| Efficiency  | Satisfactory  | The project having used output/activity based budgeting was able to institute control measures but this was bogged down by the bureaucracies that were brought about by NIM modality, which was experienced delays in disbursement of funds and approvals. However, with use of government and DLG structures and systems the project was able to mitigate the negative impacts of the government bureaucratic processes.  |
| **Partnership**:  |
| Overall partnerships built | Satisfactory  | Partnerships were forged between national and district levels as well as with both private and Civil society. These were both formal and informal in nature. At the upstream national level government ministries and semi-autonomous agencies were brought on board such as MEMD, MWE, NFA, FSSD while at the downstream the DLGs and civil society organizations also formed a strong partnership well community level beneficiaries. A key partnership with the CleanStart did not function as envisaged at project design, impacting delivery of some activities. |
| Overall stakeholders participation  | Highly Satisfactory  | As intimated above stakeholder engagement involved Government, Development Partners, CSOs, Private sector and communities  |
| **Sustainability:** Likely (L) Moderate Likely (ML), Moderately Unlikely (MU), Unlikely (U)  |
| Overall likelihood of Sustainability  | **ML – Moderately Likely**  | Sustainability of the production of charcoal by improved technologies is threatened by the fact that neither the casamance nor the retort kilns are available in the markets (can only be obtained via the project); the modified retort kiln is not yet functional; although completed, the district ordinances and not yet approved; charcoal is still sold by volume in significant markets (hence no real reward for sustainably produced charcoal); and 90% of the seedlings planted are eucalyptus, which is in high demand for timber and poles. However, if the NAMA takes off, it will tackle these challenges.  |
| Financial resources  | ML – Moderately Likely  | Even though charcoal has a budget line in the district development plans (in the four districts), financing the budget is likely to suffer in the regular budget shortfalls. District revenues continue to be dominated by forest products, yet sustainable charcoal discourse has not been in part of the revenue collection by contractors. Work on charcoal continues to be largely project funded; the absence of an exit strategy for the project is particularly worrying, given that many initiatives are just starting and will need continued support. |
| Socio-economic and Environmental aspects | Moderately Likely  | There is need to closely monitor and follow up the socio economic aspects so far realized since they are likely to vanish if the relevant improved charcoal and SLM/SFM activities are not up scaled.  |
| Institutional systems  |  Likely  | The creation of the Renewable Energy Department at the MEMD, the approval of the national charcoal standards, the formulation of the District Charcoal Ordinances and the formation of the Charcoal and Conservation Farmers Associations will all go a long way in sustaining institutional arrangements for sustainable charcoal production. |
| **Impact**: Significant (S), Minimal (M), Negligible (N) There are clear indicators that would lead to great impact over time through mentioned best practices  |
| Environmental status improvement  | Significant  | The Green Charcoal project highlighted and showcased improved charcoal and SLM/SFM practices which addressed the environmental concerns as well as sustainable charcoal production measures. |
| Social-economic status improvement  | Minimum  | The Green charcoal project was positive in directly addressing social and economic aspects especially with the direct beneficiaries including tackling gender issues in sustainable charcoal production by bringing women on board in the entire value chain. However short implementation period will render them hanging without being consolidated. |
| **Overall Project Results**  | **Satisfactory**  | **The Green Charcoal project delivered over 75% of the outputs; delivered close to 80% of the reconstructed impact indicators. However, the sustainability of these results will only be secured if the proposed NAMA materializes to tackle the considerable threats to sustainability.**  |

### Key Recommendations/Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project

The following actions should be undertaken to reinforce initial benefits from the project;

1. Develop an exit strategy: there are many project initiated activities that need funding to take root, deliver and/or sustain the benefits already manifesting. They include the gazettement of the District Charcoal Ordinances; funding the priority actions of the District Charcoal Action Plans; mainstreaming the sustainable charcoal production recommendations/discourse into the district revenue collection from forest products; continuing the amendments of the Adam retort kiln, providing the casamance on the market, continuing research in the Sustainable Charcoal Laboratory. While the NAMA may eventually provide the required funding, such funding has not yet been secured. The MTR recommended that the project produce an exit strategy before the TE. This is still pending, and is urgently required. ***Responsible Party - PSC***
2. Although the four Districts report political support and willingness to mainstream sustainable charcoal production, the budgetary allocation to the Natural Resources and Forestry Units need to be increased and prioritized. Although the districts derive considerable revenue from forest products and levies on charcoal, budget allocation for these sectors and implementation of the district charcoal action plans may not necessarily increase financial availability. This is because the low priority Natural Resources and Forestry Units will likely be the ones to suffer when there is a budget shortfall, which happens regularly. In addition, capacities for these units need to be built at the Parish levels where the services of the extension service are required. ***Responsible Party – District Authority and the Forestry Department, with support from the NAMA PSC***
3. The district revenue collection system (contracting) should take on board sustainable charcoal production principles. Currently, the sustainable charcoal project is being implemented in parallel with these revenue collection activities. ***Responsible Party – District Councils and the Forestry Department***
4. Work on market transformation should be prioritized. Although Charcoal Producer Associations report USH 10,000 pricing difference between casamance produced and earth mound produced charcoal, this is not evident beyond the local markets. The charcoal certification and national standards are now in place; but implementation needs to be prioritized to move to labeling. Proposals for future directions underlining main objectives. ***Responsible Party – the Renewable Energy Department at the MEMD, with support for the NAMA PSC***
5. The District Councils, Forest Sector Support Department (FSSD) and the MEMD should investigate further which parts of the eucalyptus woodlots will provide sustainable biomass for charcoal production versus timber and poles to the building industry. They should use this information to plan. ***Responsible Party – The District Councils, Forest Sector Support Department (FSSD) and the MEMD***
6. Ensure NAMA funding is mobilized/realized. ***Responsible Party – the Renewable Energy Department at the MEMD***
7. Knowledge Management: Produce KM products such as documentaries, videos, technical publications summarizing knowledge products/messages, to capture best practices and lessons for the future replication. ***Responsible Party – the Renewable Energy Department with support from the PSC partners.***
1. Vulnerable segments of the population increasingly benefit from sustainable livelihoods and in particular improved agricultural systems and employment opportunities to cope with the population dynamics, increasing economic disparities, economic impact of HIV&AIDS, environment shocks and recovery challenges by 2014. Notably: Outcome 2.2 Vulnerable communities, Government, civil society and the private sector are sustainably managing and using the environment and natural resources for improved livelihoods and to cope with the impact of climate change. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. CPAP Outcome 2.3:Capacity of Selected Institutions Strengthened for Sustainable Environment and Natural Resources Management (ENRM) as well as Climate Change (CC) Adaptation/ Mitigation and Disaster Risk Management [↑](#footnote-ref-2)