Midterm Review of the project "Reducing vulnerability from climate change in Foothills, lower Lowlands and Senqu River Basin"

UNDP PIMS#4630
GEF ID# 5075

MTR timeframe: November 2018 – March 2019
Final MTR Report

Submitted by: Jon Garcia (International Consultant) and

Ramochaha Lethola (National Consultant)

Requested by: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) Lesotho

April 29, 2019

Table of Contents

"Reducing vulnerability from climate change in Foothills, lower Lowlands and Senqu River Basin"
Midterm Review
FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

Acronyms

Acronym	Definition
CBA	Cost-Benefit Analysis
CSO	Civil Society Organization
CTA	Chief Technical Advisor
DPIC	District Project Implementation Committee
DPCC	District Project Coordinating Committee
EESU	Environmental and Energy Statistics Unit
FAO	Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations
FFS	Farmer Field School
GEF	Global Environment Facility
GIS	Geographic Information System
GIZ	German Development Agency (by its initials in German)
LDC	Least Developed Country
IFAD	International Fund for Agriculture Development
IGA	Income Generating Activity
LDCF	Least Developed Countries Fund
LENAFU	Lesotho National Farmers Forum
LMS	Lesotho Meteorological Services
LRP	Land Rehabilitation Programme of Lesotho
LUNDAP	Lesotho's United Nations Development Assistance Plan
LVAC	Lesotho Vulnerability Assessment Committee
M&E	Monitoring and Evaluation
MAFS	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security
MFRSC	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation
MGYSR	Ministry of Gender, Youth, Sports and Recreation
MLGCA	Ministry of Local Governments and Chieftainship Affairs
MoE	Ministry of Environment
MTR	Midterm Review
NAPA	National Adaptation Plan of Action
NDC	Nationally Determined Contribution
NGO	Non-Governmental Organisation
NSDP	National Strategic Development Plan
NUL	National University of Lesotho
OECD DAC	Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development's Development Assistance Committee
PFF	Project Field Facilitator
PMC	Project Management Costs
PMU	Project Management Unit

RSDA	Rural Self-Help Development Association
RVCC	Reducing Vulnerability from Climate Change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin Project
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
ToR	Terms of Reference
UNDP	United Nations Development Programme
UNEG	United Nations Evaluation Group
UNFCCC	United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change
WAMPP	Wool and Mohair Promotion project

1. Executive Summary

Table 1. Project information table

Project title: Reducing vulnerability from climate change in Foothills, lower Lowlands and Senqu River Basin				
GEF project ID:	5075		At endorsement (USD)	At completion (USD)
UNDP project ID:	PIMS ID 4630	GEF financing:	8,398,172	
Country:	Lesotho	IA/EA own:	600,000	
Region:	East and Southern Africa	Government:	27,000,000	
Focal area:	Environment and Climate Change	Other:		
FA objectives (OP/SP):	Mainstream climate risk considerations into the Land Rehabilitation Programme of Lesotho for improved ecosystem resilience and reduced vulnerability of livelihoods to climate shocks	Total co-financing:		
Executing agency:	Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation	Total project cost:	35,998,172	
Other partners involved:	Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS), Ministry of Gender, Youth, Sport and Recreation (MGYSR), Ministry of Local Governments and Chieftainship Affairs (MLGCA), Ministry of Environment (MoE), DoSWC, DWA, DoE, DoF, DRM, DCOs, DoLS, MoET, MTAC, MoPWT, MoSD, MoDP	Prodoc signature:	January 2015	
		Closing date:	Proposed: December 2020	Actual

The project "Reducing vulnerability from climate change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin" (RVCC) is a full-sized project implemented by Government of Lesotho, in particular by the Ministry of Forestry, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC), in partnership with United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) funded by the Least Developed Countries Fund (LDCF) – Global Environment Facility (GEF). The objective of the project is "to mainstream climate risk considerations into the Land Rehabilitation Programme of Lesotho (LRP) for improved ecosystem resilience and reduced vulnerability of livelihoods to climate shocks." This is delivered through five main outcomes. Outcomes 1 and 2 focus on institutional capacity; outcomes 4 and 5 on climate change mainstreaming; and outcome 3 on climate-smart interventions on the ground, with a particular emphasis on land rehabilitation[1]. The project is implemented in the Mohale's Hoek District, in Southern Lesotho, more specifically in the Community Councils of Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele, which constitute a continuous stretch of the Lowlands, Foothills and Senqu River Valley. It started in June 2015 and is planned to end in 2020. The project is implemented through the National Implementation Modality by the MFRSC.

The purpose of this assignment is to conduct the midterm review (MTR) of the RVCC. 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 (January 2015) up to December 2018, 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 evaluation team has cross-analysed and triangulated the data in order to inform the selected indicators and answer the evaluation questions.

As of December 2018, the project had achieved the end of the project target of two outcomes (outcomes 4 and 5) and was far from achieving the end of the project target of one outcome (outcome 3)[2]. Available information does not allow to assess the achievement of another outcome (outcome 1). In any case, the weaknesses of the result framework (see section 4.1.2, particularly section 4.1.2.2.) compromise the relevance of it to assess project performance. The project has met 43 per cent of the end of the project output targets and was far from achieving 5 of the 16 end of the project output targets. That been said, the project seems to be having some impact at institutional and policy levels and interventions on the ground seem to be improving the lives and livelihoods of targeted communities.

Table 2. MTR Rating and Achievement Summary Table for RVCC

Measure	MTR Rating	Achievement Description
Project strategy		The project is relevant to national, sub-national, UNDP, LDCF and GEF priorities, with room for improvement on effectiveness, consideration and lessons and gender.

---

[1] Considering the outcomes in the approved project document
[2] This analysis considers the results frameworks included in the project document and the latest progress report available (Q3 2018) at the time of conducting the MTR. The indicators, baselines, targets and 2018 values are presented in Annex 2

		The structure of components, outcomes and outputs is weak and the indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification do not allow proper monitoring and management.
Progress Towards Results[3]	Objective Achievement Rating:	There is no information to assess the achievement on this.
	Outcome 1 Achievement Rating: Moderately Unsatisfactory	The project has made some progress, but is far from achieving most of the output targets.
	Outcome 2 Achievement Rating: Unsatisfactory	The project is very far from achieving the end of the project outcome target. Of the three end of the project output targets, the project has met two (exceeding one), but is very far from meeting the other one.
	Outcome 3 Achievement Rating: Unsatisfactory	The project has achieved 30 per cent of the outcome target and is far from achieving the two output targets. However, the project is having some impact on the ground.
	Outcome 4 Achievement Rating: Highly Satisfactory	The project has met the end of the project outcome target, although it does not really measure the achievement of the outcome. The project has met the only output target.
	Outcome 5 Achievement Rating: Highly Satisfactory	The project has met the end of the project outcome target, although it does not really measure the achievement of the outcome. The project has met the three output targets.
Project Implementation and Adaptive Management	Moderately Unsatisfactory	The proposed governance structure is overall appropriate, but has faced some challenges during project implementation. The project has had important delays. Project Management Costs (PMC) are significantly above GEF regulations. There is room for improvement in monitoring and evaluation (M&E). Timing of reporting is overall fine, but reporting templates are insufficient. Documentation of lessons learned is limited. Communications are overall good.
Sustainability	Moderately Likely	Results on outcome 5 will be sustained. On outcomes 1, 2 and 3, most of the results of the project will likely be sustained, if some adjustments are made. There are moderate risks for sustainability in Outcome 3.

Conclusions

Project strategy[4]

---

[3] It is worth noting that, given its weaknesses, the results framework is not a useful tool to assess the achievement of project outcomes. Details are provided in section 4.1.2, particularly in section 4.1.2.2.

[4] For details see section 4.1.

The problems addressed by the project are relevant at the national and sub-national levels. The project strategy addresses these problems to a great extent. However, its effectiveness is compromised by the lack of consideration of spatial aspects. Moreover, design and implementation are not seriously informed by lessons learned from other projects. The project is aligned with national and sub-national policies, strategies and plans, as well as with UN, LDCF and GEF strategies. Project design and implementation have been consultative. The project document assesses gender-related aspects and proposes measures to contribute to gender equality, but the assessment is generic and some of the measures are not implemented. During implementation the project has involved both women and men in all activities. However, there seems to be a gender distribution on trainings.

The project components, outcomes, outputs and activities are relatively aligned with the project objective. However, the structure of outcomes, outputs and activities is confusing. The project is organized around too many outcomes, outputs and activities. Nevertheless, components do not summarize the project well. Moreover, the structure of components and outcomes does not make a lot of sense. The relationship between outcomes and outputs is not straightforward either. The results framework currently used by the project for monitoring has considerable weaknesses. It doesn't monitor the achievement of the objective. At outcome level, only one of the 7 sets of indicator and target is adequate. At output level, indicators and targets tend to be adequate, although in some cases they are not fully aligned. It is difficult to assess the adequacy of targets, as most of them refer to inadequate indicators and in some cases they are not provided. Mid-term targets are not provided. That been said, the target of 50,000 ha of rehabilitated land by the end of the project seems too ambitious, while some other targets seem rather low.

Progress towards results[5]

The latest monitoring report (Q3 2018) does not report on the achievement of the project objective. The reviewers found some progress on planning and implementation of activities, but there is significant room for improvement at project level and on improving the overall LRP. At outcome level, the project was still far from achieving the end of the project targets on Outcomes 2 and 3. The project had met the end of the project targets on Outcomes 4 and 5, although these do not really measure achievement of the corresponding outcome. The project has made progress on Outcome 1, but outputs don't necessarily imply either the achievement of the expected outcome. The latest project report reports on 16 end of the project output targets. The assessment is not clear for 2 outputs. Of the remaining 14 targets, the project had met 6 (43 per cent) by October 2018 (more than half way in implementation). In contrast, the project had not met 8of what??? (57 per cent). (The Progress Towards Results Matrix is provided in Annex 2) That been said, the project seems to be having some impact at institutional and policy levels, although there is no evidence to confirm the achievement of intended outcomes on capacity and mainstreaming. On the

---

[5] For details see section 4.2

other hand, interventions on the ground seem to be improving the lives and livelihoods of targeted communities.

The achievement of expected results has been beset by a number of barriers: i) a long inception process; ii) challenges related to the national implementation modality; iii) limited availability of technical experts; iv) challenges to engage communities on land rehabilitation on voluntary basis; v) lack of sustainability of some results; vi) the geographic approach; vii) lack of a comprehensive approach and proper planning in terms of water infrastructure, markets and soil erosion prevention; viii) some inadequacies in the selection of IGAs in some villages; ix) cultural barriers regarding some IGAs; and x) severe climate variability, although the project is expected to build resilience to this type of events.

Project implementation and adaptive management[6]

The composition, roles and responsibilities of the project governance structures are overall appropriate, although there is room for further engaging community councils. The proposed governance structure has faced some challenges during project implementation, namely i) turnover in key institutional positions; and ii) instability and limited human and technical capacity at the Project Management Unit (PMU). All project governance bodies are meeting at least as frequently as planned and operating according to their roles. The project has been able to learn and adjust to some unplanned aspects.

The project has had important delays, due to project planning, staff turnover and procurement aspects. As of December 2018, the project had spent 78 per cent of the planned budget for the 2015-2018 period. Total actual expenditure represented 33 per cent of total LDCF funding, when more than 55 per cent of the implementation time had been spent.

As of December 2018, actual PMC were slightly above planned for the 2015-2018 period. However, as of December 2018, actual PMC in 2015-2018 represented 21 per cent of total actual implementation costs in that period, when according to the budget in the prodoc they would represent 4.7 per cent of total project costs. This is a very significant divergence that will require careful attention in the remaining time of implementation.

The project document rightly considered M&E at the national, ground and project levels. The activities and timeline in the project M&E plan make sense. The budget for some activities is fine. However, the link between the three M&E levels is not properly explained and the budget is insufficient for some activities. As of October 2018, M&E at the national and site level was limited. At project level, the consultancy on M&E was conducted too late. As highlighted before, the current results framework has important deficits. The implementation of the M&E plan has demonstrated that the project team needed regular support on M&E.

---

[6] For details see section 4.3.

Timing of reporting is overall fine. The template for quarterly reports includes relevant information, but has very significant gaps. The format for the 2017 annual report is insufficient. Overall, reports provide useful information, although they are typically incomplete. The PSC meeting minutes are provided consistently and to an appropriate level of detail. The project doesn't have sufficient financial tools for adequate decision making on project priorities, budget reallocations or flow of funds.

Quarterly and annual reports include a section on lessons learned, but the information provided in that section is limited. Lessons are shared but it is not clear how partners internalize them. The project has regular and relevant interactions with its governance structures and targeted communities. In addition, it is using media to communicate with a wide range of stakeholders. The project also shares information with other development partners through government and UN coordination mechanisms.

Sustainability[7]

The project has made important efforts to build capacity at the national and sub-national levels. Information, structures and some of the knowledge will likely remain once the project phases out. However, the learning process will require more support to targeted stakeholders and equipment for some aspects may be needed. At the sub-national level key institutional coordination may stop if existing institutional structures (e.g. the Forum of Heads of Department and the Local Planning Unit) are not supported in advance.

At the national level, the National Strategic Development Plan (NSDP) 2018-2022 has considered climate change adaptation, ensuring budget for this. At the subnational level, guidelines have not been used yet to adjust local development plans. Despite increased awareness, political instability and interference and limited capacity represent key risks for sustainability.

On the ground, the project has raised the awareness of communities and increased their knowledge on climate-smart interventions. It has also rehabilitated more than 14,000 ha of degraded land. The project has contributed to the establishment of grazing associations. Demonstration of benefits could contribute to the sustainability of lands. However, there is a risk of communities waiting for cash to carry out paid rehabilitation works. Some IGAs are demonstrating that they can provide benefits and communities are willing to maintain them. However, there are concerns on access to inputs, technical advice and markets; and encroachment. Climate variability and change is an additional concern, although the project is expected to address this.

Recommendations

---

[7] For details see section 4.4.

Table 1. Summary of recommendations with responsible parties

No.	Cluster	Recommendation	Responsible party
1	Project Strategy	Gender-disaggregated indicators, baselines and targets should be developed. In addition, the project should make an additional effort to ensure a more equal gender participation in trainings.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, M&E specialist to be hired; PMU, line ministries in PSC, district and community councils
2		The results framework should be significantly adjusted. Modifications should involve the structure of components, outcomes and outputs, as well as the indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification. Detailed recommendations are provided in section 5.2. Among the changes, it would make sense to reduce the target of 50,000 ha of rehabilitated land.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, M&E specialist to be hired
3	Progress towards results	The project should accelerate delivery on Outcome 3 and 7 outputs. The project should continue to work on all other outcomes, as achievement of outputs does not necessarily imply achievement of outcomes. To accelerate delivery the project should: a) accelerate procurement processes, by improving coordination between MFRSC and UNDP. b) start procurement processes early, taking into account actual timelines, to ensure that seasonal inputs are provided in time. c) ensure training provides materials that can be used by new government staff. d) broaden the pool of experts. e) promote a coordinated approach to land rehabilitation at least at government level. f) promote grazing associations with adequate rules and monitoring and enforcement systems where land has been rehabilitated. g) prioritize some villages, focusing most of the investment in them, to increase cost-effectiveness, considering at least the criteria provided in section 5.2. This should be linked to reducing the target of 50,000 ha of rehabilitated land. h) strengthen collaboration with relevant ongoing and planned programmes and projects.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, line ministries, district and community councils a) PMU, MFRSC, UNDP b) PMU, MFRSC, UNDP c) PMU, CTA, MFRSC, UNDP d) PMU, UNDP, MFRSC e) PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC f) PMU, CTA, MFRSC g) PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC h) PMU, UNDP i) PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC j) PMU, CTA

		i) in all villages, but particularly in priority villages, the project should promote a comprehensive approach. In this sense, it should speed up and increase investment in water infrastructure, promote market linkages and improve land rehabilitation. j) assess the feasibility of the income-generating activities (IGAs) proposed by each community according to their circumstances, rejecting those that are not feasible.	
4	Project implementation and adaptive capacity	The project should adjust the project government structures at sub-national level to increase the visibility of community councils. A conversation on this should be held with the local governments. Coordination with district officers should be strengthened	PMU, CTA, PSC, district, community councils
5		A new Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), with robust expertise in M&E, should be hired urgently. A M&E specialist should also be hired through project activities – not as PMU operations.	UNDP
6		The governance structures of the project should clarify the link between the national, on the ground and project level M&E systems. The systems should be strengthened at the three levels.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, M&E specialist to be hired
7		The template for quarterly reports and annual reports should be adjusted. The PMU should fully complete all reports.	PMU, CTA, UNDP
8		PMU should strengthen its work in documenting lessons. PMU should start by documenting all the lessons that can be already drawn and are not necessarily indicated in quarterly or annual reports, collating them in one document. The process should be participatory. UNDP and the PMU should further interact with other development partners and programmes.	PMU, CTA, UNDP
9	Sustainability	At the national and sub-national levels the project should provide more capacity building support. At the sub-national level the project should further support existing institutional structures similar to project structures.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC, district, community councils
10		The project should help establish grazing associations for all rehabilitated land.	PMU, MFRSC
11		Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) should further be promoted. The project should also provide more training.	PMU, MFRSC, PSC, FAO

12		The project should promote existing associations or cooperatives and promote the creation of new ones to boost IGAs, as these structures Associations or cooperatives should be promoted for IGAs, facilitating access to inputs, technical advice and markets, including financial services. They could contribute to minimize encroachment, although the project may consider providing some fences to protect some gardens and orchards in the short term.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC
13		Associations or cooperatives should be promoted for IGAs, facilitating access to inputs, technical advice and markets.	PMU, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC

2. Introduction

2.1. Purpose of the MTR and objectives

The purpose of this assignment is to conduct the midterm review (MTR) of RVCC 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 (January 2015) up to December 2018, 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 evaluation 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 UNDP-supported, GEF-financed projects. The evaluation 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 evaluation has adopted a collaborative and participatory approach ensuring close engagement with key stakeholders and provides information that is based on evidence, credible, reliable and useful.

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 3. 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 4 indicates the consulted stakeholders, while Annex 5 provides the detailed mission plan.

2.2.2.2. Data analysis

The evaluation team 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 evaluation:

- **Evaluation matrix:** Based on an initial documentation review and following UNDP Evaluation Guidance document, an evaluation matrix was elaborated and is included in Annex 01. 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 evaluation.

2.2.2.4. Process

This MTR has been structured around three phases. The consultancy started with documentation review. This allowed the reviewers 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 evaluation process. Once the Inception Report was approved, the reviewers undertook data collection as described in Section 2.2.2.1 **Error! Reference source not found.**~~above~~, including an eight-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 reviewers 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, allowing the participation of a broader range of stakeholders that those interviewed during the in-country mission. Comments received will be taken into account for the finalization of the MTR report, which will be submitted within one week of receiving UNDP comments on the draft. 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 an executive summary. Section 2 explains the purpose, scope and methodology of the evaluation, 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 MTR ratings and achievement summary table, the list of consulted documents, the list of consulted stakeholders, the mission plan, the interview protocols and the ToR.

3. Project description and background context

Lesotho is a two million people, 30,255 km² landlocked country in Southern Africa, enclaved within South Africa. Its territory is composed of four agro-ecological zones, namely: the Lowlands (17% of the land), the Foothills (15%), the Mountains (59%), and the Senqu River Valley (9%). Its topography is mountainous, with the lowest point being at 1,400 m above sea level and its highest point at 3,482m above sea level. While 86% of the population relies on agriculture for subsistence, only 14% of the

country's land is arable. Lesotho is on the list of Least Developed Countries (LDCs), with 57% of the population living below the poverty line[8] [9]. Its population is highly dependent on agriculture, and food security is a recurrent issue. Climate change poses important threats to the country's population and economy. As temperatures are projected to increase, so are climate extremes (both hot and cold days). Rainfall patterns are also projected to change and become more erratic, with seasonal changes and an increase in the intensity and frequency of floods and droughts. This is expected to combine with existing factors that include soil erosion, loss of arable land, migration to the lowlands, high poverty levels, and competition of crops and livestock to exacerbate socioeconomic issues in the country[10].

The project "Reducing vulnerability from climate change in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin" (RVCC) is a full-sized project implemented by Government of Lesotho in particular by the MFRSC in partnership with UNDP funded by the GEF. The objective of the project is "to mainstream climate risk considerations into the LRP of Lesotho for improved ecosystem resilience and reduced vulnerability of livelihoods to climate shocks." This is delivered through five main outcomes:

- **Outcome 1:** Increased technical capacity of the MFRSC and relevant departments to apply up-to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change;
- **Outcome 2:** Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital (over 7,000 households with potential for upscaling to cover over 20,000);
- **Outcome 3:** Over 50,000 ha of land across the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart LRP;
- **Outcome 4:** National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystems management; and
- **Outcome 5:** National Strategic Development Plan mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate-smart LRP.

The project is implemented in the Mohale's Hoek District, in Southern Lesotho, more specifically in the Community Councils of Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele, which constitute a continuous stretch of the Lowlands, Foothills and Senqu River Valley. It started in June 2015 and is planned to end in 2020.

The project is implemented through the National Implementation Modality by the MFRSC. The project organisation structure includes a Project Steering Committee (PSC), Technical Advisory Committee (TAC), a District Project Coordinating Committee (DPCC) and District Project Implementation Committee (DPIC), in addition to a PMU. The governance structure includes a number of national and sub-national stakeholders, as mentioned in the project summary table.

---

[8] World Bank, Climate Change Knowledge Portal, Lesotho Dashboard: http://sdwebx.worldbank.org/climateportal/countryprofile/home.cfm?page=country_profile&CCode=LSO
[9] Central Intelligence Agency Factbook, Lesotho : https://www.cia.gov/library/publications/the-world-factbook/geos/lt.html
[10] World Bank, Climate Change Knowledge Portal, Lesotho Dashboard.

4. Findings

4.1. Project strategy

4.1.1.   Project design

4.1.1.1 How important is the problem addressed by the project at the national, district and council levels?

The project seeks to reduce the vulnerability to climate shocks of ecosystems and livelihoods at the national level in Lesotho and in some rural communities of the country, particularly in the Foothills, Southern Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin, and more specifically in the Community Councils of Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele, and there in some villages.

Desk review and interviews demonstrate that the problem addressed by the project is very relevant at the national level. Lesotho is still mostly a rural country and the majority of the rural population subsists on natural resources-based livelihoods. Poverty is particularly prevalent among farmers. Ecosystems are highly degraded, in part due to inappropriate natural resources management practices (e.g. overstocking, overgrazing and harvesting trees for fuel wood), reducing agricultural and livestock productivity, and thus further exacerbating rural poverty. Over the past 20 years Lesotho has experienced an unprecedented number and frequency of droughts, as well as an increase in the frequency of rainstorms in winter. This has increased soil erosion – significant fertile topsoil has been washed away - and has hampered severely agriculture and livestock production. Projections from several global circulation models predict: i) increased temperatures; ii) decreased precipitation in the spring and summer seasons; iii) increased precipitation in winter and autumn; and iv) increased severity and frequency of extreme events such as floods, droughts and snowfall. These changes could further affect rural livelihoods and ecosystems. Before the project, the country had limited institutional and technical capacity to plan and implement climate-smart interventions at the national and local levels, including mainstreaming climate change adaptation into land rehabilitation efforts [11]. Communities also had limited awareness of the importance of implementing and knowledge on how to implement climate-smart natural resources management practices- they would rehabilitate land for cash rather than for its importance to increase resilience. The project addresses these problems, and is therefore relevant.

---

[11] Since 2007 the Government of Lesotho, through the MFRSC implements the LRP or Integrated Watershed Management Programme. With a budget of around 10-12 USD, it operates on a cash-for-work basis, and often does not put forward an integrated catchment approach.

It is worth noting that the project document does not provide a detailed analysis of the specific problems in the selected community councils and villages. The project document assesses the problems at the national level, and explains the criteria used to select community councils and villages. The three community councils were selected based on their vulnerability, overlapping the delineations of the Lesotho Vulnerability Assessment Committee (LVAC) – a report is produced annually- and the National Adaptation Plan of Action (NAPA) (2007); their diversity, as they comprise three of the four main ecosystems of the country, which favours scaling up lessons afterwards; and the criterion of catchment continuity, as they provide a contiguous stretch of the Lowlands, Foothills and Senqu River Valley. The selection of villages considered their location along major catchments and was based on a number of criteria[12]. While these criteria provide some information on community councils and villages, they don't provide enough information on problems at those two levels. Detailed analyses were conducted during the first stages of implementation, including a climate change scenario modelling and risk assessment and a detailed land degradation mapping. The review of these documents and interviews and focus groups conducted for this evaluation confirm that the problems in the targeted community councils and villages are similar to the ones mentioned in the project document for the national level, but this might not have been the case. While a general assessment of the subnational level might be fine for a concept note, it is not enough for designing a project at the final stage.

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

The project strategy addresses the climate change impacts and the barriers for adaptation identified in the problem analysis to a great extent. Basically, the project planned to i) enhance technical and institutional capacity to mainstream climate change adaptation into policies, plans and programmes at the national and local levels and ii) raise the awareness and capacity of communities on implementing and actually implement climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and natural resource management measures (the results framework is analyzed in section 4.1.2). It is worth stressing that the strategy of the project is based on changing the mind-set of communities. In contrast with LRP and other programmes, the project is voluntary and does not provide cash for working in land rehabilitation: it aims to mobilize people based on the understanding that rehabilitating land has important resilience benefits for them in the medium and long-term and that it is their responsibility. This proved difficult during implementation. To encourage communities to work on this, and to increase resilience, the project is promoting a range of climate smart IGAs, as an economic, but not directly monetary incentive.

---

[12] The selection process involved the development of a physiographic map, delineating important catchments, using topography and major drainage systems, as well as main land uses, and overlaying later a national village map over this biophysical map. In addition to this, the selection considered the following criteria: i) poverty level (using NAPA and LVAC compound index approach); ii) water supply (focus on domestic use), reliability and sanitation; iii) land degradation in the rangelands, croplands and wetlands; iv) local governance structures, especially grazing associations and/or youth associations; v) willingness/awareness/readiness of local community; and vi) avoidance of duplication. The selection also considered reliance on rainfed agriculture (crops and livestock) and frequency and intensity of drought and storm rains but these were equivalent for all villages. The selection process involved representatives from various ministries (i.e. MRFSC, MAFS, MoGYSR) and three NGOs.

The selected strategies are aligned with the problem analysis. However, they overlook an important aspect, the need to build capacities not only to mainstream adaptation in policy and implement adaptation measures at community level, but also to plan and implement adaptation beyond the community level. Moreover, the question of whether the approach is effective to achieve the project's expected results is complex. As discussed in below, the expected results are contradictory to a certain extent: the project has very ambitious quantitative (particularly, rehabilitating 50,000 ha) and qualitative (increase resilience) targets with relatively small financial resources (around USD 36 m - 8.4 m from LDCF). To meet the quantitative target on land rehabilitation the project is spreading the resources thin, which compromises the impact of the project in terms of increasing resilience in the specific villages where it is working (the qualitative targets)[13]. The criterion used to select villages didn't contribute to effectiveness either, as complementary with other projects was considered a problem rather than a useful strategy to make a difference. Desk review and interviews suggest that there is some collaboration with the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO), which is implementing a very similar project in three different districts in the south, using a FFS approach. Interviews suggest also some collaboration with some NGOs, with some room for improvement[14]. Moreover, as discussed in section 4.2.2 below, the project has not been robust when selecting the IGAs to be conducted in each village. Available evidence suggests that the project is reacting to community requests without always fully assessing technically the feasibility and medium and long term resilience of the activities requested in each case. For instance, the project is promoting animals (i.e. layers) that require very specific inputs in hardly accessible villages – this implies challenges to get inputs in time but also to commercialize outputs at certain scale –small scale markets may be available. Overall, effectiveness is compromised by the lack of consideration of spatial aspects, considering the per capita investment and the accessibility of sites[15]. While the project will conduct a cost-benefit analysis of specific adaptation interventions, the decision on the number of villages, their selection and the selection of activities have not actually considered cost-effectiveness.

In the same sense, it is worth noting that while the project document (p. 25) claims that the project builds on lessons learned from other initiatives that have experience in climate change adaptation, agro-forestry and conservation agriculture in Lesotho, it doesn't actually indicate what are these lessons and how they inform the project strategy. Indeed, the analysis of on-going country interventions is very weak: it only identifies one project – Wool and Mohair Promotion project (WAMPP) seeking to address rural poverty. No geographical reference is given and lessons are not specified. Interviewees from different perspectives point out in this sense that the project is not bringing anything new, which could have been important to overcome some of the challenges already faced by other projects. The project document

---

[13] The project targets 4,097 households distributed in 134 villages. Each village has an average population of 31 households, but more than 30 per cent of the target villages have 15 or less households. The project did no consider the budget per village when deciding on the number of them.

[14] With Rural Self-Help Development Association (RSDA) on seed multiplication, small stock of poultry and dairy, and building communities cooperatives; with Growing Nations in conservation agriculture. The project also collaborates with World Vision and with Lesotho National Farmers Forum (LENAFU)

[15] The project did not consider accessibility a criterion to select villages. Indeed, PMU has not systematized the accessibility of participating villages.

did however plan to establish a system for monitoring and evaluating the effectiveness of various approaches to climate change adaptation to learn lessons and use them in this and future projects. The project governance structures play an important role in sharing lessons learned with key stakeholders, including government bodies and development partners, such as FAO. Exchanges with this agency also take place in the framework of the Lesotho's United Nations Development Assistance Plan (LUNDAP). However, interviews reveal poor links with some key stakeholders in the country, such as the German Development Agency (GIZ). The systematization and exchange of lessons learned during project implementation is analyzed in more detail in section 4.3.6.

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

The project is aligned with Lesotho's key development policies, such as Vision 2020 and the NSDP 2012/13-2016/17 and 2017/18 – 2022/23. The project is also in tune with the country's climate change plans and international communications, such as the NAPA of 2007; the first and second national communications to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC), submitted in 2000 and 2013, respectively; the Nationally Determined Contribution (NDC) of 2015; and the Climate Change Policy 2017-2027. The project is also in harmony with Lesotho's commitment under the Hyogo Framework of Action. In addition, the project is congruous with the National Environment Policy, the National Forest Policy and the National Biodiversity Strategy and Action Plan. Furthermore, the project is consistent with the country's Land Act, the Gender and Development Policy, and policies related to rural development. In addition, the project is in line with district and council development plans for 2012-2017 and 2018-2023. The project governance structures at national and sub-national level, with management committees that are composed of representatives from different government sectors and levels, allow regular interaction and continuous alignment. As noted below, the project is also working with communities to identify activities. Besides, the project is in tune with LUNDAP 2013-2017 and 2018-2022, as well as with LDCF and GEF strategies 2014-2018 and 2018-2022.

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

Available evidence shows that extensive stakeholder consultation informed project design. The project document reports four consultation instances between June and August 2014. These comprised an inception workshop in Maseru with key ministries; meetings at the district level with councillors, de-concentrated and decentralized officials and NGOs; and consultations with communities in the three community councils. Site selection also included a workshop with key national ministries and NGOs[16] and consultation with the targeted community councils and communities. Interviews at the national, district, council and community levels confirmed that the design process was highly participatory. The project document includes a stakeholder engagement plan. Interaction with key stakeholders corroborates that

---

[16] MFRSC; MoGYS; MAFS, Rural Self-Help Development Association (RSDA); Send-A-Cow; and World Vision

project implementation has been consultative – for instance, all interviewed communities indicated that they participated actively in the selection of the project activities in their villages. In most of the cases, communities were already working and had a sense of what they wanted to do.

4.1.1.5 To what extent were gender issues taken into account during project design?

The project document includes a section on gender (p. 19). It assesses gender-related aspects and proposes three measures to ensure that the project will contribute to gender equality, namely targeting gender- and youth-differentiated vulnerabilities into project interventions, using gender-disaggregated indicators and targets in the results framework, and involving the Ministry of Gender, Youth, Sports and Recreation (MoGYSR) throughout implementation as a member of the PSC. However, while the definition of the indicator mentions gender in 5 out of 17 outputs, gender-disaggregated targets are only established for 2 outputs related to training (2.2. and 5.4). Furthermore, the gender analysis in the project document is rather generic, lacking an in-depth assessment of gender issues in the selected communities.

Interviews reveal that the project involves both women and men in all activities, including land rehabilitation; it promotes activities that interest women; and in some cases it is trying to actively promote gender equality. Training on gender equality has also been provided. Moreover, female organizations are consulted. Indeed, available data suggests that overall at community level project activities engage more women than men. However, there seems to be a gender distribution on training. Women tend to participate more in general trainings and those related to agriculture[17], given that in Lesotho culturally men are supposed to provide money and the activities carried out by the project are voluntary, and many activities take place in the centre of the village when men take care of livestock. The project is in fact trying to engage more men in these activities. In contrast, at institutional and political level, and for some topics, such as livestock and beekeeping, the project tends to involve more men than women[18]. This is mostly due to cultural practices and/or preferences, although the project encourages equal participation of both men and women.

4.1.2.   Results framework

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

---

[17] Training on water conservation was attended by 147 females and 82 males; training on fodder production, by 112 females and 91 males; training on orchard management, by 15 females and 12 males. Training on schools also gathered more women than men (632 versus 538).

[18] The project trained 58 chiefs on legal tools to enhance their capacity to manage natural resources and execute their powers accordingly in land and natural resources disputes and related issues and to strengthen coordination in implementation of developments within their village – 47 were men and 11 women. Moreover, when training on animal health and production, the 10 trained paravets were males. Advanced training on beekeeping was attended by 35 males and 5 females, while training on seasonal weather forecast was attended by 140 males and 121 women.

The project objective is "to mainstream climate risk considerations into the Land Rehabilitation Programme of Lesotho for improved ecosystem resilience and reduced vulnerability of livelihoods to climate shocks." The project components, outcomes, outputs and activities are relatively aligned with this objective.

However, the structure of outcomes, outputs and activities is confusing. To begin with, the project is organized around too many outcomes (5), outputs (17) and activities (75). With that great number of outcomes, outputs and activities, the project is difficult to grasp - it becomes difficult to explain to stakeholders. When presenting it to stakeholders the project is often simplified.

Nevertheless, the components (2) do not summarize the project well. Component 1 focuses on "knowledge, skills and institutional capacity to support land rehabilitation programme to factor in additional risks from climate change, increase resilience and reduce vulnerability". Component 2 focuses on "climate change adaptation mainstreamed into local and national development planning and finance". While they highlight the work on capacity building and mainstreaming, they tell nothing about interventions on the ground.

Moreover, the structure of components (2) and outcomes (5) is not totally clear. Component 1 includes outcomes 1, 2 and 3, related to capacity building at the institutional (Outcome 1) and community (Outcome 2) levels and implementation of adaptation interventions on the ground in terms of land rehabilitation (Outcome 3)[19]. Component 2 includes outcomes 4 and 5, related to mainstreaming climate change adaptation in national (Outcome 4) and local (Outcome 5) policies and plans[20]. It would have made more sense to have three components and three outcomes, one on capacity building (outcomes 1 and 2), one on mainstreaming adaptation into policies and plans (outcomes 4 and 5) and one of implementing interventions on the ground (outcome 3).

The relationship between outcomes and outputs is not straightforward either, many outputs not being allocated to the most relevant outcome. Half of the outputs in outcome 1 are not related to capacity building at the institutional level, but to project planning, such as outputs 1.3 and 1.4. Moreover, four of the five outputs in outcome 2 are mostly related to outcome 1: outputs 2.2 and 2.5 refer to the institutions at the national level and outputs 2.1 and 2.4 to institutional aspects at the sub-national level. In this sense, they refer more to institutions than to communities. Only one of the outputs in outcome 2 relates directly to that outcome. In outcome 3, one of the two outputs (3.2) is not merely linked to that outcome, as is in a significant way again related to outcome 1 on institutional capacity building[21]. Outcome 4 only has one

---

[19] Outcome 1. Increased technical capacity of the MFRSC and relevant departments to apply up- to-date climate science for the management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change; Outcome 2. Communities empowered with skills, knowledge, partnerships and institutions for managing natural resources to reduce vulnerability to climate change and increase resilience of natural and social capital; Outcome 3. Over 50,000 ha of land rehabilitated through operationalization of the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.

[20] Outcome 4. National strategies for rangelands and wetlands management strengthened by the integration of climate change/variability and ecosystem management; Outcome 5. NSDP mainstreamed into local development strategies to support the constituency-wide adoption of the climate- smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.

[21] Output 3.2. A long-term strategy for monitoring and evaluating climate- smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management

output, which is relevant, but does not fully respond to the outcome. While output 4.1 refers to developing guidelines and policy briefs for mainstreaming adaptation, the project would need to do something to ensure that the developed guidelines are actually integrated/uptaken. In outcome 5 only 2 of the 5 outputs are directly linked to the outcome. Output 5.1 and 5.4 refer to institutional capacity building (Outcome 1) and output 5.5 is rather cross-cutting and refers to the project itself. It is worth noting that the title of some outputs is not in tune with the activities under them (e.g. output 1.3 refers to cost-benefit analysis of adaptation interventions but none of the five activities under the output cover actually this).

In the first quarter of 2017, that is, two years after the proposed start date, a Monitoring and Evaluation (M&E) consultant was hired to revise the logframe, among other things. The corresponding report did not recommend major changes, only shifting outputs 2.2 and 2.5 from outcome 2 to outcome 1. While the recommendation is adequate, a more comprehensive revision would have been convenient. Interviews suggest that it was in any case difficult to adjust the result given that the LDCF Council had already approved the project, with its budget – there were some financial implications in adjusting it.

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

While some of the indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification in the original logframe were fine (e.g. Outcomes 1, 2, 3 and 5), some others were not fully effective to measure and monitor the effects of the project. For instance, the indicator for outcome 4 was an output indicator and the indicator and target for output 1.2 was not specific enough[22]. In December 2017 the M&E consultant provided a revised results framework with revised indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification. Although these were much more appropriate, they still had some deficits. For instance, the proposed indicator for the objective is based on perception and thus fails to provide a reliable measure of achievement of mainstreaming of climate risk considerations into the LRP. A few sub-indicators ranking the proportion of activities, processes and plans in the LRP that fully account for climate change, would appropriately measure this. In any case, the latest quarterly report (Q3 2018) shows that a number of the proposed indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification were not taken into account given the need to observe GEF financial management guidelines. While other parameters were also included, the project is still using the original results framework to a significant extent.

The results framework currently used by the project for monitoring has considerable weaknesses. Quarterly reports do not report on the objective so it is not clear which indicator, baseline, target and means of verification are being used. As noted, both the original and revised elements are inadequate. The latest (Q3 2018) project report does not indicate either baselines or means of verification, so it is not

---

interventions for the MFRSC and relevant departments, including an experimental design to evaluate the impact of interventions

[22]

possible to assess the results framework properly at outcome or output levels. At outcome level, the project uses 7 sets of indicator and target to assess the performance of its 5 outcomes. Only one set of indicator and target (related to hectares of rehabilitated land) is adequate. 4 outcome indicators are outputs indicators and do not measure the achievement of the outcomes[23]. The indicator for outcome 1 is adequate but there is no clear target. Moreover, there are important gaps. In outcome 2 the two proposed indicators focus on knowledge and skills[24], but do not measure the extent to which the project is achieving the other aspects of the outcome, namely the strengthening of partnerships and institutions. Furthermore, in two outcomes (4 and 5) indicators and targets are not consistent. In most of the cases the M&E report provided a more adequate framework. At output level, indicators and targets tend to be adequate, although in some cases (e.g. output 1.2) they are not fully aligned.

It is difficult to assess the adequacy of targets, as most of them refer to inadequate indicators and in some cases (e.g. Outcome 1) they are not provided. Mid-term targets are not provided at outcome or output levels. It is worth noting however that the target of 50,000 ha of rehabilitated land by the end of the project seems too ambitious. As noted above, it seems to be compromising the impact on each of the villages where the project is working. In contrast, some other targets seem rather low. For instance, the target of two policy guidelines in Outcome 5 seems very low in comparison with the efforts and width of activities undertaken under this outcome, and also in relation to the contribution of this outcome to the overall project objective.

It is also worth noting that changes in the log frame have not always been robust. While several indicators have been adjusted throughout the life of the project, not all targets have been reviewed. An output 6.2 was added in the 2017 Annual Report for "Workshops, meetings and conferences that are organised and conducted/attended", but it has no link to any outcome.

Finally, as noted in section 4.1.1.5, only two output level sets of indicator and target are fully gender-disaggregated. The employment of youth and marginalized people was mentioned on several occasions[25] as a valuable benefit from the project. Yet, no target or indicator to this effect is currently included.

---

[23] In Outcome 2 the sub-indicator on number of people trained does not measure change in knowledge or skills – training may have been bad and people not have learned; in Outcome 3 the sub-indicator on seeds does not measure rehabilitated land – seed may have not been planted or developed after planting; on Outcome 4 the indicator on policy brief does not measure mainstreaming – policy briefs may have been shelved and not integrated in policies; on Outcome 5 the indicator on guidelines does not measure mainstreaming, for the same reason as for Outcome 4.

[24] The sub-indicator related to awareness is not only not properly formulated (it should be level of awareness), but also insufficient – being aware is different to having knowledge or skills. Furthermore, it is unclear how exactly is awareness measured and how reliable that mean of verification is. As noted above, the sub-indicator related to number of people trained is an output indicator.

[25] Inception Report, PSC meetings.

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?

This is a 72 months (6 years) project. It was supposed to start in January 2015 and finalize in December 2020. The project started in June 2015. In October 2018, the project had spent 46 months or 64 per cent of the implementation time if the original date of start is considered and 40 months or 56 per cent of the implementation time if it is assumed that the original completion date will be extended 6 months to compensate for the late start.

The deficits of the result framework mentioned in section 4.1.2 above don't allow robustly assessing the achievement of the expected objective, outcomes and outputs of the project by mid-term. As noted, the results framework does not provide mid-term targets. The latest monitoring report of October 2018 (Q3 2018) does not report on the achievement of the project objective. The reviewers found that climate-driven vulnerabilities informed the prioritisation of target sites in the project area and that some appropriate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures are being implemented. However, the prioritisation of target sites in the project area did not consider cost-effectiveness. Furthermore the proposed complementary activities (i.e. IGA) are not appropriate in some villages. Moreover, there is no evidence that the lessons from the project are been used by the LRP beyond the project area.

At outcome level[26], it is possible to assess robustly only the achievement of one of the five outcomes. In October 2018, the project was still far from achieving the end of the project target on Outcome 3 - it has achieved 29 per cent of the end of the project target (it had rehabilitated 14,323 ha of land out of 50,000 ha). It was also very far from achieving the end of the project target in Outcome 2[27]. The project had met the end of the project targets on Outcomes 4 and 5, although, as noted, these are framed as outputs and do not really measure achievement of the corresponding outcome[28]. The project has made progress on Outcome 1 – it has conducted two baseline assessments and trained 80 MFRSC staff on climate change scenario modelling and risk, land degradation assessment with geographic-information systems and land degradation monitoring. The project was also building capacity of the Environmental and Energy Statistics Unit (EESU). However, these are outputs that don't necessarily imply the achievement of the expected outcome (increased technical capacity). Moreover, the project doesn't report on all indicators

---

[26] This analysis considers the results frameworks included in the project document and the latest progress report available (Q3 2018) at the time of conducting the MTR. The indicators, baselines, targets and 2018 values are presented in Annex 2

[27] The project had conducted trainings, meetings and public campaigns, raising the awareness of 2,586 people. According to Q3 2018, the project aims to raise awareness to 65 per cent in Khoelenya, 70 per cent in Lithipeng, and 80 per cent in Thaba Mokhele. As of October 2018, awareness levels were 21 per cent in Khoelenya, 25 per cent in Lithipeng and 15 per cent in Thaba Mokhele.

[28] The project has developed guidelines for mainstreaming climate change into the NSDP II (outcome 5) and sectoral and local policies (outcome 4). However, this does not mean that climate change has actually being mainstreamed – the report doesn't say what has happened with the guidelines.

– it reports on outputs that have contributed towards achievement of certain indicators in accordance with quarterly plans and targets.

The latest project report reports on 16 end of the project output targets. The assessment is not clear for 2 outputs (1.1 and 1.2)[29]. Of the remaining 14 end of the project output targets, the project had met 6 (43 per cent) by October 2018 (more than half way in implementation). Of these, the project had exceeded the target in 1 (output 2.1) regarding the number of institutional staff trained at local level. The other five outputs basically refer to institutional structures (2.3) and guidelines for coordination and mainstreaming (outputs 4.1, 5.1, 5.2 and 5.3). In contrast, the project had not met 8 of the 14 (57 per cent) end of the project output targets that can be assessed. For outputs 1.3, 1.5 and 1.6, the end of the project output target had simply not been met – there is no percentage. Percentages can be provided for the level of achievement of end of the project output target for 4 outputs and five output targets. In all these cases, by October 2018 the project was very far from the end of the project target: in 1.4, 20 per cent had been achieved; in 2.2, 31 per cent; in 3.1, 26 and 29 per cent; and in 3.2, 16 per cent. The table below provides a summary of progress towards results. The full Progress Towards Results Matrix is provided in Annex 6.2. This provides the indicators, the baseline levels, the end of the project targets[30], and the justification of rating, together with the two columns provided here (the achievement rating and the mid-term level and assessment).

Table 2. Summary table on progress toward results

Project Strategy	Mid-term level and assessment	Achievement Rating
Objective		MU
Outcome 1	-	-
Outcome 2		U
Outcome 3		U
Outcome 4		S
Outcome 5		S
Output 1.1	-	-
Output 1.2	-	-
Output 1.3		MU
Output 1.4		U
Output 1.5		MU
Output 1.6		MU
Output 2.1		HS
Output 2.2		U
Output 2.3		S
Output 3.1		U
		U
Output 3.2		U
Output 4.1		S
Output 5.1		S

---

[29] On 1.1 it is not clear whether MFRSC staff have capacity to update/operationalize the system and scale it up without external assistance. Likewise, on 1.2 it is unclear whether the mentioned staff has the capacity to run the analysis by itself.
[30] As noted the results framework does not provide mid-term targets.

Output 5.2		S
Output 5.3		S

That been said, the project seems to be having some impact. At institutional level, the project has created important structures at national and district levels and has trained government staff at national and sub-national levels on a number of relevant topics[31]. The project has also contributed to mainstream climate change into national, sectoral and local planning. In addition, the project has trained communities on a number of relevant topics [32], promoted climate-smart measures, including water harvesting, and implemented land rehabilitation, as well as supported a number of IGAs, with training and inputs, such as seeds (maize, beans, wheat, sorghum), trees (apple, pear, peach), fertilizer, animals (e.g. chickens), beehives and related equipment (incubators, dryers…). This does not mean however that the project has achieved the intended outcomes: while training may result in increased awareness, it does not necessarily mean capacity and guidelines for mainstreaming do not necessarily result in actual mainstreaming. There is no evidence to confirm the achievement of intended outcomes on those fronts. On the other hand, interviews and focus group discussions suggest that interventions on the ground are improving the lives and livelihoods of targeted communities. For instance, some rangelands are starting to recover, reducing erosion and increasing the health of livestock. Gardens are also more productive and resilient. Communities also have improved access to water and more access to resilient livelihoods, such as beehives or improved chickens.

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

The achievement of expected results has been beset by a number of barriers. First, there are challenges related to the timeline in the project design. To begin with, the project had to find the team and procure inputs, such as vehicles. For the reasons explained below, this took very long. In addition, the project design was not very detailed, so project implementation involved conducting important project planning activities. These included the development of baseline studies to prioritize activities on the ground. While this is reasonable for a LDCF project (less common in Green Climate Fund proposals that require detailed

---

[31] Among others, topics have included climate change, local governance, GIS, conservation agriculture, wetland protection, productive agriculture and conflict management. Some of the training is targeted. For instance, 58 chiefs were capacitated with legal tools to enhance their capacity to manage natural resources and execute their powers accordingly in land and natural resources disputes and related issues and to strengthen coordination in implementation of developments within their villages.
[32] Topics comprise gender aspects, soil and water conservation, seasonal weather forecasts, beekeeping, grazing management, wetland protection, fodder production for livestock and re-seeding of degraded rangelands, animal health and production, poultry production, food preservation and orchard management, among others. In addition to training sessions, capacity building has included study tours.

feasibility studies), it took time. Indeed, interventions on the ground started only in 2017, that is, 1 year after the expected project start date.

Second, the project is implemented through the National Implementation Modality (NIM), in particular by the Ministry of Forest, Range and Soil Conservation (MFRSC). While this certainly has many advantages in the medium term and some positive effects in the short term, it also results in implementation challenges. To start with some procurement processes tend to take long. This is particularly true for inputs and materials that are imported from South Africa. This is a critical issue as some of the activities, such as planting seeds, are seasonal – if seeds or fruit trees are not provided within the planting season, a year may pass to be able to plant them. To address this and improve efficiency, MFRSC and UNDP have provided training to suppliers of goods and services. The government planning processes that the project seeks to influence also take long. For instance, the development of the NSDP took longer than expected, resulting in delays in the activity related to providing guidelines for it. Furthermore, the project is subject to significant technical and political turnover, project focal points being transferred to other areas or locations and elections taking place periodically, which imply that things are put on hold for some time, given their key role in the project governance and implementation structure. In addition, while the project has a specific PMU, it also represents an extra burden to government officials, which are typically very busy already, sometimes with projects that are bigger and/or provide better incentives in the form of Daily Subsistence Allowance (DSA)[33]. In fact, interviews suggest that government staff, including extension services, is getting thinner, which not only reduces complementary activities but also compromises the capacity of government officials for taking care of project activities. It is also worth noting that some key institutions are relatively new and therefore capacities are relatively low. Local governments started in Lesotho in 2005.

Third, there have been challenges regarding contracting of technical experts. The pool of available adequate external consultants is small, so it has taken time to find appropriate consultants, for instance for identifying land degradation hotspots through GIS. As it will be further discussed in section 4.3 on efficiency, there have also been issues with staffing the PMU.

Fourth, while it makes sense, the project approach makes it difficult to implement project activities, particularly on land rehabilitation. Meeting the 50,000 ha target requires significant labour. Communities in Lesotho are typically paid cash for conducting land rehabilitation work. About 70% of households in the project area receive 1,100 LSL a year for working 20 days on this through the LRP. In contrast, the project is based on voluntary work, with the idea that communities need to understand that these activities bring benefits to them and they are their responsibility. Changing the mind-set always takes time, particularly when to a great extent benefits from climate-smart land management are seen in the medium and long term, are mostly communal and are not secure –there could be bad harvests. As noted above, to address this challenge, and increase resilience, the project is promoting IGAs[34], but the

---

[33] As noted, FAO is implementing a similar project in different districts. In addition, the International Fund for Agriculture Development (IFAD) is implementing a USD 40 m country-wide project. There is also a World Bank – IFAD project on small-holder agriculture development.
[34] The project provides crop seeds, fertilizers, fruit trees, beekeeping, chickens and protected agriculture structures (greenhouses and nets). The project is also supporting water harvesting infrastructure, irrigation and potable water systems.

incentive is not personal, immediate and secure, like cash, so it is sometimes difficult to engage communities. This is particularly true regarding men, who are traditionally responsible for bringing cash, which has an impact in terms of coverage, as the men tend to be stronger than women. The project is exploring the possibility of providing a more direct, short term and secure incentive package, particularly food, on quarterly basis to complement benefits from IGAs and rehabilitated natural resources including rangelands. The project is also promoting FFS that demonstrate the different results of usual and climate-smart agriculture.

Fifth, and related to the previous point, the achievement of expected results is compromised by encroachment in rehabilitated lands, orchards and/or gardens, which is related to the tragedy of the commons. As noted, communal benefits are often to be seen in the medium and long term – however encroachment by few for immediate personal benefits may result in communal benefits not being realized in the expected time frame. While the project is putting in place some strategies to address this, especially the establishment of grazing associations, the area covered is still small and they not always work – this is further discussed in section 4.4 on sustainability.

Sixth, as noted, the achievement of expect results is compromised by the geographic approach, which, as mentioned, is related to the very ambitious target on hectares of rehabilitated land. With limited resources per village the impact in each of them is small and the incentive to work voluntarily, reduced. Interviews indicate that the equipment provided for land rehabilitation is sometimes insufficient. Moreover, some of the selected villages are very difficult to access. This reduces the likelihood of resilience and the medium and long term relevance of these villages, as the project will not be able to solve major aspects (such as roads, electricity supply or access to social services), it makes it difficult to bring inputs and take out outputs and a significant percentage of the current population may migrate, not only because of climate change, but mostly because the opportunities that they have in other areas of the country – not only in Maseru[35]. Not only the current population is small, but it will likely be smaller in the near future, despite the project. Furthermore, difficult access implies significant transaction costs for the project – the project team spends many hours travelling when they could be doing something more substantive, and there are high costs in vehicles, fuel and vehicle maintenance (e.g. tires). Reduced economies of scale are not only related to the large number of villages but also to the fact that the project is mostly working alone on the ground, without significant complementarities with other stakeholders, which could increase the investment per village.

Seventh, the achievement of expected results is also affected by the lack of a comprehensive approach and proper planning in three fronts – this is related to the previous point on scale. The original project design did not put a sufficient emphasis on water infrastructure, such as dams, tanks and other water harvesting infrastructure, when this is key for rangeland, orchards and gardens, particularly with significant climate variability. The project is now making a considerable effort on this, which requires significant investment. The original design did not pay sufficient attention either to markets. This is

---

[35] Adaptation brings a medium and long term approach to development. It is worth stressing that climate is not the only thing that changes – the demographic, economic and social structure of Lesotho are also changing and will change. Adaptation is not about adapting current society to current climate variability and future climate change, but about adapting the current and future society to current climate variability and future climate change.

proving important, as the project is promoting IGAs. In some villages this is tricky given their location. There is a dilemma as well with land rehabilitation. The project is removing bushes and plans to plant grass. This is good from a livelihood point of view, but grass alone may not be the most efficient way of retaining soil – something with deeper roots may help retain soil better. In addition, due to delays in procurement, grass has not been planted in some areas, and land is left bare, which contributes to soil erosion despite the small water retention structures that have been constructed with the removed bushes.

Eight, IGAs are not always carefully selected. The project does not always filter community suggestions in an appropriate way, when some of the proposed activities are not feasible in some specific villages.

Ninth, there are some cultural barriers. Some trees are blamed for bringing death. Apiculture is also culturally associated with bad things. Likewise with vines, which could work, on the basis that they can cause intra-family conflicts. Training is typically able to overcome these cultural barriers, but they are still there.

Finally, the project is being affected by a severe drought, affecting the survival of planted trees. The project however is expected to build resilience to this type of events, so this is not totally external to the project.

Table 3 summarizes the abovementioned barriers.

Table 3. Summary barriers

No.	Category	Description
1	Deficits in project design	Long inception phase (procurement and planning)
2	National Implementation Modality	Long procurement process Long planning processes Technical and political turnover Limited human resources (overlapping functions and competing agendas) Limited technical capacities
3	Limited human resources	External consultants PMU
4	Approach	Non-cash for work approach
5		Ownership issues (tragedy of the commons)
6		Geographic approach – resources spread thin, accessibility issues and limited complementarities
7		Lack of a comprehensive approach and proper planning on water infrastructure, markets and land rehabilitation
8	Technical	Limited feasibility assessment of project activities
9	Cultural	Resistance to some project activities
10	Climate variability	Impact of drought on project activities (i.e. survival of planted trees).

4.3. Project implementation and adaptive management

4.3.1. Management arrangements

4.3.1.1 How effective are the management arrangements?

The project document clearly presents the management arrangements (pp. 69-72). The governance structure includes a PSC, a TAC, a DPCC and a DPIC, in addition to the PMU. The project document clearly establishes the composition, roles and responsibilities of these bodies. The proposed structure and composition, roles and responsibilities of the governance bodies are overall appropriate for the project. However, at the sub-national level the structures give significant weight to district authorities and do not provide sufficient visibility or involvement to community councils, which are represented by the chairpersons and secretaries in the DPCC and the planners in the DPIC. Interviews suggest that, although implemented in the field, the project follows a deconcentration rather than a decentralisation approach[36].

Moreover, the proposed governance structure has faced some challenges during project implementation. At institutional level, there has been some turnover in key positions, such as the PS of the MFRSC[37], which co-chairs the PSC and, the project being under a NIM with this ministry, has to sign contracts. Interviews suggest that information is not always moving smoothly from one PS to the next. Not less importantly, there has been very significant instability within the PMU. Its structure has been changed twice. It was originally composed of one project manager, three project field facilitators (PFFs) (one per community council), a national administration and finance officer, an international CTA and a driver. It was then decided to hire a project manager and a project officer, instead of just one manager, as well as two and later three drivers instead of one. The roles of the manager and the officer were not properly defined and the structure didn't work: there was overlapping and in the end none of them would do parts of the work. The PMU has now a project manager, as originally planned, now called project coordinator. In addition to structure problems, there has been significant turnover: in 3 years the project has had 3 managers and 2 CTAs – the PFFs have not changed. Moreover, as procurement takes time and it is difficult to find good candidates in Lesotho, the manager and CTA positions have been vacant for significant periods of project implementation time – no CTA is currently supporting the team[38] -,

---

[36] Note that this subsection also responds to question 3.5.1 in the evaluation matrix on partnerships with relevant stakeholders.
[37] There have been 3 national elections in the last 5 years. PS is a political position.
[38] There wasn't a project manager or coordinator between January and May 2016, and between June and November 2018 (one in June – December 2015; one in May 2016 – June 2018; one in November 2018 – today). In 2015, for some time in 2017 and since July 2018 there has not been a CTA.

affecting delivery. Furthermore, the performance of one of the 3 managers had room for improvement – the contract was not extended. Besides, the PMU has limited capacity for M&E.

4.3.1.2 What is the quality of execution of the project by the executing agency and the implementing partner?

All project governance bodies are meeting at least as frequently as planned – with the PSC meeting more regularly than expected. The PSC and TAC are operating according to their roles. Structures at district level are proving very useful for guiding and coordinating implementation in the field. There is some coordination between national and sub-national bodies. The PSC and the TAC have conducted monitoring missions at least once. UNDP is providing good support to the PMU in terms of political, technical and administrative backup, with an appropriate focus on results.

Regarding risks, annex 1 of the project document presents risks, their impact and probability rating, the mitigation measures and the assumptions. 6 of the 7 risks would have high impact (5 in a scale of 5), but only in two cases the probability is medium (3 in a scale of 5). The identification of risks is comprehensive and the definition of mitigation actions reasonable[39]. As noted in section 4.3.5.1 on reporting, the reporting template includes a section on risks and provides information on the challenges encountered. However, annual and quarterly reports do not report on the risks and the mitigation measures identified in the project document. Some of them identify new risks. These are described very broadly and mitigation measures are not provided. In this sense, risks and mitigation measures and issues encountered and solutions implemented are not properly tracked. Adaptive management is not clearly visible. References to UNDP Environmental and Social Risks screening procedure were not found in the project document or the annual or quarterly reports.

That being said, PMU submits reports and work plans to the governing bodies and, according to interviews, then responds to their guidance – for example, following advice from the Ministry of Agriculture and Food Security (MAFS) through the TAC on which seeds and fertilizers to provide. Desk review and interviews shows that the project has been able to learn and adjust to some unplanned aspects. For instance, the project got three cars and drivers instead of one, given the extent of the geographic area that is covering. The project is also paying more attention to water issues and has adjusted the size of tanks – small tanks were initially provided. The project is also working closely with the Lesotho Meteorological Service (LMS) to improve meteorological data and the use of seasonal weather forecasts, an important aspect that was not initially planned. Two weather stations out of three now planned have been constructed and are operational.

4.3.2.   Work planning

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

---

[39] It is worth noting that the results framework (section 3) in the project also includes risks (in this case per outcome) but one of the risks included there is not considered in the in-depth risk analysis (Annex 1).

As noted in section 4.2 on effectiveness, the project has had important delays, due to project planning, staff turnover and procurement aspects. As mentioned, project implementation included activities (such as conducting baselines) that are sometimes carried out as part of project design. As also mentioned, there has been significant turnover at political and institutional levels, some national procurement processes are slow[40] and in some cases it has proved difficult to find good staff and consultants. As highlighted, some activities are seasonal – one month delay may imply having to wait a whole year. There have been other, less structural sources of delay. The socio-economic baseline that was meant for 2016 had to be re-advertised mid-way and it was finished only in 2018. Some consultancies, in particular the ones on cost-benefit analysis (CBA) and M&E, should have happened before, informing the design of the project, including the decision of the number of villages, their selection and the prioritization of activities in each of them, as well as the definition of the results framework.

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 December 2018, the project had spent USD 2,812,545, that is, 78 per cent of the planned budget for the 2015-2018 period – the percentage increased to 88 per cent if commitments are considered. Total actual expenditure as of December 2018 represented 33 per cent of total LDCF funding, when more than 55 per cent of the implementation time had been spent - the project had spent 46 months since the planned start date and 40 months since the actual start date, that is, 64 or 56 per cent of expected implementation time, respectively.

By year, expenditure had been slightly low every year: actual expenditure represented 81 per cent of planned expenditure in 2015; 93 per cent in 2016; 85 per cent in 2017; and 65 per cent in 2018 – with commitments the percentage increased to 82 per cent.

Per outcome, there were important differences between actual and planned expenditure in the 2015-2018 period. On two outcomes (2 and 4), actual expenditure had been significantly greater than planned: 171 and 164 per cent, respectively. On the other three outcomes actual expenditure had been lower than planned. For outcome 1, the difference was small – 89 per cent of the planned budget for the period was actually spent. On outcome 3 the difference was significant, while it was very significant for outcome 5 – 61 and 14 per cent of the planned budget for the period had been actually spent, respectively. Under-expenditure is surprising in Outcome 3 given the importance of this outcome in terms of narrative and reporting and how it has compromised the approach of the project. It is worth noting that expenditure per outcome didn't follow a constant partner in the period. The percentage of actual expenditure against planned expenditure in Outcome 2 was very low in 2015, very high in 2016, low in 2017 and very high 2018. Outcome 1 showed also a heterogeneous pattern, with a huge divergence in 2017.

---

[40] This is particularly true for inputs and materials that are imported from South Africa. To address this and improve efficiency, MFRSC and UNDP have provided training to suppliers of goods and services. Interviews suggest that one of the factors explaining long procurement process has been the weak coordination between MFRSC and UNDP regarding the forms that have to be filled in.

Regarding Project Management Costs (PMC), as of December 2018, actual PMC for the 2015-2018 period summed up USD 586,038, that is, very slightly above (103 per cent of) planned PMC for that period. Actual PMC were significantly greater than planned in 2015, as the project was starting, slightly greater than planned in 2017 and slightly lower than planned in 2016 and 2018. As of December 2018, actual PMC for the 2015-2018 period represented 21 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 very significant divergence that will require careful attention in the remaining time of implementation. These high PMC can be mostly explained by under-delivery or low rate of expenditure in project activities as well as by the increase in the members of the PMU – a project officer in addition to the project manager. PMC are very high despite the project missing a project manager and a CTA during certain periods of project implementation. It is also worth noting that the presented PMCs include only the project manager, the project officer, the finance and administrative officer and the CTA, and do not include the costs of the three PFF and the three drivers. The PFF and two of the drivers are budgeted under outcome 3 and one driver is directly paid by UNDP. Although the PFF and the drivers are on the ground on full time basis, in reality they play a critical role in project management, including project monitoring and reporting, and should be considered as PMCs. This would put PMC even further from the percentage required by the GEF. It is worth noting in this sense that covering a large area of land has significant costs in terms of drivers, vehicles and expenses in fuel and car maintenance (e.g. tires) (the project document plans one driver and one vehicle).

Tables 4 and 5 provide the detailed financial information of the project.

Table 4. Cumulative project finance

Outcome	Cumulative 2015-2018				
	Planned	Actual	Actual with commitments	Actual / Planned	Actual w c / Planned
Outcome 1	426,450	378,924	379,241	89%	89%
Outcome 2	239,612	409,642	415,422	171%	173%
Outcome 3	2,269,286	1,375,435	1,735,799	61%	61%
Outcome 4	32,857	53,866	54,159	164%	164%
Outcome 5	62,000	8,640	8,640	14%	14%
PMC	568,629	586,038	586,038	103%	103%
Total	3,598,834	2,812,545	3,179,299	78%	88%

Source: PMU

Table 5. Project finance per year

Outcome	2015				2016				2017				2018				
	Planned	Actual	Actual with commitments	Actual / Planned	Planned	Actual	Actual with commitments	Actual / Planned	Planned	Actual	Actual with commitments	Actual / Planned	Planned	Actual	Actual with commitments	Actual / Planned	Actual w c / Planned
Outcome 1	45,677	30,005	30,005	66%	189,414	164,620	164,620	87%	36,071	70,453	70,770	195%	155,288	113,846	113,846	73%	73%
Outcome 2	1,500	69	69	5%	2,592	3,385	3,385	131%	172,189	44,409	44,409	26%	191,111	361,779	367,559	189%	192%
Outcome 3	89,468	62,540	62,540	70%	278,770	264,711	264,711	95%	584,483	479,896	509,956	82%	1,316,565	568,288	898,592	43%	68%
Outcome 4	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	41,441	41,734		32,857	12,425	12,425	38%	38%
Outcome 5	-	-	-		-	-	-		-	-	-		62,000	8,640	8,640	14%	14%
PMC	30,972	42,550	42,550	137%	146,139	143,858	143,858	98%	155,509	173,088	173,088	111%	236,009	226,542	226,542	96%	96%
Total	167,617	135,164	135,164	81%	616,915	576,574	576,574	93%	948,252	809,287	839,957	85%	1,993,830	1,291,520	1,627,604	65%	82%

Source: PMU

4.3.3.2 To what is leveraging its planned co-financing?

According to the co-financing letters in the project document and the information provided in the CEO endorsement form, the planned co-financing for this project was as follows:

Table 6. Planned co-financing

Sources of Co-financing	Name of Co-financier (source)	Type of Cofinancing	Cofinancing Amount ($)
Government	National Government	Cash	26,000,000
Government	Local councils	Cash	1,000,000
GEF Agency	UNDP	Grant	600,000
Total Co-financing			27,600,000

Source: CEO Endorsement Form

While the co-financing from national and local governments is indicated as being under the form of grants, the co-financing letters point more towards in-kind co-financing, with "coordination, collaboration and information sharing". Interviews have confirmed that co-financing provided by government agencies is in-kind.

Co-financing has not been monitored or reported on. There is therefore no accurate information available as to the extent of actual co-financing. Interviews indicate that governments (at national and local levels) have supported the project with inputs such as transportation, office space and accommodation. UNDP indicates having provided the third driver that was required by the project.

4.3.4.   M&E

4.3.4.1 Is the M&E system operational and effective?

The project document planned to conduct M&E at three levels. Through output 1.2, the project document aimed at the establishment at the MFRSC of an EESU that would have the capacity "to monitor and analyse the efficacy and cost- effectiveness of ongoing adaptation activities" at the national level. The information collected through the comprehensive M&E system to be established "would be collated within a centralised platform that is mandated to disseminate such information to all relevant institutions, including the National University of Lesotho (NUL) and other vocational training institutes, non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and local communities" (p. 11). The proposed socio-economic unit would "undertake monitoring and evaluation of the changes in social capital structures and livelihoods as a result of the LDCF-financed project's activities" (p. 24).

Through output 3.2 the project document aimed to put in place a long-term participatory M&E strategy to be designed and implemented at all intervention sites, including the treatment and control units for the research programme. This system would include "representatives from Community Councils, MFRSC extension officers and NGOs throughout the implementation period". It would provide "for the regular monitoring of the interaction between local bylaws, national policy and the LRP". This system would

"ensure that the field experience in the Mohale's Hoek District informs and facilitates the replication of the intervention measures through the climate-smart LRP across Lesotho".

Finally, the project document includes M&E plan for the project. This details the activities to be carried out at project start, quarterly, annually, at mid-term and at the end of project; the responsible parties; the budget; and the timeline. The total planned budget was USD 93,000, which represents about 5 per cent of the total budget. This budget included 4 main activities – an inception report, a MTR, a terminal evaluation and audit(s). The project document includes an additional provision of USD 42,000 for the work on output 3.2. No additional provision is made for output 1.2.

The project document rightly considered the national and on the ground levels for M&E. The activities and timeline in the project M&E plan make sense. The budget for the inception report, the MTR and the terminal evaluation are fine. However, the link between the national, on the ground and project level M&E is not properly explained: the project document doesn't indicate what is the role of EESU or the groups in the selected M&E sites on project M&E, and how the budget is going to be used – for instance, who is going to train EESU on M&E. Moreover, the budget for audits is insufficient: the workplan reserves USD 3,000 for this but it says that this is the cost per year and audits have to be conducted every year, that is, 6 times. Furthermore the M&E budget does not include a budget line for ongoing support on M&E, when the project manager, PFF and administration and finance officer may have limited capacities on M&E and the support of CTA may not be enough.

As of October 2018, the project had made some progress on outputs 1.2 and 3.2. It had trained 3 MFRSC staff in M&E basic principles and established 3 sites for data collection. In addition, as noted above, the PSC and TAC have made monitoring site visits. However, EESU is not yet conducting the expected M&E activities –training and implementation capacity are very different things. The project was also far from the target of 18 M&E sites. At project level, an M&E specialist was hired to review the results framework and provide inputs on the establishment of the M&E system. The consultancy finished in December 2017, 2.5 years after the official start of the project. This should have been conducted during the inception phase. As shown in section 4.2 on effectiveness, the current results framework has important deficits. The implementation of the M&E plan has demonstrated that the project team needed regular support on M&E. Details on reporting are provided below.

4.3.5.   Reporting

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

Timing of reporting is overall fine. Although early quarterly reports (2015 Q3 and Q4) and annual reports for 2015 and 2016 are missing, the project produced quarterly reports in 2016, 2017 and 2018 and an annual report in 2017. The 2018 annual report should be produced shortly.

However, there is room for improvement in the templates that are used for reporting. As of 2016 Q2 a template was introduced reporting on i) achievements per output and per outcome, identifying challenges encountered; ii) lessons learned; iii) gender achievements; iv) risks; v) work planning; and vi)

financial aspects. The template indicates annual and quarter targets as well as achievements in the past and one particular year, and that quarter. However, the template does not provide baselines, does not indicate the cumulative achievement and does not show how far the project is from achieving end of the project targets. Reporting on quarter, annual and cumulative targets in one row can also be confusing. Additionally, focusing on outcomes and outputs, the current template does not clearly allow to assess whether the activities are on track or not against the annual or global timeframe. The current template does not allow either for a good analysis of issues encountered and solutions implemented, nor does it track important decisions made by the PSC. Adaptive management is not clearly visible. Reporting on financial aspects is discussed below. The format for the 2017 annual report is the same as for the quarterly report, which is insufficient.

Overall, reports provide useful information, although they are typically incomplete, many reports not reporting in all indicators[41], not updating risk assessments or including the work plan for the following quarter. The PSC meeting minutes are provided consistently and to an appropriate level of detail.

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 financial information made available to the evaluator was quite limited. Specifically, it included:

- The budget in the project document
- An audit report for the period July 2015-December 2016 (1,5 year)
- A *draft* audit report for 2017
- Annual Work Plans 2015, 2016, 2017, 2018 (only the first four pages)
- A financial section in the quarterly reports
- A financial section in the 2017 Annual Report

The first (2015-2016) audit report does not identify any issues with financial controls and recommends that more information is provided in the annual work plans (specifically "A detailed description of activities and a detailed breakdown of inputs required be provided in the AWP"). It was not possible to confirm whether this has been done as these pages of the annual work plan were not provided to the evaluators. The available annual work plans include limited information on the planned use of financial resources other than assigning standard budget lines (e.i. "Travel") to a broad activity and a responsible party. No reporting is made on the previous year balance. The project uses UNDP Atlas system for financial management (e.g. procurement of the third vehicle and improvement of water infrastructure).

Quarterly reports provide variable levels of financial information, but information is at best poor: it indicates a budget per activity (outcome?), commitments, actual expenditure and a balance. It often indicates a quarterly delivery rate. However, consolidated information is not provided. The information made available to the evaluators does not seem sufficient for decision making on project priorities, budget reallocations or flow of funds.

---

[41] They report on outputs that have contributed towards achievement of certain indicators in accordance with quarterly plans and targets.

4.3.6. Stakeholder engagement, communications and lesson learned

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

As noted the quarterly and annual reports include a section on lessons learned. However, the information provided in that section is limited. Some of the adjustments made by the project to increase delivery are not reflected in the reports. There is room for improvement in the documentation of lessons learned. As noted above, reports are shared in time with the governance structures of the project (PSC, TAC, DPCC and DPIC) as well as with other stakeholders through government and UN coordination mechanisms. It is not clear how partners internalize these lessons. Available evidence suggests that lessons from the project have not however fully informed the design of other important projects, particularly the EU project on watershed management and coordination with GIZ which is working a lot on lessons has been weak. The project is currently conducting a CBA of project interventions that will likely provide some additional lessons.

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

The project has regular and relevant interactions with its governance structures, which, as mentioned in section 4.1, involve all key stakeholders at national and district levels, with room for improvement in the engagement of community councils' representatives. Interviews suggest that interaction with district officers could also improve, as the PFF are often in the field. PMU visits to sites could be further coordinated with district officers. The project has a regular and relevant interaction with targeted communities. Available evidence suggests that the project team visits targeted villages twice a month in average, with more frequent visits (even twice a week) when a particular activity requires it. Communities claim that they can influence the decisions of the project – they select the activities that are implemented in their villages. In addition, the project is using media to communicate with a wide range of stakeholders. The project produced a film in May 2018, is participating on TV and radio programmes managed by MFRSC and MAFS, has shared information through newspapers and has built a website. Furthermore, the project shares information with other development partners through government and UN coordination mechanisms, such as the Water Sector Coordination Forum.

4.4. Sustainability

As noted in section 4.1.2.1, the project is mostly trying to build capacity at the national, district and communal levels (outcomes 1 and 2, respectively), mainstream climate change adaptation in national and sub-national policies and plans (outcomes 5 and 4, respectively), and implement activities on the ground in terms of land rehabilitation (outcome 3), with complementary efforts on IGAs and other

aspects, such as water harvesting.

Regarding capacity at the national level (outcome 1), the project has provided training on GIS, M&E and CBA, established the EESU and conducted background studies. The relevant information provided in those studies will continue to be available after the project. Having the EESU may also be relevant then. Some of the knowledge disseminated through training will likely remain in project staff. However, there is no evidence that training has resulted in capacity to conduct GIS and CBA exercises and run a proper M&E system without external support. The learning process will require more support, including hands-on training, and more time. The project is trying to build partnerships with institutions working on natural resources so that government staff can access additional training services once the project phases out. In addition, staff turnover is a great challenge, as some trainees leave the government. Some aspects, such as GIS, also require equipment that the government does not have.

Regarding capacity at the sub-national level (outcome 2), the project has created a relevant institutional structure (the Inter-council land rehabilitation council), increased interactions among key institutional stakeholders through DPCC and DPIC, trained staff, provided guidelines to enhance coordination and conducted useful background studies. As at the national level, some of this will remain. However, there are also concerns regarding the capacity of trained staff to use disseminated tools on their own and regarding equipment. As DPCC and DPIC dissolve as the project phases out, key institutional coordination at sub-national level may stop if existing institutional structures similar to project structures, namely the Forum Heads of Department and the Local Planning Unit, are not supported in advance.

Regarding mainstreaming, the project has provided guidelines. At the national level (outcome 5), NSDP II has considered climate change adaptation, ensuring budget for this, in part as a result of the project. These programmatic and financial commitments will be likely followed after the end of the project. At the subnational level (outcome 4), guidelines have not been used yet to adjust local development plans. While awareness of councillors and district and council staff will contribute to mainstreaming climate change adaptation, it is uncertain whether this will be actually the case. The country has recently experienced significant political instability and political interference is not rare, for instance for deciding where to place government investments. Local governments are relatively recent and so far the country has seen a de-concentration more than a truly robust decentralization process.

On the ground, the project has raised the awareness of communities and increased their knowledge on climate-smart interventions, including through study tours. It has also rehabilitated more than 14,000 ha of degraded land. In order to maintain them, and avoid encroachment, as of December 2018, the project had contributed to the establishment of grazing associations in 22 per cent of the rehabilitated land[42]. With proper norms, such as letting grass grow for some time (e.g. two years) and cutting the grass and feeding livestock outside, and monitoring and enforcement systems, including counting how much is

---

[42] As of December 2018, the project had supported the establishment of community grazing associations in 4 areas, covering 10 villages and a total of 3,095 ha, which represents 22 per cent of rehabilitated land.

produced and cut and putting fines when needed, these associations can greatly contribute to the sustainability of rehabilitated land. Some communities are providing money for this. The project plans to establish these associations for all rehabilitated lands. These associations may however not be enough and may need to be complemented with continued awareness raising efforts. The project is trying to build ownership and demonstrate the benefits of land rehabilitation. Work with councillors, chiefs and schools are good strategies. However, headbodys, who manage rangeland, have not always been involved in trainings, according to communities. Moreover, these efforts take place at the same time that other programmes, including LRP, provide cash incentives. The project itself is promoting IGAs and more recently exploring the possibility of giving food to address this challenge, as while there has been worth noting progress on ownership, raising awareness to the expected extent is proving difficult. As time goes on, it is reasonable to hope that the project will be able to demonstrate more benefits and engage more people on that basis. However, there is a risk of communities not maintaining the land that has been rehabilitated and waiting for cash to carry out paid rehabilitation works.

Regarding IGAs, some of them are demonstrating that they can provide benefits and communities are willing to maintain them. The project has provided training that can be useful for that, including on multiplication of drought-resistant seeds. Working with lead farmers through FFS can also ensure that relevant knowledge will be there to certain extent when the project phases out. The project is also working on water infrastructure, which is key for some of the promoted IGAs. However, some IGAs (e.g. layers) require inputs (e.g. especial feeds) that communities may find difficult to get on their own, particularly in villages that are difficult to access. Similarly, there are issues with bringing outputs to markets, which can compromise the sustainability of certain activities. With some IGAs, such as orchards and gardens, which do not require costly inputs, marketing efforts or very specialized knowledge, there are also concerns regarding encroachment of animals that require the establishment of associations with adequate rules and monitoring and enforcement systems. In some cases fences may be useful as well. Besides, if they are few, they are not properly trained and few results can be demonstrated, lead farmers may be insufficient to convince and provide advice to other farmers with very limited government extension services, which could be the case after the project phases out according to government staff at different levels. Similarly, the provision of seasonal weather forecast may require additional financial support – LMS is currently trying to mobilize external resources for this. While the project is thinking on creating associations of producers, there is still room for improvement on this, which would be important to get inputs, including knowledge, manage production and get it to markets.

For land rehabilitation and IGAs there is one additional concern regarding sustainability. The country is experiencing great climate variability and climate change is expected to be very severe. The ecosystems are highly degraded and are very fragile and some invasive species (e.g. chrysocoma species), strong. As noted in section 4.2.2, climate variability is already affecting the achievement of expected results. The project is trying to address this challenge and build resilience to the projected climate changes, including some adjustments, such as working more in water infrastructure. However, current impacts on project activities suggest that there is room for improvement to increase resilience of project results to projected climate changes, including droughts and hailstorms.

In the sustainability section (pp. 45-46) the project document considers lessons learned as one of the strategies for the sustainability of project results[43]. While some work is ongoing and some other is planned (e.g. CBA), as noted in section 4.3 on efficiency, there is room for improvement in this regard at the site, project and national levels. There is also a risk of the government not having enough trained people in the field to properly assess performance, draw lessons and share them after the project.

Risk to sustainability can also be organized considering four types of risks, namely, financial risks, socio-economic risks, institutional framework and governance risks, and environmental risks. Paragraphs above on capacity at national and sub-national level and on mainstreaming refer mostly to institutional framework and governance risks. Paragraphs focusing on on the ground activities, including IGAs, refer mostly to socio-economic and financial risks. The paragraph on land rehabilitation and IGAs refers to environmental risks.

5. Conclusions and recommendations

5.1. Conclusions

Project strategy

In terms of <u>relevance</u>, the problem addressed by the project is relevant at the national level. While he project document does not provide a detailed analysis of the specific problems at district and village levels, as it should, available evidence confirms that the problem addressed by project is also relevant at those levels. The project strategy addresses these problems to a great extent. However, there are concerns regarding its <u>effectiveness</u>. Overall, this is compromised by the lack of consideration of spatial aspects, including the per capita investment and the accessibility of sites. While the project will conduct a cost-benefit analysis of specific adaptation interventions, the decision on the number of villages, their selection and the selection of activities have not actually considered cost-effectiveness. Moreover, while the project document claims that the project builds on lessons learned from other initiatives, it doesn't actually indicate what are these lessons and how they inform the project strategy. During implementation there has been some exchange of lessons learned through the project governance structures and within the UN, but there is room for improvement on this front.

Regarding <u>alignment</u>, the project is in tune with Lesotho's development, climate change, environment and relevant sectoral policies, strategies and plans, as well as with district and community council's

---

[43] The project document highlights outputs 1.2 and 3.2, claiming that "Lessons learned and best practices from the project regarding environmental sustainability and climate resilience will be shared and up-scaled across the country to increase the project's impact". In addition to learning, the project document refers to the establishment of institutional structures, mainstreaming of climate change adaptation in policies and plans and community and household ownership, already discussed above.

development plans. The project governance structures at national and sub-national level allow regular interaction and continuous alignment. The project is also working with communities to identify activities. Besides, the project is in tune with UN, LDCF and GEF strategies. In terms of consultation, available evidence shows that project design and implementation have been consultative.

The project document assesses gender-related aspects and proposes three measures to contribute to gender equality, including the use of gender-disaggregated indicators. However, the latter are only used in 2 of the 17 output indicators. Furthermore, the gender analysis in the project document is rather generic. During implementation the project both women and men were involved in all activities, including land rehabilitation; promoted activities that interest women; and in some cases tried to actively promote gender equality. However, there seems to be a gender distribution on trainings. Women tend to participate more in general trainings and those related to agriculture, while at institutional and political level, and for some topics, such as livestock and beekeeping, the project tends to involve more men than women.

Regarding the results framework, the project components, outcomes, outputs and activities are relatively aligned with the project objective. However, the structure of outcomes, outputs and activities is confusing. The project is organized around too many outcomes (5), outputs (17) and activities (75). Nevertheless, components (2) do not summarize the project well. While they highlight the work on capacity building and mainstreaming, they tell nothing about interventions on the ground. Moreover, the structure of components (2) and outcomes (5) does not make a lot of sense. The relationship between outcomes and outputs is not straightforward either. 3 outputs refer to the project itself and not to any outcome and 8 outputs are not allocated to the most relevant outcome. Some outputs do not fully respond to the outcomes. Moreover, the title of some outputs is not in tune with the activities under them. The indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification in the original logframe were not effective to measure and monitor the effects of the project. A revised logframe was proposed two years after the proposed start date. This was considered only marginally, even though the scope of the proposed revision was insufficient.

The results framework currently used by the project for monitoring has considerable weaknesses. It doesn't monitor the achievement of the objective. At outcome level, only one of the 7 sets of indicator and target is adequate. 4 outcome indicators are output indicators and do not measure the achievement of the outcomes. The indicator for outcome 1 is adequate but there is no target. Moreover, some aspects are not measured and in some cases indicators and targets are not consistent. At output level, indicators and targets tend to be adequate, although in some cases they are not fully aligned. It is difficult to assess the adequacy of targets, as most of them refer to inadequate indicators and in some cases they are not provided. Mid-term targets are not provided. That been said, the target of 50,000 ha of rehabilitated land by the end of the project seems too ambitious, while some other targets seem rather low. Changes in the log frame have not always been robust.

Progress towards results

The latest monitoring report (Q3 2018) does not report on the <u>level of achievement</u> of the project objective. The reviewers found some progress on planning and implementation of activities, but there is significant room for improvement at project level and on improving the overall LRP. At outcome level[44], the project was still far from achieving the end of the project targets on Outcome 3 and Outcome 2. The project had met the end of the project targets on Outcomes 4 and 5, although these do not really measure achievement of the corresponding outcome. The project has made progress on Outcome 1, but outputs don't necessarily imply either the achievement of the expected outcome. The latest project report reports on 16 end of the project output targets. The assessment is not clear for 2 outputs. Of the remaining 14 targets, the project had met 6 (43 per cent) by October 2018 (more than half way in implementation). Of these, the project had exceeded the target in 1. In contrast, the project had not met 8 (57 per cent). For 3 outputs, the end of the project output target had simply not been met – there is no percentage. In the other five the project was very far from the end of the project target (less than 30 per cent of achievement). (The Progress Towards Results Matrix is provided in Annex 6.2)

That been said, the project seems to be having some impact. At institutional level, the project has created important structures at national and district levels and has trained government staff at national and sub-national levels on a number of relevant topics. The project has also contributed to mainstream climate change into national, sectoral and local planning. In addition, the project has trained communities on a number of relevant topics, promoted climate-smart measures, and implemented land rehabilitation, as well as supported a number of IGAs. However there is no evidence to confirm the achievement of intended outcomes on capacity and mainstreaming. On the other hand, interventions on the ground seem to be improving the lives and livelihoods of targeted communities.

The achievement of expected results has been beset by a number of <u>barriers</u>: i) a long inception process, namely related to the setting up of the team and the equipment and the development of baseline studies to prioritize activities on the ground; ii) challenges related to the national implementation modality, in terms of long procurement and planning processes, technical and political turnover, overlapping functions, competing agendas and limited capacity; iii) limited availability of technical experts for PMU and consultants; iv) although there has been progress on ownership, challenges to engage communities on land rehabilitation on voluntary basis, even if complemented with the promotion of IGAs, when other programmes provide cash for this; v) lack of sustainability of results, particularly in terms of encroachment in rehabilitated land; vi) the geographic approach, in terms of spreading the resources thin, limited accessibility of some villages and no complementarities with other projects; vii) lack of a comprehensive approach and proper planning in terms of water infrastructure, markets and land erosion prevention; viii) some inadequacies in the selection of IGAs in some villages; ix) cultural barriers regarding some IGAs; and x) severe climate variability, although the project is expected to build resilience to this type of events.

Project implementation and adaptive management

---

[44] This analysis considers the results frameworks included in the project document and the latest progress report available (Q3 2018) at the time of conducting the MTR. The indicators, baselines, targets and 2018 values are presented in Annex 2.

Regarding management arrangements, the project document clearly establishes the composition, roles and responsibilities of the project governance structures. These are overall appropriate. However, at the sub-national level the structures do not provide sufficient visibility to community councils. Moreover, the proposed governance structure has faced some challenges during project implementation. At institutional level, there has been some turnover in key positions. Interviews suggest that information is not always moving smoothly from one PS to the next. There are also concerns regarding the PMU: its structure has been changed twice, there has been significant turnover, the project manager and CTA positions have been vacant for significant periods of time, the performance of one of the managers had room for improvement, and there is limited capacity for M&E.

All project governance bodies are meeting at least as frequently as planned and operating according to their roles. There is some coordination between national and sub-national bodies. UNDP is providing good support to the PMU. This submits reports and work plans to the governing bodies and, according to interviews, then responds to their guidance. The project has been able to learn and adjust to some unplanned aspects, regarding the number of cars, the need to invest in water infrastructure or the importance of meteorological data.

On work planning, the project has had important delays, due to project planning, staff turnover and procurement aspects. Some consultancies, in particular the ones on CBA and M&E, should have happened before, informing the design of the project. As of December 2018, the project had spent 78 per cent of the planned budget for the 2015-2018 period – the percentage increased to 88 per cent if commitments are considered. Total actual expenditure represented 33 per cent of total LDCF funding, when more than 55 per cent of the implementation time had been spent. By outcome, actual expenditure was significantly greater than planned in outcomes 2 and 4, and lower, with distinct levels of divergence, in outcomes 1, 3 and 5.

Regarding finance, as of December 2018, actual PMC were very slightly above planned for the 2015-2018 period. However, as of December 2018, actual PMC for the period 2015-2018 represented 21 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 very significant divergence that will require careful attention in the remaining time of implementation. These high PMC can be explained by under-delivery or low expenditure on project activities, as well as by the increase in the members of the PMU. It is worth noting that PMCs do not include costs that are key for project management. Including this as PMC would further increase the above-mentioned divergence. There is no accurate information available as to the extent of actual co-financing.

The project document planned to conduct M&E at three levels. Through output 1.2, the project document aimed at the establishment of a unit that would have the capacity "to monitor and analyse the efficacy and cost-effectiveness of ongoing adaptation activities" at the national level. Through output 3.2 the project document aimed to put in place a long-term participatory M&E strategy in all intervention

sites. Finally, the project document includes a project M&E plan that details the activities to be carried out; the responsible parties; the budget; and the timeline.

The project document rightly considered these three levels. The activities and timeline in the project M&E plan make sense. The budget for 3 of the 4 main project M&E activities is fine. However, the link between the national, on the ground and project level M&E is not properly explained. Moreover, the budget for audits is insufficient. Furthermore the M&E budget does not include a budget line for ongoing support on M&E, when this could be needed.

As of October 2018, the project had made some progress on outputs 1.2 and 3.2. However, EESU is not yet conducting the expected M&E activities. The project was also far from the target of 18 M&E sites. At project level, the consultancy on M&E was conducted too late. As highlighted before, the current results framework has important deficits. The implementation of the M&E plan has demonstrated that the project team needed regular support on M&E.

Timing of reporting is overall fine. The template for quarterly reports includes relevant information, but it does not provide baselines, does not indicate the cumulative achievement and does not show how far the project is from achieving end of the project targets. Reporting on quarter, annual and cumulative targets in one row can also be confusing. Additionally, the current template does not clearly allow to assess whether the activities are on track or not. The current template does not allow either for a good analysis of issues encountered and solutions implemented, nor does it track important decisions made by the PSC. Adaptive management is not clearly visible. The format for the 2017 annual report is the same as for the quarterly report, which is insufficient. Overall, reports provide useful information, although they are typically incomplete. The PSC meeting minutes are provided consistently and to an appropriate level of detail. In terms of financial management and reporting, available annual work plans and quarterly reports suggest that the project doesn't have sufficient tools for adequate decision making on project priorities, budget reallocations or flow of funds.

Regarding stakeholder engagement, lessons learned and communications, quarterly and annual reports include a section on lessons learned. However, the information provided in that section is limited. Some of the adjustments made by the project to increase delivery are not reflected in the reports. These are shared in time with the governance structures of the project. It is not clear how partners internalize these lessons. The project has regular and relevant interactions with its governance structures and targeted communities. In addition, it is using media to communicate with a wide range of stakeholders. The project also shares information with other development partners through government and UN coordination mechanisms.

Sustainability

The project has made important efforts to build capacity at the national level. Information, structures and some of the knowledge will likely remain once the project phases out. However, the learning process will require more support and equipment for some aspects, such as GIS, may be needed. This applies as

well to the sub-national level, where key institutional coordination may stop if existing institutional structures similar to project structures (e.g. the Forum of Heads of Department and the Local Planning Unit) are not supported in advance.

At the national level, NSDP II has considered climate change adaptation, ensuring budget for this, in part as a result of the project. At the subnational level, guidelines have not been used yet to adjust local development plans. Despite increased awareness, political instability and interference and limited capacity represent key risks for sustainability.

On the ground, the project has raised the awareness of communities and increased their knowledge on climate-smart interventions. It has also rehabilitated more than 14,000 ha of degraded land. In order to maintain them, and avoid encroachment, the project has contributed to the establishment of grazing associations. Demonstration of benefits could contribute to the sustainability of lands. However, there is a risk of communities not maintaining the land that has been rehabilitated and waiting for cash to carry out paid rehabilitation works. Some IGAs are demonstrating that they can provide benefits and communities are willing to maintain them. Training, working with lead farmers and providing water infrastructure can contribute to that. However, there are concerns on access to inputs, technical advice and markets, especially for some IGAs and some villages; and encroachment. Climate variability and change is an additional concern for sustainability, although the project is expected to address this.

5.2. Recommendations

Project strategy

Gender-disaggregated indicators, baselines and targets should be developed. In addition, the project should make an additional effort to promote a more equal gender participation in trainings. In particular, the participation of men should be further encouraged in general trainings and those related to agriculture (adjusting for example the timing of some trainings so that they don't coincide when times where men are in the field), while the participation of women should be promoted at institutional and political level, and for some topics, such as livestock and beekeeping.

The results framework should be significantly adjusted. Modifications should involve the structure of components, outcomes and outputs, as well as the indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification. This is unlikely to be feasible, as the GEF didn't accept a more light revision following recommendations from the M&E consultant. The project should however try it again, following the insights provided in section 4.1.2 of this evaluation[45], as the current results framework doesn't allow proper monitoring and therefore management. In particular, it would be convenient to i) organize the

---

[45] In addition to the insights provided, it is worth mentioning that, throughout the logframe, the use of proportional rather than absolute targets would help assess the extent of the project's contribution to outcomes.

project in three components and three main outcomes, one on capacity building (outcomes 1 and 2), one on mainstreaming adaptation into policies and plans (outcomes 4 and 5) and one on implementing interventions on the ground (outcome 3); ii) delete outputs that should have been part of project design (e.g. 1.3, 1.4, 5.5); iii) move some outputs (i.e. outputs 2.1, 2.2, 2.4, 2.5, 3.2, 5.1 and 5.4) to new outcome 2 on capacity building [46]; iv) delete the reference to CBA of output 1.3; v) adjust the indicators for outcomes 2, 3[47], 4 and 5, using outcome level indicators; vi) indicate a clear target for outcome 1; vii) add sub-indicators to measure progress on partnerships and institutions for outcome 2; viii) ensure indicators and targets are consistent for outcomes 4 and 5; ix) reduce the target of 50,000 ha of rehabilitated land, avoiding the project focusing too much in that quantitative target and putting more emphasis on qualitative changes[48]; x) increase the target for Outcome 5; and xi) align the indicator and target in output 1.2. Adjusting the results framework is urgent. The insights provided in this evaluation report should be considered by the M&E specialist to be hired by the project when adjusting in detail the results framework, after consulting with the GEF the extent to which this can be adjusted.

Progress towards results

The project should accelerate delivery on Outcome 3 and 7 outputs[49]. While the project has met some of the end of the project targets, the governance structures of the project should try to work in most of the corresponding aspects, as achievement of outputs does not necessarily imply achievement of outcomes. It is worth noting that a considerable amount of funds is still available, particularly for outcome 3.

To accelerate delivery the project should try to address the existing barriers. That should involve:
  k) accelerating procurement processes, by further improving coordination between MFRSC and UNDP building on the progress made recently.
  l) starting procurement processes early, taking into account actual timelines, to ensure that seasonal inputs are provided in time.
  m) ensuring training provides materials that can be used by new government staff to deal with staff turnover[50].
  n) broadening the pool of experts on topics relevant to project activities, including people from neighbouring countries, namely South Africa.
  o) promoting a coordinated approach to land rehabilitation at least at government level where the cash for work modality is replaced for less direct incentives, such as IGAs. Among other things, the project could organize more demonstration exhibitions, which so far seem to have increased

---

[46] Outputs 2.2 and 2.5 refer to the institutions at the national level and outputs 2.1 and 2.4 to institutional aspects at the sub-national level.
[47] For the sub-indicator on seeds.
[48] The evaluators would recommend the LDCF Council, UNDP and project designers that the design of future projects includes less ambitious quantitative geographic objectives and favours a more focused or concentrated approach, with more ambitious qualitative targets that are more likely to be sustained once the project phases out.
[49] Outputs 1.3, 1.4, 1.5, 1.6, 2.2, 3.1 and 3.2.
[50] The project cannot control staff turnover as this has to do with government and personal decisions. The recommendation is to provide materials to train new government staff when turnover takes place.

buy in at the political level. At community levels, FFS should be further promoted as they can increase ownership (see below).

p) promoting grazing associations with adequate rules and monitoring and enforcement systems where land has been rehabilitated.

q) while it is not feasible to reduce at this stage the number of villages, the project should prioritize some, focusing most of the investment in them, to increase cost-effectiveness. The project should still work in all the villages where it is currently working, but the level of investment should not be uniform. To prioritize villages the project should consider at least the following criteria: i) vulnerability; ii) community engagement so far; and iii) cost effectiveness, in term of a) number of people currently and projected, taking into account demographic trends (e.g. immigration); b) existence of social infrastructure (e.g. education and health centres), including investment plans; c) economic potential taking into account economic trends (e.g. land productivity, skills); d) accessibility, including transport investment plans; and e) opportunities for complementarities with other ongoing and planned and approved programmes and projects (considered as a positive aspect), including government ones[51]. This should be linked to reducing the target of 50,000 ha of rehabilitated land. In terms of management, monitoring should involve tracking and assessing how many financial resources are being spent in each village[52]. This is particularly urgent.

r) Following the prioritization of villages, the project should try to strengthen collaboration with relevant ongoing and planned programmes and projects. For example, the project should explore the possibility of collaborating with the IFAD project, especially now that this agency seems more open to partnerships. It should also explore opportunities for further collaboration with the EU, GIZ and FAO. In addition, it should further coordinate with government programmes and their investments.

s) in all villages, but particularly in priority villages, the project should promote a comprehensive approach. In this sense, it should speed up and increase investment in water infrastructure (e.g. dams, water harvesting tanks, boreholes), promote market linkages and ensure that grass and a local plants with deeper roots are planted after removing bushes as part of land rehabilitation. Some other inputs, such as greenhouses, shading nets, irrigation schemes, dryers, chicken brooding machines, poultry houses, should be considered.

t) the PMU should carefully assess the feasibility of the IGAs proposed by each community according to their circumstances, rejecting those that are not feasible. The PMU should explain the communities why the proposed IGA has been rejected for that location. For instance, layers, cows and pigs may not be feasible in villages with poor accessibility given the difficulty to provide the inputs (mostly food) and bring the outputs to the market. All villages are different, but for managing purposes the project could build a typology of villages to help define interventions.

---

[51] Note that this assessment should consider that society changes, factoring in demographic, social and economic trends in a changing climate.

[52] The project should be a table with the following columns: council, electoral division, village, vulnerability, community engagement so far, cost-effectiveness (considering the criteria provided above), detailed type of activity (not only what type (e.g. layers), but how many of each type (e.g. how many layers), and budget per village.

u) the project should continue its efforts to overcome unsound cultural barriers through training and demonstration

Project implementation and adaptive management

Project government structures at sub-national level (DPCC and DPIC) should be adjusted to increase the visibility of community councils, contributing to decentralization and not only to de-concentration. This could entail involving more representatives from community councils. A conversation on this should be held with the local governments. Coordination with district officers should be strengthened, including visits to project sites.

Relevant staff at MFRSC and PMU should make additional efforts to brief new PS in the ministry.

The structure of the PMU should not be changed again. It is critical to hire a new CTA. The CTA to be hired should have robust expertise in M&E and her/his ToR should allocate a significant percentage of time to support the PMU on this. In any case an M&E specialist should also be hired through project activities – not as PMU operations. This is especially urgent.

It is probably not possible to reduce PMC to the extent needed to represent 5 per cent of project costs. PMU staff cannot be reduced without a dangerous impact on project management. However, a more focused geographical approach could reduce travel related costs (e.g. fuel, car maintenance).

The governance structures of the project should clarify the link between the national, on the ground and project level M&E systems. The capacity of EESU to conduct the expected M&E should be tested, providing hands-on training if needed. Work must be accelerated in the establishment of M&E sites. Recommendations for the project M&E system have been provided above.

The template for quarterly reports should be adjusted: it should include baselines; indicate the cumulative achievements, indicating how far the project is from achieving end of the project targets; indicate whether activities are in track with the annual work plan; provide a more detailed analysis of issues encountered and solutions implemented; and track important decisions made by the PSC, showing adaptive management. Financial information should also be more comprehensive, with clearer indication of the percentage of disbursement against planned disbursement by quarter, year and total project implementation. The annual report template should be adjusted in the same sense, with more detailed cumulative information. The PMU should fully complete all reports.

PMU should strengthen its work in documenting lessons. This should be informed by the national and on the ground M&E systems and the CBA to be conducted, but PMU should start by documenting all the lessons that can be already drawn and are not necessarily indicated in quarterly or annual reports, collating them in one document. The process should be participatory and the draft lessons learned report should be shared with all key stakeholders for comments. UNDP and the PMU should further interact with other development partners and programmes, including IFAD, the EU and GIZ (who, as noted, is

working a lot on lessons learned), to disseminate these lessons and get insights that could be useful for RVCC.

Sustainability

At both the national and sub-national levels the project should provide more capacity building support, including trainings, study tours and equipment for some aspects, such as GIS. At the sub-national level the project should further support existing institutional structures similar to project structures, namely the Forum of Heads of Department and the Local Planning Unit.

The project should try to help local governments use the guidelines developed by the project when preparing the new local development plans.

The project should help establish grazing associations for all rehabilitated land, ensuring adequate rules and monitoring and enforcement systems are put in place.

FFS should further be promoted as a way of demonstrating benefits and build local experts that can train others when the project phases out. The project should also provide more training, including on food production and conservation, trimming of fruit trees, beekeeping, poultry management and improvement of local cows. Training on rangeland management should include headboys.

The project should promote existing associations or cooperatives and promote the creation of new ones to boost IGAs, as these structures facilitate access to inputs, technical advice and markets, including financial services. They could contribute to minimize encroachment, although the project may consider providing some fences to protect some gardens and orchards in the short term.

Table 7 presents a summary of the recommendations and indicates the responsible parties.

Table 7. Summary of recommendations with responsible parties

No.	Cluster	Recommendation	Responsible party
1	Project Strategy	Gender-disaggregated indicators, baselines and targets should be developed. In addition, the project should make an additional effort to ensure a more equal gender participation in trainings.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, M&E specialist to be hired; PMU, line ministries in PSC, district and community councils
2		The results framework should be significantly adjusted. Modifications should involve the structure of components, outcomes and outputs, as well as the indicators, baselines, targets and means of verification. Detailed recommendations are provided in section 5.2. Among the changes, it would make sense to reduce the target of 50,000 ha of rehabilitated land.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, M&E specialist to be hired
3	Progress towards results	The project should accelerate delivery on Outcome 3 and 7 outputs. The project should continue to work on all other outcomes, as achievement of outputs does not necessarily imply achievement of outcomes. To accelerate delivery the project should: v) accelerate procurement processes, by improving coordination between MFRSC and UNDP. w) start procurement processes early, taking into account actual timelines, to ensure that seasonal inputs are provided in time. x) ensure training provides materials that can be used by new government staff. y) broaden the pool of experts. z) promote a coordinated approach to land rehabilitation at least at government level. aa) promote grazing associations with adequate rules and monitoring and enforcement systems where land has been rehabilitated. bb) prioritize some villages, focusing most of the investment in them, to increase cost-effectiveness, considering at least the criteria provided in section 5.2. This should be linked to reducing the target of 50,000 ha of rehabilitated land. cc) strengthen collaboration with relevant ongoing and planned programmes and projects.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, line ministries, district and community councils k) PMU, MFRSC, UNDP l) PMU, MFRSC, UNDP m) PMU, CTA, MFRSC, UNDP n) PMU, UNDP, MFRSC o) PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC p) PMU, CTA, MFRSC q) PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC r) PMU, UNDP s) PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC t) PMU, CTA

		dd) in all villages, but particularly in priority villages, the project should promote a comprehensive approach. In this sense, it should speed up and increase investment in water infrastructure, promote market linkages and improve land rehabilitation. ee) assess the feasibility of the income-generating activities (IGAs) proposed by each community according to their circumstances, rejecting those that are not feasible.	
4	Project implementation and adaptive capacity	The project should adjust the project government structures at sub-national level to increase the visibility of community councils. A conversation on this should be held with the local governments. Coordination with district officers should be strengthened	PMU, CTA, PSC, district, community councils
5		A new Chief Technical Advisor (CTA), with robust expertise in M&E, should be hired urgently. A M&E specialist should also be hired through project activities – not as PMU operations.	UNDP
6		The governance structures of the project should clarify the link between the national, on the ground and project level M&E systems. The systems should be strengthened at the three levels.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, M&E specialist to be hired
7		The template for quarterly reports and annual reports should be adjusted. The PMU should fully complete all reports.	PMU, CTA, UNDP
8		PMU should strengthen its work in documenting lessons. PMU should start by documenting all the lessons that can be already drawn and are not necessarily indicated in quarterly or annual reports, collating them in one document. The process should be participatory. UNDP and the PMU should further interact with other development partners and programmes.	PMU, CTA, UNDP
9	Sustainability	At the national and sub-national levels the project should provide more capacity building support. At the sub-national level the project should further support existing institutional structures similar to project structures.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC, district, community councils
10		The project should help establish grazing associations for all rehabilitated land.	PMU, MFRSC
11		Farmer Field Schools (FFSs) should further be promoted. The project should also provide more training.	PMU, MFRSC, PSC, FAO

12		The project should promote existing associations or cooperatives and promote the creation of new ones to boost IGAs, as these structures Associations or cooperatives should be promoted for IGAs, facilitating access to inputs, technical advice and markets, including financial services. They could contribute to minimize encroachment, although the project may consider providing some fences to protect some gardens and orchards in the short term.	PMU, CTA, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC
13		Associations or cooperatives should be promoted for IGAs, facilitating access to inputs, technical advice and markets.	PMU, UNDP, MFRSC, PSC

6. Annexes

1. Evaluation Matrix

Table 8. 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	• Number and types of stakeholders consulted during project design	• Local executing partners, including community members and groups, government	• Desk review • Interviews • Field visits

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
into account during project design?	• Evidence of concerns expressed being used to adjust project strategy	stakeholders and 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

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
2.2 What are the main barriers to address and the main opportunities to leverage based on current progress towards results?	• Nature and extent of barriers hindering progress towards results • Nature and extent of opportunities generated by most successful achievements to date	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports • Local executing team and executing partners • Local and national stakeholders	• Focus groups • 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	• Interviews • Desk review

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
		• Local executing team and executing partners	
3.2.2 Are work-planning processes results-based?	• Proportion of results-based planning and reporting documents	• Project planning, progress reports, and monitoring reports	• Desk review
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

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
3.4 Project-level M&E systems			

3.4.1 Is the M&E system operational and effective?	• Existence and quality of:
	  ○ Roles and responsibilities;
	  ○ 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
		• Project planning, progress reports, audit reports and monitoring reports
		• Local executing team and executing partners
			• Interviews
			• 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

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
3.5.3 To what extent is the public /community stakeholders aware and supportive of the project's objectives?	• 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
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?			

Evaluative Questions	Indicators	Sources	Methodology
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 available once the GEF assistance ends?	• Type and cost of activities that would require continued financial support after the end of the project to maintain outcomes • Existence of potential alternative sources of funding for these activities	• Local executing team and executing partners • Project document and progress reports	• Interviews • Document 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

2. Rating scales

Table 9. Progress towards results matrix

Project Strategy	Indicator	Baseline level	End-of project target[53]	Mid-term level and assessment	Achievement Rating	Justification for rating (As of October 2018)
Objective	The use of climate-driven vulnerabilities and cost- effective planning to inform the implementation of the Land Rehabilitation Programme.	Climate change risks are not integrated into the Land Rehabilitation Programme. Target sites are chosen on an *ad hoc* basis. Rehabilitation and management measures are not tailored to specific ecosystems.	Climate-driven vulnerabilities and cost-effective planning are used to inform site prioritisation of target sites and the implementation of appropriate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures		MU	Project progress reports do not provide information on this. The reviewers found some progress on planning and implementation of activities, but there is significant room for improvement at project level and on improving the overall LRP.
Outcome 1	% of MFRSC and relevant departments technical staff competent in skills for management of evolving risks and uncertainty linked to climate change	Baseline estimated at a score of 3. Baseline to be verified during year 1 of project implementation.	Capacity increased to a score of 7. Target to be verified during year 1 of project implementation.	-	-	Technical Capacity Assessment yet to be done The project has conducted baseline studies, provided training and conducted a capacity needs assessment.
Outcome 2	% of targeted population awareness	Baseline level of awareness in target population to be	Increase level of awareness to 65% in Khoelenya;		U	21% in Khoelenya;

---

[53] Mid-term targets are not available.

59

	of predicted adverse impacts of climate change and appropriate responses	verified during year one of project implementation.	70% in Lithipeng; 80% in Thaba Mokhele	■		25% in Lithipeng; 15% in Thaba Mokhele
Outcome 3	Area of land (ha) successfully protected, better managed and rehabilitated under the climate-smart Land Rehabilitation Programme.	Not provided	By project end-point, at least 50,000 ha of land in the Foothills, Lowlands and the Lower Senqu River Basin under climate-smart LRP.	■	U	Total of 14,323 ha (29%) of land under climate-smart rehabilitation / protection or better management on rangelands and crop lands
Outcome 4	Existence of policy briefs proposing policy revisions to address climate risk considerations in rangeland and wetland management strategies	National strategies do not adequately include climate risk considerations.	By project end-point, at least two policy briefs developed that include recommendations for the incorporation of climate risk considerations into each of the national rangeland and wetland management strategies	■	S	Consultancy for developing guidelines for mainstreaming climate change into sectoral and local policies and strategies was completed. Consultancy for mainstreaming Climate change risk considerations in the NSDP II was completed
Outcome 5	Existence of climate change adaptation measures in local government development strategies.	Development strategies do not adequately include climate change (as provided for in the NSDP).	By project end-point, climate change adaptation is integrated into local policy processes and development strategies (in the prodoc). At least two policy guidelines for incorporating climate science in the review/formulation processes on national	■	S	Consultancy for mainstreaming Climate change risk considerations in the NSDP II was completed.

			sectoral strategies developed by 2019 (in Q3 2018 report)			
Output 1.1	Number of geo-based climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological information system tested in pilot area and ready for up-scaling to other districts in Lesotho	Lack of a coordinated information system that compiles GIS information on climatic, agro-ecological and hydrological variables.	One geo-based information system established and operational, ready for up scaling to the rest of the districts in Lesotho by 2020.	-	-	The formulation of the Geographic Information System is complete Land degradation baseline Assessment is complete The information system has been used to produce project information maps for the three councils and these maps aided local authorities in identifying and planning the location of the implementation sites during the planning process Technical departments use land degradation hotspot maps for land rehabilitation Unclear whether the MFRSC has the capacity to operationalize/updated the system on its own
Output 1.2	Number of staff members in the socio-economic unit	No dedicated unit considering social capital issues in the selection of intervention methods.	By the end of the first year, a socio-economics unit is established. (Has trained staff, equipment, develops required data tools, conducts research, analyses	-	-	4 staff identified and 3 trained. Capacity needs assessment has been conducted. Unclear whether the trained staff the capacity to do the analysis on their own.

	No. of staff trained in the socio-economic unit to conduct socio-economic research, production of reports and dissemination of information	Not provided	data, produces reports for dissemination and use)			
	Number of required tools available for socio-economic data collection and analyses	Not provided				
Output 1.3	Number of climate-driven vulnerability assessments and cost-benefit analyses of specific adaptation interventions undertaken for each of the selected Community Councils.	No rigorous assessments of climate-driven vulnerability or cost benefit analyses of climate change adaptation interventions undertaken at	2 climate driven vulnerability assessments for each of the community council by 2020 2 cost-benefit analyses for each Community council by mid-2019 and March 2021	 	MU	Climate Change and Socio-Economic Baseline assessments conducted. Cost-benefit analyses not conducted yet.
Output 1.4	Number of technical guidelines on climate change adaptation interventions identified for the selected Community Councils.	No guidelines on climate change adaptation interventions have been developed for the selected Community Councils.	At least 10 technical guidelines reviewed/ developed by 2018.	 	U	Two technical guidelines have been produced (typology of climate-smart practices and beekeeping)
Output 1.5	Number of staff trained in climate science from	Not provided	Four (4) staff trained (with engineering unit =1,	 	MU	• Three (3) staff members from planning and monitoring have been trained in M&E

	engineering, planning and monitoring sections		planning unit = 2, monitoring unit =1).			Draft ToRs have been developed for capacity assessment
Output 1.6	Number of strategies developed for maintaining technical capacity of MFRSC and relevant departments	Not provided	One strategy for maintaining technical capacity at MFRSC is developed and implemented by 2018		MU	Not developed
Output 2.1	Number of technical staff trained in climate change adaptation, including restoring and managing ecosystems and agro-ecological landscapes.	Technical staff of the District Technical Teams, Regional Council staff and land managers have received limited training on climate change adaptation.	At least 50 technical staff of the District Technical Teams, District and Community Council staff and land managers trained by 2019.		HS	The project has trained a large number of people in different topics. It is not possible to know if the same people have received the same training, but the target has been exceeded.
Output 2.2	Number of Local community members participating in training programmes on implementation of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management measures (data disaggregated by gender).	Not available	At least 3,500 Local community members trained by 2018. (No end of the project target available)		U	Over 1,100 people trained (31 per cent of the target achieved)
Output 2.3	Number of inter-council land rehabilitation	Not available	One (1) operational inter-council land rehabilitation committee (ICLRC)		S	Inter council land rehabilitation held its quarterly meeting

			established and operational by 2018			
Output 3.1	Number of households across three Community Councils adopting climate-smart livelihood strategies, including climate-smart farming or agro-forestry practices	The number of households adopting climate-smart livelihood strategies will be determined during implementation.	At least 7,000 households adopting climate-smart livelihood strategies by 2020.		U	1838 households adopting climate-smart livelihoods strategies (26 of the target achieved)
	Percentage of land under appropriate climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions (conservation agriculture, agro-forestry and water harvesting) in Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba Mokhele Community Councils	Climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions are not currently implemented in the Lithipeng, Khoelenya and Thaba-Mokhele Community Councils.	50,000 ha of land rehabilitated		U	14,323 ha of land rehabilitated (29 per cent of the target achieved)
Output 3.2	Number of functioning long-term monitoring field sites established at	Monitoring is limited to recording of outputs from quarterly and	18 functioning long-term monitoring sites – including a control, experiment and benchmark – established by		U	Routine collection of monitoring data is being collected daily and quarterly by designated community members in 3 sites

	intervention sites for measuring the effects of climate-smart ecosystem rehabilitation and management interventions on relevant ecosystem services	annual reports – because the LRP has no Monitoring and Evaluation Unit.	2018	🟥		(16 per cent of the target achieved) In addition, the project has installed 2 automatic weather stations to monitor weather parameters
Output 4.1	Existence of policy briefs proposing policy revisions to address climate risk considerations in rangeland and wetland management strategies	National strategies do not adequately include climate risk considerations.	All national strategies for rangeland, cropland, and wetland management revised to include climate risk considerations by 2019	🟩	S	Consultancy for mainstreaming Climate change risk considerations in the NSDP II was completed
Output 5.1	Existence of a coordination strategy tailored for inter-ministerial and departmental coordination on climate change	No strategy in place to ensure coordination between national and district development teams	By project end-point, the coordination strategy is implemented.	🟩	S	The project recruited a consultant to develop a coordination strategy that links the national and the district.
Output 5.2	Existence of revised local policies in agriculture, infrastructure and rural development with identified best practices and budgets for	Policies do not adequately refer to climate risk considerations.	By project end-point, at least one policy brief developed for each productive sector – agriculture, infrastructure and rural development – to include identified best practices and budgets for climate-smart interventions	🟩	S	The project recruited a consultant to develop policy guidelines for sectoral policies across productive sectors.

	climate-smart interventions.					
Output 5.3	Number of policy briefs for design, appraisal and approval processes for District and Community Councils Development Plans for agriculture, infrastructure and rural development	There is no programmatic approach to mainstreaming climate risk considerations into development plans.	At least 6 policy briefs for integrating climate risk considerations into District and Community Councils Development Plans for each of agriculture, infrastructure and rural development programmes by 2019 (one for each of the plans and sectors).		S	The project has recruited a consultant to develop policy guidelines and incorporation of policy recommendations on climate change risks.

3. List of reviewed documents

- Project Document
- UNDP Initiation Plan
- UNDP Environmental and Social Screening Results (not yet available to the evaluator)
- Project Inception Report
- Project Implementation Reports (not yet available to the evaluator) and/or Annual Reports (only 2017 available)
- Quarterly progress reports and work plans
- Annual work plans
- Audit reports
- GEF focal area Tracking Tool at CEO endorsement and at midterm (not yet available to the evaluator)
- Oversight mission reports/ Monitoring reports
- Financial and administration guidelines used by project team
- Project operational guidelines, manuals and systems (not yet available to the evaluator)
- UNDP Country programme documents
- Minutes of RVCC Board Meetings and Project Appraisal Committee Meetings
- National and sub-national policies, strategies and plans: NDP 2, NAPA, local plans...

4. List of interviewees

Table 10. Stakeholder at the national level

No.	Name	Organization	Position	Men	Women	Date
1	Thebe Mokoatle	Ministry of Forestry (MFRSC)	Principal Secretary	X		17/01/2019
2	'Makhalane Mofolo	Ministry of Forestry (MFRSC)	Economic Planner		X	17/01/2019
3	Elias Sekaleli	Ministry of Forestry (MFRSC)	Director – Forestry	X		17/01/2019
4	Refuoe Boose	Ministry of Forestry (MFRSC)	Director – Soil Conservation	X		17/01/2019
5	Piteko Nyakallo	Ministry of Forestry (MFRSC)	Senior Range Officer	X		17/01/2019
6	Mosuoe Letuma	Ministry of Energy and Meteorology	Principal Meteorologist	X		17/01/2019

7	Lesetla Makoae	Ministry of Agriculture (MAFS)	Senior Crop Production Officer	X		17/01/2019
8	Karabelo Letsoela	Ministry of Agriculture (MAFS)	Chief Extension Officer		X	17/01/2019
9	Mokau Mosili	Ministry of Agriculture (MAFS)	Principal Agriculture Information Officer		X	17/01/2019
10	Mofihli Phaqane	Ministry of Local Government	Rural Project Coordinator	X		17/01/2019
11	Mokitinyane Nthimo	Food and Agriculture Organisation	Assistant FAO Representative	X		18/01/2019
12	Mampho Thulo	Rural Self-help Development Association	Managing Director		X	18/01/2019
13	Koena Marabe	European Union – Lesotho	Project Manager – Cooperation	X		18/01/2019
14	Taole Tesole	GIZ	Senior Technical Advisor - Khubelu	X		18/01/2019
15	M. Damane	Ministry of Environment	Director of Environment (GEF)	X		18/01/2019
16	Limomane Peshoane	United Nations Development Programme (UNDP)	Head of Energy and Environment Unit	X		20/01/2019
17	Motlatsi Phasumane	UNDP – RVCC	PFF – Thaba Mokhele	X		21/01/2019
18	Neo Mosito	UNDP – RVCC	PFF – Lithipeng	X		21/01/2019
19	Mabataung Sekete	UNDP – RVCC	PFF – Khoelenya		X	21/01/2019
20	Lira Adam	Ministry of Local Government	District Administrator	X		21/01/2019
21	Litsoeneng Tiheli	Ministry of Local Government	Senior Information Officer	X		21/01/2019
22	'Mathato Makoate	Ministry of Local Government	District Council Secretary		X	21/01/2019
23	Matela Makhetha	Ministry of Forestry	District Coordinator	X		21/01/2019
24	Tsiu Mphanya	Ministry of Agriculture (MAFS)	District Agriculture Officer	X		21/01/2019

25	Thabang Khutlane	Ministry of Local Government	Lithipeng Council Secretary	X		21/01/2019
26	Tebello Sekhobe	Ministry of Forestry (MFRSC)	District Conservation Officer		X	21/01/2019
27	Mamokhoebi Mokuoane	Ministry of Agriculture (MAFS)	District Extension Officer		X	21/01/2019
28	Neo Likotsi	Ministry of Agriculture (MAFS)	District Horticulture Officer	X		21/01/2019
29	Kotsoane Lekote	Ministry of Forestry (MFRSC)	District Forest Officer	X		21/01/2019
	TOTAL			21	8	

Table 11. Stakeholders at the sub-national level

Council	Name	Position	Men	Women	Date
Khoelenya	Mamolumo Hlophe	Community Council Secretary		X	21/01/2019
Khoelenya	Tsepo Mosoka	Deputy Community Council Chairperson	X		21/01/2019
Khoelenya	Relebohile Lerotholi	Representative of the chief in the Council	X		21/01/2019
Khoelenya	Maitumeleng Pheko	Councillor		X	21/01/2019
Khoelenya	Mamorero Sieane	Councillor		X	21/01/2019
Khoelenya	Thabo Klaas	Councillor	X		21/01/2019
Khoelenya	Rethethetsoe Lephatsoe	Councillor	X		21/01/2019
Khoelenya	Motlatsi Falatsa	Councillor	X		21/01/2019
Khoelenya	Matholang Nyamatama	Councillor		X	21/01/2019
Khoelenya	Matumelo Makoetlane	Councillor		X	21/01/2019
TOTAL			5	5	

Table 12. Participants in focus group discussions

Council	Village	Men	Women	Total	Date
Khoelenya	Makilanyaneng	13	3	16	22/01/2019
Khoelenya	Ramonyatsi	6	10	16	22/01/2019
Lithipeng	Shalane	3	14	17	23/01/2019
Lithipeng	Khoai	16	20	36	23/01/2019
Thaba Mokhele	Morobong	7	19	26	24/01/2019
Thaba Mokhele	Nketheleng	7	12	19	24/01/2019
TOTAL		52	78	130	

5. 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 13. 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									

Questions	PMU/CTA	UNDP Lesotho	MFRSC	PSC	Key partner institutions	District and local authorities	Consultants	Baseline projects staff	Communities
3.7.1 Could you please tell me what the project expected outcomes and its activities are?						x		x	x
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. MTR Mission plan

Day 1 16th January 2019

Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible
14:30 – 15:30	Meeting with RVCC team for coordination purposes.	RVCC Office	PC and PFF Khoelenya and Lithipeng

Day 2 17th January 2019

Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible/ contact
8:30 – 10:00	Meeting MFRSC management	MFRSC HQ	PFF Lithipeng Nt M. Nthimo
10:30 – 11:30	Meeting with GEF Focal Point (Environment)	MoETC	PFF Lithipeng Nt Damane
12:00-13:00	Meeting with MAFS (TSC)	MAFS	PFF Lithipeng Nt Nchaka

13:00 – 14:00	Lunch		
14:00 – 15:00	Meeting with MoLGCA	MLGCA	PFF Lithipeng Nt Phaqane
15:30-16:30	Meeting with MEM (LMS)	LMS	PFF Lithipeng Nt Letuma

Day 3 18ᵗʰ January 2019

Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible/ contact
8:30 – 9:30	Meeting with FAO	FAO	PFF Lithipeng Mr Nthimo
10:00 – 11:00	Meeting with RSDA	RSDA	PFF Lithipeng Mrs Thulo
11:30-12:30	Meeting with EU	EU	PFF Lithipeng
12:30 – 13:00	Lunch		
13:00 – 14:00	MTR Inception report presentation to PSC/TAC	UNDP	PFF Lithipeng
14:00 – 15:00	Meeting with GIZ	GIZ	PFF Lithipeng

Day 5 20ᵗʰ January 2019

Time	Activity	venue	Person Responsible
13:00-14:00	Meeting UNDP Energy and Environment Unit Head	kick 4 Life	Mr L. Peshoane
13:00–15:00	Travel to Mohales Hoek		Mr Phomolo Seliane

Day 6 21ˢᵗ January 2019

Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible/ contact
8:30 – 8:45	Meeting with DA M/Hoek	DA Office M/Hoek	PFF Thaba Mokhele Mr Adam
8:55 – 9:30	Meeting with DCS M/Hoek	DCS Office M/Hoek	PFF Thaba Mokhele Mrs Makwate
9:45-11:30	Meeting with DC and DAO	MAFS M/Hoek	PFF Thaba Mokhele Mr Makhetha and Mphanya
11:30-12:30	Meeting with DPIC representative	MAFS M/Hoek	PFF Thaba Mokhele (Mokuoane, Lekote, Khutlane, Likotsi, Ramokoatsi, Sekhobe)
12:30 – 13:15	Lunch		

13:15 – 13:45	Travel to Khoelenya Community Council		All
14:00-16:00	Meeting with Khoelenya Community Councillors	KCC	PFF Thaba Mokhele Mrs Nthulanyane
17:00 – 19:00	Meeting with RVCC PMU	Mt Maluti	PC

Day 7 22nd January 2019

Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible/ contact
8:30 – 11:30	Meeting with Nkhetheleng Community members	Ha Nkhetheleng	PFF Thaba Mokhele
11:30-12:30	Travel to Morobong	DCS Office M/Hoek	PFF Thaba Mokhele
12:30 – 13:30	**Lunch**		
14:00 – 16:00	Meeting with Morobong Community members	Morobong	All

Day 8 23rd January 2019

Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible/ contact
8:30 – 11:30	Meeting with Waterfall Community members	Waterfall	PFF Khoelenya
11:30-12:30	Travel to Ha Khoai		PFF Khoelenya
12:30 – 13:30	**Lunch**		
14:00 – 16:00	Meeting with Ha Khoai Community members	Ha Khoai	PFF Khoelenya

Day 9 24th January 2019

Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible/ contact
9:00 – 12:00	Meeting with Ramonyatsi Community members	Ramonyatsi	PFF Khoelenya
11:30-12:30	Travel to Makilanyaneng		
12:30 – 13:30	**Lunch**		
14:00 – 16:00	Meeting with Ha Makilanyaneng Community members	Makilanyaneng	PFF Khoelenya

Day 9 25th January 2019

Time	Activity	Venue	Responsible/ contact
8:30 – 10:30	Meeting with PSC Members (sharing of preliminary findings)	UNDP Boardroom	PC
11:00-12:00	UNDP/RVCC Management (sharing of preliminary findings)	UNDP Boardroom	PC

12:30 – 13:30	Lunch		
14:00-15:00	Meeting MFRSC (sharing of preliminary findings)	MFRSC	PC

7. Terms of reference for the Midterm Review

TORs.pdf

8. 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. [1] SEP

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. [1] SEP

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. [1] SEP

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. [1] SEP

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. [1] SEP

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. ⌊SEP⌋

7. Should reflect sound accounting procedures and be prudent in using the resources of the evaluation.
⌊SEP⌋MTR Consultant Agreement Form ⌊SEP⌋

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 in London on April 29th 2019

Signature: