# Annex 11: Audit Trail for a Terminal Evaluation

## Project title - Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Practices through an Integrated Approach

The table below shows responses to the comments received by the Evaluation Team from Project Stakeholders (UNDP and Government and Partners).

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Comments on draft TE report for PIMS 4493 (Uganda charcoal project)** | | | **How it was Addressed** |
| **Page #** | **Section** | **Comment** |  |
|  | Table 1. Project Summary Table | Complete the Financing info at the TE stage | Done. The total co-finance raised is US$ 46,448,246. This is over 2.5 times higher than the co-finance anticipated at CEOR of US$ 18,065,808. The creation of s Renewable Energy Department at the Mineral Development (MEMD) with the subsequent raising of over US$ 30 million to support its work (in the form of projects) contributed to this jump in co-finance. Table 1 has been updated in green highlighted text. |
| xviii-xix | Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project | Please make it clear which organization/entity is responsible for each recommendation listed. | Done. A responsible party has been indicated under each recommendation |
| 1-2 | 1.2 Scope & Methodology | -Provide more details on how the data collected was cross-referenced and triangulated.  -The methodology should refer to how gender integration was to be assessed and include details on the tools/techniques used for such an assessment. | Done. The following paragraph was added to Section 1.2 (Methodology) of the report.  **Data Gathering:** Data was gathered using a combination of desktop research, focused group discussions and observations. These steps were necessary to cross-reference and triangulate data reported in the project reports with information provided by the respondents and observations in the field. Data on gender was cross-checked with the project gender strategy, which was formulated late into project implementation process. Every effort was made to ensure that both men and women (and youth) participated in the focused group discussions. However, this was done in full recognition of the fact that traditionally, there is a distinct gender based division of labour on the charcoal value chain. Men, especially the youth dominate charcoal production, while women largely dominate charcoal sales and use (in households). The evaluation questions included questions on gender issues, regardless of the gender of the respondent |
| 10-11 | 3.1.2 Indicators and targets | Comment on how gender was or was not incorporated into the results framework.  Consider the following questions, as applicable:  -Are the project’s results framework indicators disaggregated by sex and wherever possible by age and by socio-economic group (or any other socially significant category in society)?  -Are the project’s results framework targets set up to guarantee a sufficient level of gender balance in activities (e.g. quotas for male and female participation)?  -Are gender sensitive indicators included in the project’s results framework? | Done – the following text was added to section 3.1.2..  The strategic results framework for the project was assessed against gender sensitivity/responsiveness and “SMART” criteria, whether the indicators and targets were gender segregated, sufficiently specific, measurable, achievable, relevant, and time-bound Were indicators gender sensitive? The TE finds that at design, the indicators listed in the Box below should have been disaggregated by: a) sex; b) age; and c) socio-economic group (or any other socially significant category in society). Although this was not the case, a gender strategy was designed during project formulation, which introduced gender disaggregated reporting on the indicators. The strategy fell short of disaggregating the targets and results along the other two criteria (age and socio-economics category). The TE therefore concludes that the project design did not adequately guarantee a sufficient level of gender balance in activities (e.g. quotas for male and female participation). |
| 19-20 | 3.3 Project Finance | The GEF is now requiring additional information in MTRs/TEs regarding co-financing contributions. (More information about this will be communicated to our unit.)  With support from the CO and project team, could a table, similar to the one below, be added to list the actual co-financing contributions and indicate whether each contribution was ‘investment mobilized’ or ‘recurrent expenditures’?  Definitions are provided below.     |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Sources of Cofinancing**    *Select one:*  *-GEF Agency*  *-Donor Agency*  *-Recipient Country Government*  *-Private Sector*  *-Civil Society Organization*  *-Beneficiaries*  *-Other* | **Name of Co-financer** | **Type of Co-financing**    *Select one:*  *-Grant*  *-Loan*  *-Equity -Investment*  *-Public -Investment*  *-Guarantee*  *-In-Kind*  *-Other* | | GEF Agency | UNDP |  | | Recipient Country Government | Government of Uganda |  | | GEF Agency | FAO |  | | Donor Agency | UNCDF |  | | Donor Agency | GIZ |  | | **Total** | | | | The Table has been generated and inserted in Section 3.3 of the TE report (and is reproduced below this audit trail). |
| 21 | 3.4    UNDP and Implementing Partner implementation / execution (\*) coordination, and operational issues | Provide more details on the assessment of UNDP’s performance:  For UNDP, consider the following points:   * Was there was an appropriate focus on results? * The adequacy of UNDP support to the Implementing Partner and project team Quality and timeliness of technical support to the Executing Agency and project team * Candor and realism in annual reporting * The quality of risk management by UNDP * Responsiveness of the managing parties to significant implementation problems (if any) * Any salient issues regarding project duration, for instance to note project delays, and how they may have affected project outcomes and sustainability | Done. The following text was added to section 3.4 – highlighted in green.  **Focus on results**: The TE finds that although the project was planned using the Results Based methodologies with a lograme and Project results Framework, the theory of change at design was weak. However, it was transferred into the PIR without modification. Unfortunately, many outcomes were simply outputs. Despite the recommendation to modify the ToC by the MTR, this was ignored. Hence project management and reporting was focused largely at the output level.  **The adequacy of UNDP support to the Implementing Partner and project team Quality and timeliness of technical support to the Executing Agency and project team:** Focus group discussions with the implementing partners reported that UNDP was highly responsive to project requests. However, the responsiveness did not always translate to effectiveness where the NIM modality meant UNDP could not override government procedures. For example in delayed procurement processes; weak PMU (that did not have executive power over project budget). The TE also finds that UNDP should have been pro-active in fixing the theory of change; at the very least in response to the MTR recommendation to refine indicators. The PIR for this project is complex and cumbersome to understand. This should have been simplified. In addition, there is no evidence that the GEF Tracking Tool has been used in managing the project or reporting. The PMU was unaware of its existence and it is yet to be availed to the TE Team in early October.  **Candour and realism in annual reporting:** The TE finds that the impact of the failed retort kiln on effectiveness of the project is under evaluated internally and consequently under reported. It is not clear how the mitigation values reported in the 2019 PIR were arrived at in the absence of a functional retort (noting that this TE did not adopt those figures in its findings).  **The quality of risk management by UNDP**: UNDP actively managed risks effectively, within the complexities of the implementation arrangement of NIM projects in Uganda.  **Responsiveness of the managing parties to significant implementation problems:** The government bureaucratic procedures are too slow for a four year project with ambitious targets. The effect of the weak PMU was pointed out to the PSC, as reflected in minutes of several PSC meetings, and the MTR. The Government did not make any changes to the implementation arrangement to address this challenge.  **How does project delay affect project outcomes and sustainability:** Despite the many challenges, the project delivered impressive results (summarised in the executive summary), with only one year cost-neutral extension. However, the delayed approval of the district ordinances may derail the continued implementation of sustainable charcoal action plans; the failed retort kiln means the plantation-based charcoal production kiln challenge is unaddressed; the analogue database is not as flexible and useful as a digital database. These challenges are expected to be taken up and resolved by the NAMA. |
| 35 | 3.6 Relevance | Include text on how the project is relevant to UNDP programming.    Describe linkages between the project and relevant SDG targets/indicators. | Done. The following text has been added to section 3.6 on relevance -- The project was relevant to the UN and UNDPs 2010-2014 Strategic Programmes. It contributed to Outcome 2 of the UN Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF) for 2012-2014 - Vulnerable segments of the population increasingly benefit from sustainable livelihoods and in particular improved agricultural systems and employment opportunities to cope with the population dynamics, increasing economic disparities, economic impact of HIV&AIDS, environment shocks and recovery challenges by 2014. Notably: Outcome 2.2 Vulnerable communities, Government, civil society and the private sector are sustainably managing and using the environment and natural resources for improved livelihoods and to cope with the impact of climate change. It also contributed to outcome 2.3 of the 2010-2014 UNDP CPAP (Capacity of Selected Institutions Strengthened for Sustainable Environment and Natural Resources Management (ENRM) as well as Climate Change (CC) Adaptation/ Mitigation and Disaster Risk Management).  The project also contributed to the post-2015 development agenda and the Sustainable Development Goals; specifically SDG 7 and 15. On SDG 7 (Ensure access to affordable, reliable, sustainable and modern energy for all), the project specifically contributes to targets 7.2 and 7.3 (respectively, by 2030, increase substantially the share of renewable energy in the global energy mix; by 2030, double the global rate of improvement in energy efficiency). On SDG 15 (Life on land: Protect, restore and promote sustainable use of terrestrial ecosystems, sustainably manage forests, combat desertification, and halt and reverse land degradation and biodiversity loss), it contributes to target 15.3: By 2030, combat desertification, restore degraded land and soil, including land affected by desertification, drought and floods, and strive to achieve a land degradation-neutral world; and to the achievement of a "land degradation-neutral world", which can be reached by restoring degraded forests and land lost to drought and flood. |
| 37 | 3.9 Mainstreaming | Were any assessments made on how/if the project mainstreamed other UNDP priorities including but not limited to: poverty alleviation, improved governance, climate change mitigation and adaptation, disaster prevention and recovery, human rights, and capacity development, etc., as applicable.    Consider the following questions:         positive or negative effects of the project on local populations (e.g. income generation/job creation, improved natural resource management arrangements with local groups, improvement in policy frameworks for resource allocation and distribution, regeneration of natural resources for long term sustainability).         extent to which the project objectives conform to agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CPD) and other country programme documents.         whether project outcomes have contributed to better preparations to cope with disasters or mitigate risk.         extent to which poor, indigenous, persons with disabilities, women and other disadvantaged or marginalized groups benefited from the project         the poverty-environment nexus (how the environmental conservation activities of the project contributed to poverty reduction) | Done. The following text has been added to section 3.9 to strengthen the argument on mainstreaming, highlighted in green… As outlined in Sections 3.5, 3.6 and 3.10, the project achievements have advanced the agenda of mainstreaming sustainable natural resources management and energy efficiency in the following ways:   * Increasing investments in market transformation for energy efficiency, which has been mainstreamed in three important ways: i) It provided an understanding of the requirements for doing this effectively; ii) The completion of the NAMA, which when funded will target market transformation for energy efficiency, among other things. The NAMA is set to mobilize $60 million, 50 million of it from the private sector; iii) The creation of the Renewable Energy Department during the lifetime of the project is a critical co-finance achievement for mainstreaming the work of renewable energy along the whole value chain. * Good management practices in LULUCF adopted both within the forestland and in the wider landscape: as reported previously, the project has created capacity (skills, information, knowledge and networks) to enhance the uptake of sustainable forest and land management practices in the four pilot districts. This has improved good management practices in existing forests and trees in the productive landscape (under agricultural land); * Vulnerable communities, Government, civil society and the private sector are sustainably managing and using the environment and natural resources for improved livelihoods and to cope with the impact of climate change: In addition to institutional support to the government structures (Ministries and District authorities), the project supported the adoption of climate smart agriculture at the local level and the creation of sustainable charcoal producer associations. These measures not only led to increase in food production for participating farmers, they also created social capital at the local level, necessary for sustaining the results. Over 40 charcoal producers groups, 15% of led by women were established following the recognition of sustainable charcoal as a viable business in the targeted districts. Consequently, women have more incomes, contributing to household resilience. The project facilitated the formation of 42 Charcoal Producer Associations with 800 members (40% women), who all received training on sustainable charcoal production, reforestation and afforestation with both indigenous and exotic growing tree species. The various activities from improved technology charcoal production to those groups involved in retailing and wholesaling as well as intercropping all provided opportunities to men and women as well as the youth in realising incomes and employment from the project. These results contribute directly to the agreed priorities in the UNDP country programme document (CPD) and other country programme documents. They also addressed directly the poverty-environment nexus by linking sustainable charcoal production, improved land and forest management to creation of jobs and household incomes; * Gender mainstreaming: During the project design gender concerns were keenly incorporated. Whereas there was no deliberate gender strategy guiding the mainstreaming of gender during the implementation, there was evidence that women were brought on board as a result of introduction of the improved charcoal technologies as opposed to the traditional method that is more manual hence favoring men. Women were also reported to have benefitted to some extent like their male counterparts by being involved in the entire value chain of charcoal production and marketing as a result of the project. For instance, in Kiboga district in Alinyikira group women testified that the project has united families as decisions and economic gains accruing from the participation of both women and men has led to the stabilization of families. The majority of women were also registered in charcoal associations and groups – a situation that has lifted their income and poverty levels. |
| 43-44 | 4.3 Actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project | Please make it clear which organization/entity is responsible for each recommendation listed. | Done – green highlighted text in the section 4.3 |
| Annexes | Annexes | Add the following to the Annexes:  *-Annexed in a separate file:* Terminal GEF Tracking Tool *(if the terminal Tracking Tool has not yet been completed, the project team should complete it ASAP.  We are required to submit to the GEF the terminal Tracking Tool together with the TE report.)*  *-Annexed in a separate file*: TE Audit Trail | Done |

**Comments from the Regional Technical Advisor**

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Issue** | **Comment** | **How it was addressed** |
| Project co-finance at TE | We should at least provide an estimate. |  |
| Evaluation Rating Table | Relevance appears twice in the ratings table. Please consolidate. |  |
| A “Likely” rating for overall sustainability does not match the analysis presented in Table 4: Assumptions and their effects on project implementation and achievements. | Rating has been adjusted to align with the revaluation findings summarized in Table 4 and explained in many other sections of the report. |
| Summary of conclusions, recommendations and lessons | Please include a summary of the conclusions below. | Done |
| The section below does not read like a recommendation – it is more like a finding.. Output 3.2.3: Land use planning done in each target district using FAO-LADA-WOCAT outcomes[[1]](#footnote-1): and, Output 1.5.2: Updated guidelines for measuring biomass (CAI[[2]](#footnote-2) & MAI[[3]](#footnote-3)) calculated using the biomass study technical manual. Annual Allowable Cut (AAC) targets established for all districts by year 2. Both outputs would have contributed to the planning of biomass supply for the sustainable charcoal production and highlighting land degradation and sustainable management issues. It is not clear why the two were dropped. | This has been modified to read as follows: Two important outputs were not delivered, without a credible explanation: Output 3.2.3: Land use planning done in each target district using FAO-LADA-WOCAT outcomes: and, Output 1.5.2: Updated guidelines for measuring biomass (CAI & MAI) calculated using the biomass study technical manual. Annual Allowable Cut (AAC) targets established for all districts by year 2. Both outputs would have contributed to the planning of biomass supply for the sustainable charcoal production and highlighting land degradation and sustainable management issues. This information is still necessary. It’s provision should be catered for in the exit plan of this project, and it should be emphasized in the NAMA and similar projects. |
| Best and worst practices in addressing issues relating to relevance, performance and success | Where are the worst practices? | The following worst practices are now included, with the appropriate ratings..   1. Highly complex project document with too much information, some not relevant to the project strategy 2. Weak indicators and M&E system – which was not addressed, even after the MTR pointed it out and recommended that indicators be strengthened 3. Lack of an exit strategy, despite the MTR recommendation to formulate one urgently. 4. Incomplete modification of the retort kiln; a stationery kiln is still necessary for charcoal production in plantations |
| Stakeholder participation | It would be useful to assess to what extent the envisaged collaboration with the UNCDF CleanStart programme materialized | Done, the following text has been added to the analysis, highlighted in green colour.  The TE also finds that while stakeholder participation during the implementation was largely as expected at the project design stage, briquette producers in the four project pilot districts were unable to participate in the CleanStart programme because of the small scale of their operations. The CleanStart Programme was open to national level competition for loans by the private sector/players engaged in energy value chains. None of the briquette producers in the pilot district qualified for CleanStart funding. The impacts of this are discussed in Section 3.5 (Results – under Outcome3) and in Table 11 (Rating project achievements by indicators and assessment of delivery on outputs). |
| Feedback from M&E activities used for adaptive management | The narrative and the rating do not seem to match | Eating changed from satisfactory to moderately unsatisfactory to align with the findings of the TE. |
| 3.3 Project finance | It would be helpful to provide a bit more analysis on the co-financing. Of the co-financing presented in the table above, is it fair to say that only the UNDP TRAC co-financing was expected to pass through the project’s books? Does the 4.6% of co-finance | Done. The following text was inserted in section 3.3, highlighted in green: **Co-finance:** Although the project did not systematically track and report on co-finance, analysis of the project reports showed that the co-finance contribution from other project partners exceeded the CEOR estimates by three times (realizing US$ realizing US$ 42,968,246 against an estimate of $14,585,808). About 80% of the co-finance realized was grants while about 20% was in kind contribution. The creation of a Renewable Energy Department at the Mineral Development (MEMD) with the subsequent raising of over US$ 30 million to support its work (in the form of projects) contributed to this jump in co-finance. The new Renewable Energy Department is currently implementing USD $3.2 million project for biogas generation from municipal solid waste, Euro 15 million project for improved cook stoves for all schools, and USD $ 4 million project for grants for promoting biomass investments. The TE finds that the increased coordination contributed to mobilization of co-finance; it indeed led to the USD 2.28 million mobilized from GIZ to support investment in alternative and improved energy technologies in line with the 10-year Action Plan of the Biomass Energy Strategy (BEST). Additional co-finance from government has been mobilized through the District Charcoal Action Plans, which have been integrated into the District Development Plans allowing districts to allocate budget lines and budgetary resources for their implementation; as demonstrated in Nakaseke and Mubende districts, which have budget lines for priority interventions of the Action Plans. It is expected that the draft Charcoal Industry Ordinances and District Charcoal Action Plans will further enhance coordination, charcoal production and trade; and revenue collection at district level. It is worth noting that once approved and financed, the NAMA will mobilize additional $60 million, $50 million of it from the private sector. |
| 3.7: efficiency | Reporting that 100% of the co-finance promised at project design has been provided does not correspond with the findings presented in the Project Finance section. | Corrected – co-finance delivered was two and half times the amount expected at CEOR. |

# Table on Co-finance Types

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Sources of Cofinancing** | **Name of Co-financer** | **Type of Co-financing** | **Amount at TE (US$)** | **Investment mobilized\*** |
| GEF Agency | UNDP | In kind | 1,860,000 | ***Recurrent expenditures*** |
| Recipient Country Government | Government of Uganda | In kind | 6,928,246 | ***Recurrent expenditures*** |
| Recipient Country Government | Government of Uganda | Grant | 30,000,000 | ***Investment mobilized*** |
| GEF Agency | FAO | Grant | 600,000 | Grant supporting multiple government agencies to update landcover maps of Uganda, including the four pilot districts. |
| Donor Agency | UNCDF | Grant | 1,300,000 | These funds were disbursed as loans to national entities dealing in clean energy value chain, on a competitive bidding process.. However, none on the briquetting associations in the project pilot districts qualified for the loans. |
| Donor Agency | GIZ | Grant | 2,280,000 | Funds used to support investment in alternative and improved energy technologies in line with the 10-year Action Plan of the Biomass Energy Strategy (BEST). |
| **Total** | | | **42,968,246** |  |

1. The Land Degradation Assessment in Drylands (LADA) is a tool of FAO and has as part of its objectives to assess land degradation at local, national and global scale. In order to do so, the project has developed guidelines for each assessment level. WOCAT (World Overview of Conservation Approaches and Technologies) is an established global network of Soil and Water Conservation (SWC) specialists, contributing to sustainable land management (SLM). [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. CAI – Current Annual Increment, i.e. the volumetric or biomass increment which a tree puts in a single year  [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. MAI – Mean Annual Increment, i.e. the total volumetric or biomass increment up to a given age divided by that age [↑](#footnote-ref-3)