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# Background

## Context

Charcoal is the preferred cooking energy in Uganda (particularly by urban consumers) because of a variety of reasons including: it is affordable by all cadres of society and the only option available for the many low waged urban employees; it is substantially more efficient than wood and burns with very limited smoke, it has high-energy content per unit weight; it has a higher energy density than wood; it is easier to transport than wood and can be easily transported to markets far away from the forest. As a result, many people consider charcoal a relatively modern fuel rather than a traditional one. Notwithstanding its popularity, the charcoal sub-sector remains plagued by inefficient production practices, lack of sustainable supplies of woody biomass and inadequate, often conflicting, policy statements.

The Government of Uganda, with technical assistance from UNDP, designed a GEF financed project to address the twin challenges of unsustainable utilization of biomass for charcoal and poor land management practices common in Uganda’s Woodlands. Piloted in four districts in the most naturally wooded areas of the country (outside protected areas), the project expected to spend $3,480,000 to address multiple issues across 50,000 ha inhabited by 1.7 million people. Project implementation started in 2014; operational closure is scheduled for November 2019. Implementation is led by the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) in close partnership with the Ministries of Water and Environment (Forestry Sector Support Department and District Forest Services), and National Forestry Authority Local Government, and the District local Governments of Kiboga, Kiryandongo, Mubende and Nakaseke. Project monitoring and evaluation is conducted by the project team and the UNDP country office in accordance with established UNDP and GEF procedures for GEF-5 STAR. UNDP Country Office with support from UNDP/GEF Regional Coordination Unit provides quality assurance for project implementation.

This terminal evaluation (TE) is being conducted to assess the achievement of project results, and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming. The evaluation will be carried out in according with the guidance, rules and procedures established by UNDP and GEF as reflected in the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects. The TE is being undertaken by a team of two consultants: a Team Leader and a National consultant, guided by the Terms of Reference in Annex 1.

## Synthesis of the project

The goal of the project is to “Develop improved charcoal production technologies and sustainable land management practices through an integrated approach in Uganda.” The goal is implemented through three components, namely: i) Data collection and improved coordination and enforcement of regulations governing the biomass energy sector, in particular those related to sustainable charcoal; ii) Dissemination of appropriate technologies for sustainable charcoal production in selected charcoal-producing districts (Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo) and; iii) Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots.

Table 1: Project Details showing Components and Outcomes

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Component**  | **Outcomes**  |
| 1. Data collection and improved coordination and enforcement of regulations governing the biomass energy sector, in particular those related to sustainable charcoal
 | Outcome 1.1 Existing & ongoing policy, regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security integrated with new biomass energy strategy (BEST) under development  Outcome 1.2 Improved coordination of institutions managing sustainable charcoal production at pilot district level  Outcome 1.3 Improved data collection and monitoring of biomass energy and charcoal production and use (integrated into national database and for use as baseline information in a possible NAMA)  Outcome 1.4 Improved charcoal and biomass guidelines and ordinances at district level  Outcome 1.5 Heightened awareness of new institutional frameworks and ordnances, guidelines and certification schemes at district level |
| 1. Dissemination of appropriate technologies for sustainable charcoal production in selected charcoal-producing districts (Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo)
 | Outcome 2.1 Low-carbon charcoal production technologies have successfully replaced inefficient systems in targeted pilot districtsOutcome 2.2 Sustainable charcoal recognized as a viable SME in pilot districts by end of projectOutcome 2.3 Carbon finance is integrated into sustainable charcoal practice in targeted areasOutcome 2.4 Increased incomes for all charcoal cooperatives involved in projectOutcome 2.5 Technical support for charcoal briquetting producers enhanced |
| 1. Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots
 | Outcome 3.1 Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlotsOutcome 3.2 SLM/SFM knowledge effectively transferred from on-going SLM Best Practices in the neighboring Cattle Corridor districts replicated in the four target districts |

##  Purpose of the Inception Report

This inception report presents the methodology to be applied for the evaluation, evaluation matrix (showing data to be collected, sources of data and methodology) and a workplan for the completion of the exercise. It represents the common understanding between the Consultants and the Project executors about what is being evaluated and how.

# Methodology

**Overall approach**

The TE will be conducted in line with UNDP-GEF Guidelines, as spelled out in the ToR (Annex 1). It will be conducted in close coordination with UNDP, Government of Uganda, Project Implementing Partners (PIPs) and project beneficiaries. The evaluation will therefore cover four areas of the project, mainly- Project Strategy; Results Framework/Log-frame; Progress towards Results and; Project Implementation and Adaptive Management. Evaluation of progress towards achievement of the formal project overall objective, purpose, goals and component outcomes will be done using the project’s own results statements as presented in the Project Document, complemented by findings of the field missions and discussions with key stakeholders. Thus the evaluation will assess progress towards results, identify lessons learnt as well as early risks to sustainability, and, provide supportive recommendations to ensure that the project meets its stated objectives.

The evaluation will be undertaken through a combination of desktop research, focused group discussions, observations (via field mission) as well as consultations with GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, steering committee, UNDP GEF Regional Technical Adviser and key stakeholders (particularly Ministries of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD), Local Government, National Forestry Agency (Forestry Sector Support Department and District Forest Services). Others to be consulted include Charcoal Producers Associations, communities and CSOs engaged with the project activities.

#### Theory of Change Analysis

The evaluation will reconstruct the Theory of Change (ToC) of the project at design and at evaluation, based on a review of project documentation and stakeholder interviews. The ToC will be reconstructed through the verification, amendment and updating of the problem analysis at the origin of the project. It will be used to facilitate discussions with stakeholders in order to ascertain understanding of the project context, the impact pathways, the roles of various stakeholders and the validity of drivers and assumptions described in the ToC. It will also be used to verify alignment of the project with UNDP’s Programme of Work, assess the extent to which the project intervention responds to stakeholder priorities and needs, and, support the assessment of sustainability and up-scaling by providing better understanding of the relative importance of outputs, outcomes, drivers and assumptions, along with the role of stakeholders, in sustaining and up-scaling higher level results. The theory of change will be used to guide stakeholder consultations and workshops during data collection.

The terminal evaluation will be undertaken in four steps (Figure 1), briefly outlined below. Details of methods that will be used at each stage are provided in the following sections.



Figure 1: Proposed Evaluation Methodology

####  Preparation and Inception

Debriefing meetings will be held with UNDP and the key project stakeholders in order to discuss and agree upon the precise scope of the assignment, expectations in terms of deliverables or outcomes, especially in light of the proposed use of the Theory of Change approach to guide evaluation. This will be accompanied by an in-depth document review of the following:

* **Relevant background documentation** including the UNDP Development Assistance Framework (UNDAF), UNDP Country Programme Document (CPD), UNDP Country Programme Action Plan (CPAP), GEF focal area strategic program objectives, national strategic documents including the National Forestry Plan (NFP), National Development Plan (NDP), National Action Plan (NAP), Renewable Energy Policy and other relevant documents.
* **Project design documents** including the Project Identification Form, GEF project information form, project document, log frame analysis, UNDP Initiation Plan and project implementation plan.
* **Project reporting documents** including project inception report, mid-term review, annual project implementation reports, project budget and financial data, project tracking tool, progress reports form collaboration partners, lessons learnt, meeting minutes, relevant correspondence revisions to the project and any other documents deemed relevant.

An inception meeting will be held with the project implementing team (and preferably the Project Board), where they will be facilitated to reconstruct the project Theory of Change. This process will be used to facilitate discussions with stakeholders in order to ascertain understanding of the project context, the impact pathways, the roles of various stakeholders and the validity of drivers and assumptions described in the ToC. It will also be used to verify alignment of the project with UNDP’s Programme of Work as well as global standards on biomass energy, SLM and livelihoods, assess the extent to which the project intervention responds to stakeholder priorities and needs, and, support the assessment of sustainability and up-scaling by providing better understanding of the relative importance of outputs, outcomes, drivers and assumptions, along with the role of stakeholders, in sustaining and up-scaling higher level results. The theory of change will be used to guide stakeholder consultations and workshops during data collection. The outcomes of these discussions and document review will be used to refine the evaluation questions (in Table 2), the selection of field sites and the methods to be used during the data gathering stage.

#### Implementation and Data Gathering

#### Key Respondent Interviews

The TE consultants, in close collaboration with the UNDP country office and project team will organize and conduct interviews with key stakeholders in the project implementation. This includes, but is not limited to:

1. Leadership of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development
2. Officials of the Renewable Energy Department in Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development
3. Project Management Unit
4. Select officials from the Ministry of Water and Environment
5. Select officials of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
6. Select officials of the National Forestry Authority
7. Select officials of the Nyabyeya Forestry College
8. Leadership of Kiboga District Local Government
9. Kiboga District Natural Resources department
10. Leadership of Kiryandogo District Local Government
11. Kiryandogo District Natural Resources department
12. Leadership of Mubende District Local Government
13. Mubende District Natural Resources department
14. Leadership of Nakaseke District Local Government
15. Nakaseke District Natural Resources department
16. Officials of UNDP Regional Services Centre for Africa and UNDP Uganda

Discussions will be guided by the evaluation matrix (Tables 2 and 3). The questions in the matrix are designed to interrogate the project’s stated objective and outcomes and the extent to which they have been achieved at the close of the project. They will supplement the literature review and give a coherent picture of progress and results achieved.

#### Field Visit

Site visits will be made to the four districts. Further data gathering in the field will include focused group discussions and interviews with district project’s focal persons and officials, , local stakeholders, including community leaders and communities, development partners, NGOs and civil society organizations in the project sites. A presentation on initial findings will be made (where and with what audience) once field visits and stakeholder consultations have been concluded.

#### Analysis and Reporting

The consultants will use the data gathered to analyse and review project progress at closure. This will include defining outcomes, identifying patterns and trends, critical lessons as well as illustrating findings through stories, charts, graphs etc. The analysis will be undertaken in a participatory process wherever possible. The analysis will include the following steps:

* **Project Strategy (Project design and Results Framework/Logframe):** The TE will examine the problem addressed by the project and the underlying assumptions; review the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document; review the relevance of the project strategy and assess whether it provides the most effective route towards expected/intended results; reviewe whether lessons from other relevant projects were properly incorporated into the project design; examine how the project addresses country priorities and review country ownership. The TE will also review decision-making processes to determine if the planning phase took the perspectives of those who would be affected by project decisions, those who could affect the outcomes, and those who could contribute information or other resources; and, the extent to which relevant gender issues were raised in the project design.
* **On Progress Towards Outcomes Analysis:** The TE guidelines require review of the logframe indicators against progress made towards the end-of-project targets; comparison and analysis of the GEF Tracking Tools at the Baseline with the one completed right before the TE; identification of remaining barriers to achieving the project objective; review of the aspects of the project that have already been successful, identifying ways in which the project partners can further expand these benefits even after the end of the project.
* **On Management Arrangements:** The TE will review the overall effectiveness of project management as outlined in the Project Document, determining if changes have been made and if they are effective; examine if responsibilities and reporting lines are clear and if decision-making is transparent and undertaken in a timely manner. Further, the quality of execution of the Executing Agency/Implementing Partners will be reviewed along with the quality of support provided by the GEF Partner Agency (UNDP).
* **On project implementation,** the TE will assess if there has been delays in project start-up and implementation, identifying the causes and examining if they have been solved; it will also examine if work-planning processes are results-based, and if changes have been made to the original logframe and if it is being used as a management tool.
* **On finance and co-finance** - the TE will assess; i) Whether strong financial controls have been established that allow the project management team to make informed decisions regarding the budget at any time, and allow for the timely flow of funds and the payment of satisfactory project deliverables; ii) Variances between planned and actual expenditures; iii) Whether the project demonstrates due diligence in the management of funds, including annual audits; iv) Any changes made to fund allocations as a result of budget revisions and the appropriateness and relevance of such revisions; v) Whether co-finance has been delivered in accordance with expectations laid out in the project document, and if the Project Team has made effort to pursue delivery of co-finance.
* **On stakeholder engagement***,* the review will assess whether the project management team developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders; whether local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project and continue to have an active role in project decision-making; whether public awareness has been created to support the project and how stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributes to the progress towards achievement of project objectives.
* **On reporting and Communication,** the review will assess how adaptive management changes have been reported by the Project Team and shared with the Project Board; how well the Project Team and partners undertake and fulfil GEF reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-rated Project Implementation Reports (PIRs) and how these have been shared with the Project Board and other key stakeholders; in addition, it will assess how lessons derived from the adaptive management process have been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners and incorporated into project implementation.
* **On financial risks to sustainability,** the TE will assess the likelihood of financial and economic resources being available once the GEF assistance ends, examining the opportunities for financial sustainability and additional factors needed to create an enabling environment for continued financing.
* **On socio-economic risks to sustainability**, the will TE assess whether there are social or political risks that may jeopardize sustainability of project outcomes; whether there is a risk that the level of stakeholder ownership (including ownership by governments and other key stakeholders) will be insufficient to allow for the project outcomes/benefits to be sustained; whether lessons learned are being documented continually; and whether successful aspects of the project are being transferred to appropriate parties, potential future beneficiaries, and others who could learn from the project and potentially replicate and/or scale it in the future.
* **On institutional framework and governance risks to sustainability**, the TE will assess; whether the country’s legal frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes pose risks that may jeopardize project benefits; whether the project has in place frameworks, policies, governance structures and processes that will create mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and technical knowledge transfer after the project’s closure; whether the project has developed appropriate institutional capacity (systems, structures, staff, expertise, etc.) that will be self-sufficient after the project closure date; and how the project identified and involved champions (i.e. individuals in government and civil society) who can promote sustainability of project outcomes; and whether the project leadership have the ability to respond to future institutional and governance changes (i.e. foreseeable changes to local or national political leadership) – thus can the project strategies effectively be incorporated/mainstreamed into future planning?
* **On environmental risks to sustainability**, the TE will assess whether there are environmental factors that could undermine and reverse the project’s outcomes and results, including factors that have been identified by project stakeholders.
* **Conclusions & Recommendations:** The TE will offer evidence-based conclusions, in light of the findings. Recommendations made will be succinct suggestions for critical intervention that are specific, measurable, achievable, and relevant. Ratings along the objectives will be provided in accordance with the guidelines in Box 1 (below).

Box 1: Progress towards results rating scale

|  |
| --- |
| **Highly Satisfactory (HS)** --- The objective/outcome is expected to achieve or exceed all its end-of-project targets, without major shortcomings. The progress towards the objective/outcome can be presented as “good practice”. **Satisfactory (S)** -- The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets, with only minor shortcomings. **Moderately Satisfactory (MS)** -- The objective/outcome is expected to achieve most of its end-of-project targets but with significant shortcomings. **Moderately Unsatisfactory (MU)** -- The objective/outcome is expected to achieve its end-of-project targets with major shortcomings. **Unsatisfactory (U)** -- The objective/outcome is expected not to achieve most of its end-of-project targets. **Highly Unsatisfactory** -- (HU) The objective/outcome has failed to achieve its midterm targets, and is not expected to achieve any of its end-of-project targets. C. Project Implementation & Adaptive Management |

#### Validation and Reporting

An initial draft of the final report (outline in Annex 2) will be submitted for review and comments from stakeholders to validate the findings and agree on ratings. The report will contain the key sections required by the UNDP guidelines, including the following sections:

* Introduction: Purpose, Scope, and Methodology
* Project Description & Background Context
* Findings: (A) Project Strategy, (B) Progress Towards Results, (C) Project Implementation and Adaptive Management, and (D) Sustainability
* Conclusions and recommendations: Corrective actions for the design, implementation, monitoring and evaluation of the project; actions to follow up or reinforce initial benefits from the project and; proposals for future directions underlining main objectives and mitigating risks to sustainability

The final draft report will be accompanied by an audit trail used to create the revised final terminal review report for submission to the Commissioning Unit as required by UNDP guidelines. The final report will be presented to stakeholders for review and feedback before final submission to UNDP.

### Evaluation Questionnaire: Guiding Questions

The table below outlines the questions that will guide the evaluation based on UNDP criteria.

Table 2: Evaluation Matrix

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Evaluative Questions | Indicators | Sources | Methodology |
| Relevance: Project Strategy: To what extent is the project strategy relevant to country priorities, country ownership, and the best route towards expected results? |
| * Are the issues/challenges being addressed by the project relevant to national development and livelihoods?
* In which way are they relevant?
* Are they government priority and if so where are these priorities stated?
* What lessons were used to influence project design?
 | The extent to which the project activities address the gaps in the policy, regulatory and capacity framework at the national levelAlignment with energy policies;Contribution to BESTAlignment with the SLM Framework programmeExtent to which project formulation was participatory | Prodoc;Government policy on energy, National SLM programme documents; GEF Focal Area objectives;Stakeholders views | Document analysis, focus group discussions. |
| **Effectiveness: Progress Towards Results: To what extent have the expected outcomes and objectives of the project been achieved thus far?** |
| **To what extent have the outputs below been delivered (products and services):** |
| **Output**  | **% delivery** | **Verification** |
| ***Output 1.1.1.*** National charcoal survey and updated standardized baseline reports completed based on latest data***Output 1.2.1:*** Framework for institutional coordination and resource mobilization developed between MEMD, local government authorities and the National Forest Authority to manage charcoal trade at district level – *contained in the charcoal action plan and the ordinances; gazettement pending; districts allocating funds for charcoal action plans****Output 1.3.1:*** Baseline report and functional biomass database established and hosted at MEMD and published in Uganda Bureau of Standards reports and used for a sustainable charcoal NAMA (see Output 2.3.1) – done; national standards for charcoal and brickets and a NAMA produced. Database was supposed to be computerized; analogue database..***Output 1.4.1:*** Local ordinances and standards for sustainable charcoal certification schemes developed, adopted and publicized in targeted pilot districtsOrdinances – 95% - almost being gazette;Standards – outline for certification is imbedded within the ordinances. Scheme formulated but not yet adopted or publicized.  ***Output 1.5.1:*** Awareness and educational program on local ordinances and standards for sustainable charcoal completed in all targeted pilot districts*Designed a communication strategy and implemented it,,, including training journalists and developing awareness raising materials****Output 1.5.2:*** Updated guidelines for measuring biomass (CAI37 & MAI38) calculated using the biomass study technical manual. Annual Allowable Cut (AAC) targets established for all districts by year 2. *Not yet delivered – check with NFA****Output 2.1.1:*** 60 sustainable charcoal producer groups organized, trained and operational40 comprised of a minimum 2,400 charcoal champions41 spread across pilot districts. *64 associations; with average 40 members each; all operational****Output 2.2.1:*** Model scheme to support consumer financing schemes for charcoal producing groups (with local financial institutions) proposed by end of project. *Charcoal producers trained and linked to micro finance institutions; some groups given loans but there are challenges. Charcoal is seasonal, payment is challenging.* ***Output 2.3.1:*** Basic Program of Activities (PoA) project submitted for registration to appropriate authority under a VCS methodology or alternatively a Sustainable Charcoal NAMA Design Document developed and endorsed ***Output 2.4.1:*** Profit margin per output unit of charcoal produced with new technologies increased by at least 20% per group (with new kilns) as compared to baseline scenario for all participating charcoal cooperatives; *other things have to be in place to realize differentiated market (better marketing, acceptance and use of packaging, standards, etc.)* ***Output 2.5.1****.* Training and technical assistance provided to all briquetting businesses that are receiving loans for briquetting machines from Micro- Finance Institutions (in conjunction with *CleanStart*42) – Cleanstart did not take off as anticipated. Project identified bracketing groups – 8 (2/d). groups to be assisted identified, work yet to be done***Output 3.1.1:*** At least 1,100 private woodlot owners in the four pilot districts identified, trained and contracted to make land available for woodlot establishment (minimum 5,900 hectares set-aside). *Was changed; land is scarce and so this did not happen as planned. Project reports target reached but no signed commitments..* *Challenges with indigenous trees promotion – source of seedlings/ famers hesitate to take the seedlings/ bcos they take too long to establish and grow into useable products. So project changed species and eucalyptus has dominated (90%).* ***Output 3.1.2:*** Sustainable woodlots (out-grower schemes) successfully established to supply improved kilns with renewable biomass established (5,900 ha). ***Output 3.2.1:*** Targeted communities indigenous knowledge of SLM enhanced using the “Stimulating Community Innovations (SCI–SLM) approach49” to generate local solutions to land degradation – *technology – farmer managed regeneration encouraged in pastures;* ***Output 3.2.2:*** Conservation Agriculture (CA) practices introduced to 400 farming households (50 in each district) over 400 ha - ***Output 3.2.3:*** Land use planning done in each target district using FAO-LADA-WOCAT ***Output 3.2.4:*** District Forestry and Land Use Planning staff trained in the use of techniques that support community planning, implementation processes and land degradation assessment. ***Output 3.2.5:*** Mapping completed of all targeted areas under sustainable forestry management as well as agricultural lands under SLM in collaboration with FAO and National Forestry Authority’s new GIS/mapping platform |  | Document analysis, observation, key informants |
| What factors contributed to the delivery of the outputs?  |  |  |
| ***To what extent have the products from the outputs reached end users, been used and contributed to achievements of outcomes?*** |
| ***Outcome***  | % achieved | Verification  |
| Outcome 1.1 Existing & on-going policy, regulatory and institutional work on sustainable charcoal and land tenure security integrated with new biomass energy strategy (BEST) under development Outcome 1.2 Improved coordination of institutions managing sustainable charcoal production at pilot district level  Outcome 1.3 Improved data collection and monitoring of biomass energy and charcoal production and use (integrated into national database and for use as baseline information in a possible NAMA)  Outcome 1.4 Improved charcoal and biomass guidelines and ordinances at district level  Outcome 1.5 Heightened awareness of new institutional frameworks and ordnances, guidelines and certification schemes at district levelOutcome 2.1 Low-carbon charcoal production technologies have successfully replaced inefficient systems in targeted pilot districtsOutcome 2.2 Sustainable charcoal recognized as a viable SME in pilot districts by end of projectOutcome 2.3 Carbon finance is integrated into sustainable charcoal practice in targeted areasOutcome 2.4 Increased incomes for all charcoal cooperatives involved in projectOutcome 2.5 Technical support for charcoal briquetting producers enhancedOutcome 3.1 Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlotsOutcome 3.2 SLM/SFM knowledge effectively transferred from on-going SLM Best Practices in the neighbouring Cattle Corridor districts replicated in the four target districts |  | Document analysis, observation, key informants |
| What factors contributed to the state of affairs (achievement of results)? |  |  |
| What factors contributed to delaying achievement of results? |  |  |
| To what extent has the achievement of outcomes contributed to addressing the project objective and delivering impacts? |
| To what extent has the project objective been realized? |  |  |
| **Higher level result** | **Indicators**  | **Methodology**  |
| Is there i) improved data collection; ii) improved coordination; iii) improved enforcement of regulations governing the biomass energy sector, in particular those related to sustainable charcoal?  | Data base;Evidence of use;Enacted legislation/ Bills/ Recommendations for policy change;Increase in yields for crops;Increase in tree cover; hectarage planted by woodlots  | Document analysis, informants interviews and observation |
| Is there reduction in fragmentation of charcoal policies?Is there clearer mandates for the many institutions dealing with many aspects of sustainable charcoal? Is there stronger and more effective coordination among institutions relevant to sustainable charcoal production and consumption? |
| Is there significant increase in adoption of sustainable land management practices, linked to biomass energy and sustainable charcoal?  |
| Has the project led to increase in the flow of ecosystems services, and if so which?1. Food production?
2. Carbon sequestration?
3. Soil conservation?
4. Soil fertility?
5. Biodiversity conservation?
6. Watershed improvement?
 |
| How well has the project involved and empowered communities to implement management strategies as they relate to charcoal and SLM in the pilot districts? |
| How has the project incorporated gender issues as the relate to charcoal and SLM? |
| What contributed to the positive achievements? |
| What contributed to lack of progress or slow progress? |

Table 3: List of Supplementary Questions to Guide Focus Group Discussions and Document Review

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Evaluation Subject** | **Evaluation Questions** |
| Project Strategy | **Relevance**: * Are barriers and threats well described?
* Do the proposed solutions address the barriers?
* Are they relevant to the conditions needing to be addressed?
* Were underlying assumptions correctly identified?
* What is the effect of any incorrect assumptions or changes to the context to achieving the project results as outlined in the Project Document?
* Did lessons from other relevant projects inform project design and implementation arrangements?
* Was the logframe logic and ToC clear and adequate?
 |
| Results Framework/ Logframe | **Project Strategy*** Are the project’s objectives and outcomes or components clear, practical, and feasible within its time frame?
* Are the log-­‐frame indicators and targets “SMART” and gender disaggregated?
* Has progress made so far led to, or could in the future catalyse beneficial development effects (i.e. income generation, gender equality and women’s empowerment, improved governance etc...) that should be included in the project results framework and monitored on an annual basis.
* How are the catalysing effect of the project results being monitored?
 |
| Project Implementation and Adaptive Management | * What is the current project management arrangement?
* What are the SWOT of the current project management arrangements?
* Has it been effective?
* Are responsibilities and reporting lines clear?
* Is decision-­‐making transparent and undertaken in a timely manner?
* Has the Executing Agency/Implementing Partner(s) facilitated project execution adequately?
* What are the recommendations for improvement?
* What lessons can be drawn from this arrangement?
* Has the Partner Agency (UNDP) supported project execution effectively?
* What are the key challenges of project execution?
* What recommendations?
 |
| Work Planning | * Is project implementation in line with the timeline set in the Prodoc?
* If there were delays what caused them?
* What is the likely implication of any delays on the rest of the project timeline?
* Has adaptive management effectively resolved any issues of delays? If no, why not?
* Are work-­‐planning processes results-­‐based?
* Has the results framework/ log-­‐frame been used as a management tool?
* To what end? Has it worked well and if not why not?
* What recommendations?
 |
| Finance and co-finance | * What is the level of expenditure to-­‐date?
* Is this level in line with the original plans in the project budget?
* If not, why have changes occurred? And what are the exact changes?
* Have the appropriate approvals been sort and provided for these changes?
* Has the project been cost effective and what criteria can we use to determine this?
* Does the project have the appropriate financial controls, including reporting and planning, that allow management to make informed decisions regarding the budget and allow for timely flow of funds?
* Has the project mobilized extra funding?
* Has it accessed any co-­‐finance?
* Is co-­‐finance being monitored to confirm the expected situation at project design stage?
 |
| Project level monitoring and review systems | * Does the project use an M&E system?
* Does it involve key partners in M&E?
* Is the M&E linked to partner institutions’ systems?
* Does M&E provide the necessary information efficiently/effectively?
* Is it considered cost-­‐effective?
* Are additional tools required to make M&E more participatory and inclusive?
* Are sufficient resources being allocated to monitoring and review?
* Are these resources being allocated effectively?
 |
| Stakeholder engagement  | * Has the project developed and leveraged the necessary and appropriate partnerships with direct and tangential stakeholders?
* Do local and national government stakeholders support the objectives of the project?
* Do they continue to have an active role in project decision-­‐making that supports efficient and effective project implementation?
* To what extent has stakeholder involvement and public awareness contributed to the progress towards achievement of project objectives
 |
| Reporting and communication | * Have changes made via adaptive management been reported by the project management and approved by the Project Board?
* How well do the Project Team and partners understand and undertake UNDP reporting requirements (i.e. how have they addressed poorly-­‐rated PIRs, if applicable?)
* Have lessons derived from the adaptive management process been documented, shared with key partners and internalized by partners?
* How is internal project communication with stakeholders done?
* Is it regular and perceived to be effective? What is the evidence of that?
* Are there key stakeholders left out of communication?
* Are there feedback mechanisms when communication is received?
* Does this communication with stakeholders contribute to their awareness of project outcomes and activities and investment in the sustainability of project results?
* How does the project communicate with the broader stakeholders? Via a project website?
 |

Table 4: **Financial data capture template**

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Outputs | Planned Budget | Actual expenditure | Variance | Reasons for variance |
| **Project Component 1:** Data collection and improved coordination and enforcement of regulations governing the biomass energy sector, in particular those related to sustainable charcoal | $332,500 |  |  |  |
| **Project Component 2:** Dissemination of appropriate technologies for sustainable charcoal production in selected charcoal-producing districts (Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo). | $1,004,800 |  |  |  |
| Project Component 3: Strengthening the capacity of key stakeholders in SFM and SLM best practices and establishment of sustainable woodlots | $1,968,700 |  |  |  |
| Project Management cost | 174,000 |  |  |  |
| **Total**  | **3,480,000** |  |  |  |
| **Co-financing Arrangements** |
| Partners | Pledged amount | Actual contributed | Variance | Reasons for variance |
| GEF | 3,480,000 |  |  |  |
| UNDP | 1,860,000 |  |  |  |
| Gov’t | 6,928,246 |  |  |  |
| FAO | 1,600,000 |  |  |  |
| UNCDF | 1,300,000 |  |  |  |
| GIZ | 2607562 |  |  |  |
| BTZ | 290,000 |  |  |  |
| **Total**  | **18,065,808** |  |  |  |

# Proposed Mission Schedule

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **#** | **Activity** | **Duration** | **Timeline** | **Responsible** |
| 1 | Sharing of relevant documents | Continuous | Starts on 15 July 2019 | UNDP and Project Team |
| 2 | Inception report preparation | 6 working days | Starts on 15 July 2019 | Consultants |
| 3 | Submission of draft inception report | - | 1st August 2019 | Consultants |
| 4 | Stakeholder mapping and identification | 6 working days | 22 July 2019 | Consultants |
| 9 | International Consultant arrives in Uganda |   | 13th Aug 2019 | UNDP |
| 10 | Briefing meeting with UNDP |   | Morning 14th Aug 2019 | UNDP |
| 11 | Presentation and adoption of inception report | 1 day | afternoon of 14th Aug 2019 | Consultants |
| 12 | Consultative meetings with key stakeholders in Kampala\* | 7 working days | Starts on 14th Aug to 18th August 2019   | Consultants |
| 13 | Filed Visit\*\* |   | Start on 19 August to 28th August 2019 | Consultants |
| 14 | Debriefing meeting with UNDP and project team | 1 day | Morning of 30th August 2019 | Consultants |
| 15 | International consultant departs Uganda |   | Night of 31 August 2019 | UNDP |
| 15 | Draft report Submission |  | 6th Sept 2019 | Consultants |
| 16 | Review and comments (Several revisions and feedback sessions) | 10 working days | 13th September | Consultants, UNDP and Project Team |
| 17 | Submission of final report\*\*\*\* |   | 20th Sept. 2019 | Consultants |

# Annexes

## Annex 1: Terms of References (available on request)

1. **General Information**

**Programme /Project Title:** Addressing barriers to the adoption of improved charcoal production technologies and sustainable land management practices through an integrated approach in Uganda

**Post Title:** International Consultant

**Duty Station:** Home-based with mission travel

**Expected Areas of Travel:** Kampala, Kiboga, Kiryandongo, Mubende and Nakaseke

**Type of Contract:** Individual Consultant

**Languages:** English

**Duration of Contract:** 30 working days spread over a period of two calendar months

**Start Date:** 1 May 2019

1. **Introduction**

In accordance with UNDP and GEF M&E policies and procedures, all full-size UNDP supported GEF financed projects are required to undergo a terminal evaluation upon completion of implementation. These terms of reference (TOR) sets out the expectations for a Terminal Evaluation (TE) of the *Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Practices through an Integrated Approach* (PIMS *#4493*).

**Project Summary Table**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Project Title** | **Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Practices through an Integrated Approach** |
| GEF Project ID: | 4644 |  | *at endorsement (Million US$)* | *at completion (Million US$)* |
| UNDP Project ID: | 00086931 | GEF financing:  | 3,480,000 |  |
| Country: | Uganda | IA/EA own: |  |  |
| Region: | Africa | Government: | 6,928,246 |  |
| Focal Area: | CCM & LD | Other: |  |  |
| FA Objectives, (OP/SP) |  | Total co-financing: |  |  |
| Executing Agency: | Ministry if Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) | Total Project Cost: | 18,065,808 |  |
| Other Partners involved: | MWE, NFA, District Local Governments of Kiboga, Kiryandongo, Mubende and Nakaseke | ProDoc Signature (date project began): | 20 May 2014 |
| (Operational) Closing Date: | Proposed: 20 May 2018 | Actual: 20 November 2019 |

1. **Background**

Biomass is the main source of energy in Uganda, contributing about 94% of all energy consumed. Of the total biomass consumed, wood fuel accounts for about 80%, charcoal 10% and crop residues 4%. Firewood and crop residues are majorly consumed in rural areas while charcoal is consumed in urban areas. Limited storage space in urban areas, high standards of living, higher calorific value of charcoal than for wood and easier handling by vendors makes charcoal the favoured fuel over firewood in urban areas.

Recent estimates indicate that the demand for charcoal has been increasing steadily at an estimated 6% per annum. This demand is attributed to a high rate of urbanization coupled with a rapidly increasing population, as well as high cost of using electricity especially for cooking and heating purposes. Notwithstanding its popularity, the charcoal sub-sector remains plagued by inefficient production practices, lack of sustainable supplies of woody biomass and inadequate, often conflicting, policy statements.

To address the barriers that impede sustainable charcoal production, the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development (MEMD) on behalf of Government of Uganda is, with support from UNDP Green Environment Facility (UNDP-GEF) implementing a project: Addressing Barriers to Adoption of Improved Charcoal Production Technologies and Sustainable Land Practices through an Integrated Approach (Green Charcoal Project).

The objective of the project is to secure multiple environmental benefits by addressing the twin challenges of unsustainable utilization of fuel wood (including charcoal) and poor land management practices common in Uganda’s woodlands through technology transfer, enhancement of the national policy framework and promotion of Sustainable Land Management (SLM) and Sustainable Forest Management (SFM) practices.

The project implemented since May 2014 involves piloting low carbon emission sustainable charcoal technologies and broader sustainable land and forest management practices in four districts: Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo.

1. **Objective and Scope**

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

1. assess the achievement of project results, and
2. draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project, and aid in the overall enhancement of UNDP programming
3. **Evaluation Approach and Method**

An overall approach and method for conducting project terminal evaluations of UNDP supported GEF financed projects has developed over time. The evaluator is expected to frame the evaluation effort using the criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact, as defined and explained in the UNDP Guidance for Conducting Terminal Evaluations of UNDP-supported, GEF-financed Projects.

A set of questions covering each of these criteria have been drafted and are included with this TOR (fill in Annex C) The evaluator is expected to amend, complete and submit this matrix as part of an evaluation inception report, and shall include it as an annex to the final report.

The evaluation must provide evidence‐based information that is credible, reliable and useful. The evaluator is expected to follow a participatory and consultative approach ensuring close engagement with government counterparts, in particular the GEF operational focal point, UNDP Country Office, project team, UNDP GEF Technical Adviser based in the region and key stakeholders. The evaluator is expected to conduct a field mission to Uganda, including the following project sites (Mubende, Kiboga, Nakaseke and Kiryandongo). Interviews will be held with the following organizations and individuals at a minimum:

1. Leadership of the Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development
2. Officials of the Renewable Energy Department in Ministry of Energy and Mineral Development
3. Select officials from the Ministry of Water and Environment
4. Select officials of the Ministry of Agriculture, Animal Industry and Fisheries
5. Select officials of the National Forestry Authority
6. Select officials of the Nyabyeya Forestry College
7. Leadership of Kiboga District Local Government
8. Kiboga District Natural Resources department
9. Leadership of Kiryandogo District Local Government
10. Kiryandogo District Natural Resources department
11. Leadership of Mubende District Local Government
12. Mubende District Natural Resources department
13. Leadership of Nakaseke District Local Government
14. Nakaseke District Natural Resources department
15. Officials of UNDP RSCA and UNDP Uganda

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

1. **Evaluation Criteria and Ratings**

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

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

1. **Project Finance/ Cofinance**

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

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

1. **Mainstreaming**

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

1. **Impact**

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

1. **Conclusions****, recommendations & lessons**

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

1. **Implementation arrangements**

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

1. **Evaluation timeframe**

The total duration of the evaluation will be 30 days (spread over two calendar months) according to the following plan:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **Activity** | **Timing** | **Completion Date** |
| **Preparation** | 04 days | 10 May 2019 |
| **Evaluation Mission** | 15 days | 31 May 2019 |
| **Draft Evaluation Report** | 09 days | 14 June 2019 |
| **Final Report** | 02 days | 28 June 2019 |
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