# Executive summary

**Brief description of project**

1. While Mt Elgon offers a variety of ecosystem services essential to the livelihoods of the communities living there, the ability of the ecosystem to continue providing these services has been diminished substantially. This is mostly due to (a) the deforestation of roughly 60% of land now occupied by agriculture and human settlement, and (b) the degradation of land.
2. Drivers of land degradation include insecure land tenure, exploitation of resources, unsustainable agricultural practices, soil erosion, lack of integrated land-use planning (including the lack of effective natural resource mapping). These drivers are all exacerbated by climate change.
3. As a result, the project under evaluation aimed to curb land degradation and enhance ecosystem health by contributing to improved livelihoods and resilience of the ecosystem through the use of integrated landscape management approaches. The project objective was *to empower communities in Mt Elgon to manage their production landscapes in an integrated manner for improved livelihoods and ecosystem resilience*.
4. To achieve this objective, the project had two main components. This first was to raise awareness among district authorities and local communities on SLM, SFM and CCM technologies and approaches. The project aimed to strengthen the general knowledge of the location of Mt Elgon natural resources, land degradation and GHG emission status through the development of community resource maps. Based on the resource maps, the project planned to support the development of Land Use Plans working at both the landscape and household level (farm planning). The project sought to strengthen the enforcement of land legislation and the rights of land occupiers in the Mt Elgon area. The project also aimed to support the mainstreaming of sustainable land management (SLM), sustainable forest management (SFM) and climate change mitigation (CCM) into District Development Plans (DDP).
5. Under the second component, the project aimed to adopt and use the Food and Agriculture Organisation’s Farmer Field School approach[[1]](#footnote-1) in the districts of intervention, providing training in SLM, SFM, CCM technologies and approaches for local farmers. Under this component, the project sought to implement pilots to showcase and support the uptake of SLM, SFM and CCM technologies and approaches such as conservation agriculture practices, afforestation and tree planting. The component also sought to strengthen partnerships and collaboration between public and private sectors to better secure farmers’ access to inputs, markets and technical support and advice. Frameworks to monitor carbon emissions and sequestration and soil erosion were also going to be developed and implemented by the project. Finally, the project also sought to collect, compile, and disseminate best practices and lessons learned for related on-going and future initiatives in the region.
6. The project focused on three districts in particular: Mbale, Manafwa and Bulambuli, and more specifically 6 sub-counties: Wanale and Nyondo in Mbale District, Khabutoola and Nalondo in Manafwa District, and Sisiyi and Namisuni in Bulambuli District. The selection of these districts and sub-counties was done by local stakeholders with guidance from consultants based on the degree of ecosystem degradation, levels of poverty and potential to make change.[[2]](#footnote-2)
7. In line with the UNDP Evaluation Guidance for GEF Financed Projects[[3]](#footnote-3), as well as the UNDP Evaluation Guidelines[[4]](#footnote-4) developed by the Independent Evaluation Office of the UNDP, the Terminal Evaluation of the “Integrated Landscape Management for Improved Livelihoods and Ecosystem Resilience in Mount Elgon” is being undertaken at the completion of the project to assess performance (in terms of relevance, effectiveness and efficiency), and determine outcomes and impacts (actual and potential) stemming from the project, including their sustainability. As is standard for GEF-financed projects, the evaluation has two primary purposes:
	1. To provide evidence of results to meet accountability requirements, and
	2. To promote operational improvement, learning and knowledge sharing through results and lessons learned among UNDP, MAAIF and project partners.

**Brief Report on Project Results Achievement**

1. Annex 1 provides a detailed report on the achievement of project results within the Results Framework and C. Project Results and Impacts provides the detailed narrative. Below is a brief summary of the project results.
2. For Outcome 1; Output 1.1. and 1.2. were successful, resource maps and land use plans were developed for all 33 parishes. Output 1.3. achieved partial success, gap analysis study was done, two of three by-laws were implemented, with NEMA following up on the last by-law. For Output 1.4, a monitoring framework has been developed but has not been implemented at the time of project closure. For Output 1.5. all three districts have mainstreamed SLM, SFM, and CCM into their district development planning processes, with some annual budget allocations in one district.
3. For Outcome 2; Output 2.1. was not achieved by project closure, Output 2.2. was partially achieved, although no action plan was put in place, farmers had been equipped and connected to the private sector and cooperatives had been formed (with Ministry of Trade, Industry and Cooperatives taking this forward). Output 2.3. was successfully implemented with CBOs implementing SLM, SFM technologies, and additionally there has been evidence uptake beyond the project intervention areas. For Output 2.4. for carbon sequestration and soil erosion monitoring frameworks have been established with limited implementation. For Output 2.5. best practices have not been fully documented although uptake of best practices in SLM and SFM technologies have taken place in neighbouring sub-counties of project intervention areas.

**Main Findings**

1. The below section summarizes the key findings of the Terminal Evaluation detailed in the content of this report.
2. **Project Design:** The project document and its results framework was country-driven and addressed key national priorities related to sustainable land management and climate change[[5]](#footnote-5). The design did not include a Theory of Change and one had to be reconstructed for the purpose, which was used to guide the evaluation in terms of overall project impact. The overall objective, components and outcomes were generally feasible and practical in terms of the time frame of the project.[[6]](#footnote-6) Overall the results framework was clear with SMART indicators, and gender-disaggregation. Despite the results framework having clear ecosystem-based and capacity-development objective-level indicators (in the form of GEF tracking tools), the evaluators noted that there were no livelihood indicators to track progress towards “enhanced livelihoods”. As a result, the evaluators made some suggestions on how these could have been included in the design.[[7]](#footnote-7) The results framework would have benefitted from having clear outcome-level indicators and targets. Examples of these have been suggested.[[8]](#footnote-8) Based on the level of changes and challenges faced during implementation, the evaluators believe more effective stakeholder engagement and partnership, including capacity assessments should have been done at design.[[9]](#footnote-9)
3. **Project Implementation and Execution:** The project underwent *changes in project implementation*, all of which were formally recorded. These included (a) going directly through CBOs to implement their land use plans and SLM technologies and pilot demo sites (which the evaluators found was the most successful part of the project)[[10]](#footnote-10) (b) small changes in collaboration partners (including a. and the partnership with Busitema that was not planned during design), (c) delays in implementation that necessitated an 18-month no-cost extension.
4. The first two changes (a) and (b) affected the project positively in that results were achieved successfully, and evidence has demonstrated that the potential for sustaining these results are high.[[11]](#footnote-11)
5. The third (c), affected the project negatively in that certain results were not achieved within the timeframe of the project, despite an 18-month extension having been granted. Reasons for this are attributed to prolonged uncertainty on who and how the output (specifically Output 2.1) was to be achieved due to disagreements between MAAIF and UNDP, delays in procuring consultants (including challenges in finding suitable candidates), and finally when work plans and commitments had been put in place (more than a year into the 18-month extension), COVID-19 forced the project co further postpone resulting in the result not being achieved by project closure.[[12]](#footnote-12)
6. Unnecessary delays contributed to the lack of results achievement discussed above, most notably, the delay in setting up the PMU. The project was delayed by one year because MAAIF had not been able to set up the PMU. The PMU was eventually set up directly by UNDP as agreed by the Project Board in June 2017.[[13]](#footnote-13)
7. Project finance and expenditure was reported on annually. The evaluators found high variances between planned and actual expenditure by year, particularly in the first year. This can be attributed to the delays experience in the first year where virtually no activities were implemented. Huge discrepancies exist between co-financing committed at project design and actual co-financing realized during project implementation. Complete co-financing expenditure information was not received for the evaluation and thus the evaluators can only assume that either reporting was weak, or co-financing in the form that was committed was not realised.[[14]](#footnote-14)
8. The grant mechanism, although effectively implemented overall, posed some administrative challenges, and the project team highlighted that in hindsight it would have been more efficient (and opened up more time to do more technical aspects) to have used an intermediary to administer the grant.[[15]](#footnote-15)
9. M&E plan included the basic requirements, although the results framework would have benefitted from some minor improvements on the output-level indicators, and the inclusion of outcome-level indicators in the results framework.[[16]](#footnote-16) Implementation of M&E was done through quarterly reporting, PIR reporting and the M&E framework.
10. Risks management was generally well-managed with the exception of the risks to implementation arrangements that caused unnecessary delays in some aspects of the project already covered in the paragraphs above.
11. **Project results and impacts:** *Outcome 1* has largely been successfully achieved. Land-use plans were developed for all parishes and these have been mainstreamed into district development plans in all three districts. Clause adoption has achieved more limited success, although evidence suggests that their adoption is ongoing beyond project closure. Monitoring and enforcement mechanisms have been put in place and integrated into district annual workplans.[[17]](#footnote-17) *Outcome 2* has had been very successfully achieved in terms of the empowerment aspect and demo sites with communities, but only partially achieved on some of its outputs by project closure. Implementation delays affected particularly Output 2.1 which was not achieved within the timeframe of the project (although it is clear from the evidence provided to the evaluators that workplans and commitments had been made to finalise this post-project). Some achievement had been made towards strengthening public-private collaboration to improve farmers’ access to inputs, but the Action Plan was not fully developed or implemented. The implementation of SLM and SFM at community level was highly successful and evidence suggests uptake, replication, and sustaining of project results. Monitoring frameworks for carbon sequestration and soil erosion had been developed and put in place, but implementation is limited due to low capacity at district level. A best practices document was not developed, although best practices from the SLM interventions have been replicated and upscaled into neighbouring areas of project intervention sites.[[18]](#footnote-18)
12. *Relevance:* The project was well-aligned to country priorities at government level (predominantly through the NDPII and ASSP), and within the UN country framework (UNDAF and CPAP). Stakeholder engagement during project implementation was strong (e.g. representation on the project board, representation at Inception Meeting including update of recommendations from stakeholders into project implementation such as the direct implementation of some outputs by communities, level of engagement of local-level government).
13. *Effectiveness:* The project did not manage to fully achieve on all its outputs. Some activities that could have been realistically achieved within the project timeframe were not because of implementation-related delays (such as the action plan for public-private collaboration, the FFS training, the best practices documentation), other activities were overly ambitious (such as the carbon monitoring framework). Despite this, the project managed to make some impactful achievements in terms of the wider Theory of Change, particularly in relation to community empowerment and uptake towards SLM integration into farming to enhance resilience and ecosystem health in the project areas of Mt Elgon.[[19]](#footnote-19)
14. *Efficiency:* The project faced several delays including losing the first year because the PMU was not set up, which ultimately resulted in the project not achieving some of its outputs within the project timeframe despite the granting of an 18-month no-cost extension. There were some variances between years, but the project was generally cost-efficient in terms of its expenditure in relation to outcome.[[20]](#footnote-20)
15. *Overall project outcome:* Considering the above paragraphs, overall achievement of outputs is moderately satisfactory. Some elements were highly successful, especially the community engagement, the use of community championships, gender empowerment through women leadership of community implementation of SLM and SFM activities. The landscape planning and management processes were certainly an improvement from what was there before (the project managed to have digitized, and integrated land use planning conducted for all 33 parishes). Local communities were empowered to apply technologies and approaches to reverse land degradation and reduce GHG emissions through the adoption of technologies in the project areas, but also through the replication of neighbouring communities who saw for themselves that the technologies worked and supported improvements in livelihoods.
16. *Sustainability:* Several examples of financial commitment suggest that project results will be sustained, especially at community level.[[21]](#footnote-21) Empowerment of communities, including women empowerment, has resulted in community-championship of SLM interventions and further uptake; government at various levels has seen the success of community engagement and has demonstrated political support for further uptake.[[22]](#footnote-22) In terms of governance and legal frameworks, land use plans and by-laws are progressing forward, the inter-ministerial taskforce is a good reflection of a wider and more programmatic approach to SLM and wider adoption of project successes have been demonstrated through a NEMA-led project to upscale SLM into the wider Mt Elgon landscape.[[23]](#footnote-23) Environmental sustainability has been improved through the project in relation to the environmental risks encountered prior to project implementation.[[24]](#footnote-24)
17. *Gender empowerment:* Gender empowerment was particularly strong in this project as demonstrated by the level of women leadership and championship of SLM interventions in the project areas. The Gender Action Plan was developed late (half-way through project implementation) and the project would have benefitted from an action plan of this level of quality if it been done at PPG phase. However, the evaluators found that women empowerment particularly was demonstrated in the monitoring of the results framework (particularly at community level).

**Conclusions**

1. The project faced implementation challenges that put project results attainment at risk. Unnecessarily delaying some output implementations until the very last months (March – August 2020) of an already maximised project time-frame[[25]](#footnote-25) increased vulnerability of the project to external risks, which is exactly what happened when the COVID-19 pandemic restricted project implementation in the final months of the project. In fact, the project should have been under final operational closure in these months (and not in “starting phases” of output implementation). If it had been, it would not have been as affected by COVID-19 as it was.
2. The finalisation of Output 2.1 (the FFS training) merits discussion, because the evaluators were provided with evidence that in fact funding was committed (funds transfer dated 26 August), and MAAIF commitment through work plans signed off by the Permanent Secretary had been approved by the Project Board, all before project closure. This evidence was provided during the finalisation of this TE report, and shows that activities of this output will be finalised by the end of the year (2020). However, the international evaluator is limited to assessing the project results attainment within the timeframe of the project (which officially closed 31 August 2020). Whether the output will or will not be achieved beyond project closure cannot be assessed by the TE. GEF rules stipulate that no extensions can be provided beyond the 18 months that had already been provided to the project. A recommendation is made by the evaluator in the finalisation of project results for specific outputs that were not achieved within the timeframe of this project, but this is placed in the context of GEF rules and regulations, and the IA, EA and GEF will need to take this matter forward accordingly. Specific recommendations are made below in relation to the finalisation and sustaining of some outputs that were not finalised within the project time frame (Recommendation Category A below).
3. The Government of Uganda had made a large co-financing commitment in project design of which the majority was not realised, at least in terms of expenditure reporting made available to the evaluators. Similarly, expenditure reporting for the majority of the co-financing contribution from UNDP was also not available for the evaluators to assess where exactly the co-financing was used to achieve project results. GEF funding is supposed to be an incremental contribution, not the core contribution, towards what are essentially government-led projects. GEF additionality is a new section for evaluators to consider in GEF-funded project evaluations, and future project design will be focusing more on co-financing commitments and realisations thereof in project implementation. Co-financing that is committed at project design should be reported on, and a lesson from this project has been included in the lessons learnt for future project design.
4. UNDP had to take over some of the executive functions of MAAIF during project implementation, including the setup of the PMU and direct recruitment and sometimes even management of project outputs. This leads the evaluators to question why the HACT capacity assessment that was used for project design had not picked up some limitations of MAAIF as an executing partner. Similarly, recruitment of appropriate staff and consultants proved difficult (e.g. FFS, gender). On the other hand, MAAIF was convinced that it had the in-house capacity to conduct the FFS training, and there was resultant to-and-fro between UNDP and MAAIF about whether external (or FAO) consultants should be used or not. Improved capacity assessment (HACT) of the EA may have supported a better understanding of this capacity or limits thereof.
5. In summary, even with the project extension, some outputs were not fully delivered. Some other outputs demonstrated successful (or, in some cases over-) achievement. Results overall in terms of the project’s results framework were not fully achieved.
6. That said, the project demonstrated achievements in terms of its outcomes and overall objective within the framework of the reconstructed Theory of Change that illustrates that the project was impactful in what it set out to achieve within the broader aims of SLM in Mt Elgon.
7. The project aimed to decrease land degradation and enhance ecosystem health by using landscape management approaches and SLM, SFM and CCM technologies with communities to improve livelihoods and enhance resilience among people and ecosystems. The two strategic, higher-level questions guiding the evaluation linked to its two outcomes were (a) did the project success in integrating and improving landscape planning and management processes in the three project districts? and (b) did the project contribute to empowering communities in Mt Elgon to manage their production landscapes in an integrated manner?
8. Based on the evidence provided to the evaluators of uptake and integration of land use planning in the districts, the integration of monitoring frameworks to support measuring land condition improvements, and the successful uptake and ownership at community-level of the SLM and SFM demonstrations, as well as the replication into areas outside of project intervention, it seems that the project did indeed contribute substantially to both improved landscape planning and improved community management of their production landscapes. The extent of this has been demonstrated in the results section of this report. The recommendations provided below will further strengthen this contribution toward impact and sustainability.
9. Additionally, and in particular reference to community championship, the evaluators believe that the community-led approach had a significant impact in terms of sustaining project result, and move to impact in the TOC. This is evidenced by strong community ownership and uptake, longer-term savings schemes generated (through training and community empowerment as a result of allowing communities to lead activities instead of one company), and thus sustainability of results at least in terms of community-related SLM, SFM and CCM interventions.
10. The project fit well within the larger programmatic approach of the Government (in relation to its inter-ministerial task force on SLM) relevant to country development priorities (e.g. NDPII) and should be seen as a leverage point for further catalytic action towards more systems and holistic SLM across wider landscapes.
11. The evaluators believe that the community-led approach had a significant impact in terms of sustaining project result. This is evidenced by strong community ownership and uptake, longer-term savings schemes generated (through training and community empowerment as a result of allowing communities to lead activities instead of one company), and thus sustainability of results at least in terms of community-related SLM, SFM and CCM interventions.
12. Based on the above considerations, the project, overall, is given a rating of ***Moderately*** ***Satisfactory***, with the summary table provided below (see Table 4 in main report for description of rating system).

Table 2. Summary of project ratings (as guided by the 2020 UNDP Terminal Evaluation Guidance for GEF-financed Projects)

| **Criterion** | **Rating** | **Summarized Notes** | **Rating number** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Monitoring and Evaluation** | **MS**  |  | **4** |
| M&E Design at Entry | MS | Clear plan for M&E outlined in project document, logical framework mostly clear, some indicators could have been more “SMART”, no outcome-level indicators.  | (4) |
| M& Implementation | MS | M&E reporting was conducted and coordinated by the PMU with a dedicated staff member (although this member also had other responsibilities), GEF tracking tools reported on but not clear how tracking was done and by whom, M&E did not allow for adaptive management in regard to achievement of some outputs, Terminal Evaluation was delayed and overlapped with project closure. | (4) |
| **UNDP Implementation/Oversight and Implementation Partner Execution** | **MU** |  | **3** |
| Quality of UNDP Implementation/Oversight | MU | Insufficient co-finance reporting, implementation and oversight issues related to results achievements of some of the outputs, not enough contingency put in place to deal with disagreements with EA, generally some good risk management procedures put in place re COVID-19 (e.g. adaptations to deal with meeting restrictions), PMU good relationship with stakeholders | (3) |
| Quality of Implementing Partner Execution | MU | Huge variance in co-finance committed versus reported as spent, causing delays such as the delayed set up of the PMU, lack of achieving certain outputs despite extension time awarded, good community empowerment aspects | (3) |
| **Assessment of Outcomes** | **MS** |  | **4** |
| Relevance | S | Well-aligned to country priorities, UNDAF and CPAP frameworks, aligned to gender mainstreaming, stakeholder engagement strong | (5) |
| Effectiveness | MS | Mixed level of success with regard to output achievements, even with 18-month extension some outputs were not achieved, strong community engagement, ownership and move to impact | (4) |
| Efficiency | MS | Many project delays, including the set-up of the PMU, and some important outputs not being achieved even in a realistic time frame | (4) |
| **Sustainability** | **L** |  | **4** |
| Financial resources | L | Ongoing support through grant mechanisms to CBOs, saving schemes by CBOs, other financing support, district government budgeting, setting up farmer cooperatives, support funding to by-laws | (4) |
| Socio-political | L | Community empowerment and uptake strong, women empowerment strong, high level support from MAAIF | (4) |
| Institutional framework and governance | L | Legal frameworks put in place, levels of commitment by government demonstrated, further project submitted to GEF by NEMA and UNEP to upscale elements of this project | (4) |
| Environmental | L | Ongoing SLM technologies to continue improving ecosystem health, environmental sustainability more secure now than before project started (based on GEF tracking tools and SLM technologies stabilizing soil structure and health) | (4) |
| **Overall Project Rating** | **MS** | **Project had some impactful achievements and there is some evidence pointing to move to impact as per the Theory of Change mostly due to community empowerment through adoption of SLM, SFM and CCM technologies, improved land use planning and improved land condition monitoring frameworks in place, but there were some issues with implementation and not all project outputs were achieved in time for project closure despite the 18-month no-cost extension.**  | **4** |

**Recommendations**

Table 3. TE Recommendations for the ILM Mt Elgon Project

| **Rec #** | **TE Recommendation** | **Entity Responsible** | **Time Frame** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **A** | **Category A: Ensuring (necessary) final project results achievement** |  |  |
| A.1. | Ensure bylaws are effectively finalised and enforced. NEMA to facilitate this process to fruition using the following steps: (a) bottom-up verification process at parish level should be conducted to get final buy-in from resistant community members, (b) submitting and tabling at sub-county, district, and finally Attorney General level (for verification and validation with existing laws) and (c) final gazetting.  | NEMA, District Government and Ministry of Justice  | Latest by end of 2021 |
| A.2. | Ensure final reporting on lessons learnt and uptake as per Output 2.5 (particularly include CBO and women empowerment aspects of this project). | UNDP CO/MAAIF (under supervision of project board) | ASAP |
| A.3. | Finalise FFS training as planned under MAAIF (dependent on agreements and rules by GEF). | MAAIF | End of 2020 |
| A.4. | Continue supporting the forming of cooperatives to improve farmer access to markets. | MTIC | ASAP and ongoing |
| **B** | **Category B: Sustaining and further catalysing results for TOC impact** |  |  |
| B.1.  | Provide continued platform for successful CBOs to share stories, support training in future replication, farmer-exchange visits. | MAAIF | Without limit to time frame |
| B.2.  | This recommendation is specifically to be included in the project design for the project by NEMA/UNEP (concept development support from MAAIF) on SLM implementation in the broader Mt Elgon region. Integrate community empowerment, women leadership and lessons below into the GEF-cycle concept development that aims to catalyse and replicate aspects of this project into the entire Mt Elgon ecosystem. (See paragraph 222 under “Institutional framework and governance sustainability” for background). | NEMA/MAAIF | Into Project Document of the project to be developed (time frame depending on PPG phase) |

**Lessons Learned**

1. **Lesson 1: It is important to conduct comprehensive capacity assessment and effective stakeholder engagement (including community empowerment options) at design phase**
2. Implementation challenges and changes were faced by the project. A lesson to be learnt from these challenges is the importance of conducting comprehensive capacity assessments of the executing agency in terms of capacity to manage the project but also to implement certain activities in-house. Conducting a more robust stakeholder engagement process and mapping of capacity within the country in relation to specific outputs (either at onset of project or, preferably, at design) can further enhance ownership and sustaining of project results.
3. **Lesson 2: Community empowerment (and encouraging women leadership) can have a much more sustained impact (and be more cost-effective)**
4. The greatest success factor of this project was the change from design to implementation (based on stakeholder pressure) to do a grant mechanism and empower (through training and facilitative support) CBOs to lead and run the initiatives directly. This might be more risky in terms of financial oversight (good training, trust building and good but not too limiting oversight can overcome this risk) but the reward is much higher – especially in terms of longer-term impact and sustaining of project results.
5. **Lesson 3: Devolving grant mechanism coordination to an intermediary (preferably an NGO who can do this in a programmatic way) might simplify project management responsibilities for PMUs**
6. The UNDP CO and PMU spent much of their implementation time on administering the grant (without human resources or sufficient capacity) to 33 different parishes. It might simplify project management and implementation procedures to allow a capacitated NGO or other implementing partner to do this, and supporting them instead with a small management fee, possibly building in a programmatic approach here (or if there is an existing and operational government grant mechanism, using that). The UNDP Low Value Grant Guidance allows for intermediary administration of a grant mechanism provided a HACT assessment is conducted.
7. **Lesson 4: Championship is key to project results attainment and sustainability, catalytic role and replication**
8. This lesson can be taken in two contexts, namely (a) champion farmers and CBO representatives, who allow for social spread more rapidly as they have trust and respect in their communities, and (2) champion project partners, whose commitment goes beyond the tick-box project implementation, and often results in a much higher and more impactful project.
9. Lifting, rewarding and further empowering those champions who go the extra mile will have a reinforcing feedback loop effect on longer-term impact.
1. FFS is an approach to extension that is based on the concepts and principles of people-centred learning and was developed as an alternative to the conventional, top-down, extension approaches. It uses innovative and participatory methods to create a learning environment, including learning networks, in which land users have the opportunity to learn for themselves about particular production problems, and ways to address them, through their own observation, discussion and participation in practical learning-by-doing field exercises. FFS serve as pilots for conservation agriculture technologies and approaches for improved land management and livelihoods of smallholder farmers; they are particularly suited for the intervention of the project. [↑](#footnote-ref-1)
2. Selection done during PPG phase. [↑](#footnote-ref-2)
3. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/documents/guidance/GEF/UNDP-GEF-TE-Guide.pdf> [↑](#footnote-ref-3)
4. <http://web.undp.org/evaluation/guideline/> [↑](#footnote-ref-4)
5. See paragraph 64. [↑](#footnote-ref-5)
6. See paragraph 67. [↑](#footnote-ref-6)
7. See paragraph 72-74. [↑](#footnote-ref-7)
8. See paragraph 69-71. [↑](#footnote-ref-8)
9. See paragraphs 83-87. Implementation changes were made in e.g. direct use of communities instead of private company to implement ILM technologies; there was pressure from MAAIF to directly implement some activities themselves instead of using activities (e.g. Output 2.1) but attempts were made by UNDP to source consultants without success, Busitema University for Output 1.1 and 1.2 could have been hired at the onset if there had been more partnership capacity assessments conducted at design. [↑](#footnote-ref-9)
10. See paragraphs 98, 177-179, 186, but also the whole section under Sustainability, Catalytic/Replication Effect and Progress to Impact [↑](#footnote-ref-10)
11. See section under Sustainability. [↑](#footnote-ref-11)
12. See paragraph 139. [↑](#footnote-ref-12)
13. See paragraph [↑](#footnote-ref-13)
14. See paragraphs 113-128. [↑](#footnote-ref-14)
15. See paragraph 126. [↑](#footnote-ref-15)
16. See paragraphs 129-131. [↑](#footnote-ref-16)
17. See paragraphs 152-165. [↑](#footnote-ref-17)
18. See paragraphs 166-186. [↑](#footnote-ref-18)
19. See paragraphs 193-197. [↑](#footnote-ref-19)
20. See paragraphs 198-203. [↑](#footnote-ref-20)
21. See paragraphs 205-212. [↑](#footnote-ref-21)
22. See paragraphs 213-218. [↑](#footnote-ref-22)
23. See paragraphs 219-222. [↑](#footnote-ref-23)
24. See paragraphs 223-227. [↑](#footnote-ref-24)
25. Referring to the 18-month no-cost extension that extended the project by 1.5 years. [↑](#footnote-ref-25)