

|

Executive Summary

The IUCN designed the Securing Rights and Restoring Lands for Improved Livelihoods project (referred

scale of these successes to have broader impact on the social, economic and environmental improvements.

5. Project delays have affected the impact and sustainability. The overall impact of the project has been decreased by a range of exogenous and endogenous factors, which have delayed implementation. In Jordan, there were long lead-in times to secure access rights; in Botswana, the project faced challenges due to the remoteness of the sites and the lack of a field officer; in Mali, conflict has had a significant impact on the ability to implement; and, finally in Sudan, delays were caused due to relationships with Government and local partners, and difficulties faced when setting up an office.
6. Lack of technical and socio-economic monitoring. Across the program, there has been a lack of available data with which to monitor impact. For many of the sites, baseline studies have not been undertaken. Where baseline studies do exist, monitoring of social, economic and environmental indicators has not taken place. This has made it somewhat difficult for the evaluators to effectively assess all the indicators particularly in terms of effectiveness and efficiency.

Recommendations

The recommendations are designed to inform IUCN Drylands Initiative as this is an end of project evaluation.

1. Continue to support the development of national policy and strategies. Significant resources have been invested in improving the national policy agenda, which should continue to be supported through forums and dialogue to convert specific strategies or policies into action on the ground. The strategy for controlling *Prosopis* in Botswana, and the ongoing implementation of the National Rangelands Strategy with the Hima approach in Jordan are two examples of where continued support could be particularly valuable.
2. Continue to support successful pilots. Successful sites can be used as national and international champions, and support should be given to replicate endeavours. There is a risk that successful pilots that are the basis of the success stories in this project may not receive support into the future.

wider dry landscape issues and gathered large interest, particularly when shared with TV and media. This type of communication was much more effective at raising the level of knowledge on issues being considered, while also garnering support for policy and implementation.

7. Ensure timeliness in the programme. The approach of CEMPs relies on a strong level of community engagement and buy-in that creates shared and mutual accountability across the project stakeholders. While this is clearly positive in terms of the sustainability and impact of the project, it is also a time-consuming process. More time should be factored in at the beginning of projects, as well as the provision of ongoing support. It is however recognised that project timeframes can restrict the first best solutions.

Acronyms

AWO	[Jordan] Arab Women's Organisations
CBO	Community-based Organisation
CBNRM	Community-based Natural Resources Management
CEAP	Community Environment Action Plans
CEDARE	The Centre for Environment and Development for the Arab Region and Europe
CEMP	Community Environmental Management Plan
COR	Office of the Commissioner for Refugees, Sudan
CSD	[United Nations] Commission on Sustainable Development
DFID	[UK] Department for International Development
DFRR	[Botswana] Department for Forestry and Rangeland Resources
ECOWAS	Economic Community of West African States
ELD	Economics of Land Degradation
ENRTP	Environment and Natural Resources Thematic Programme
ESRC	[UK] Social and Economic Research Council
FAO	[United Nations] Food and Agriculture Organisation
FNC	[Sudan] Forests National Corporation
GEF	[World Bank] Global Environment Facility
ICARDA	International Center for Agricultural Research in the Dry Areas
IFAD	International Fund for Agricultural Development
IGAD	Intergovernmental Authority on Development (Eritrea, Ethiopia, Kenya, Somalia, Sudan and Uganda)
IPCC	Inter-governmental Panel on Climate Change
IUCN	International Union for Conservation of Nature
JSOF	Jordanian Society for Organic Farming
MAGREB	The Maghreb Economic Community of North Africa
MOA	[Jordan] Ministry of Agriculture
NCARE	[Jordan] National Centre for Agricultural Research and Extension
NFTP	Non-Timber Forest Products
NGO	Non-governmental Organisation
ORASECOM	Orange-Senqu River Basin Commission
SADC	Southern African Development Community
TAC	Technical Advisory Committee
ToC	Theory of Change
UNCBD	OrD -.001outFun -1643.4(Ofrnmen)6.2(tal25sation)]TVTc 0 Tw (ORASECOM)Tnd Extensi.3(o9n)

Final Project Evaluation of Securing Rights and Restoring Lands for Improved Livelihoods

General Overview 24

Result 1: Dryland landscapes sustainably and equitably through strengthened institutional arrangements 25

Result 2: Security of access to ecosystem services 25

Result 3: Economic and income generating options for rural communities 26

Result 4: Policy development at local, national, regional, and transnational levels 24

Introduction

The IUCN designed the Securing Rights and Restoring Lands for Improved Livelihoods project (referred hereafter simply as 'the project') in response to concerns about desertification, which were raised in Millennium Ecosystem Assessments. The project seeks to ensure the sustainable management of ecosystems services as the basis for improving livelihoods. This is achieved through providing more secure land rights, better management, and enhanced income generation opportunities. The project includes partners in each country of intervention: Veld Products Research and Development (VPR&D) and the Department of Forestry and Rangeland Resources in Botswana; the Jordan Ministry of Agriculture (MOA) and Arab Women's Organisation (AWO) and Jordanian Society for Organic Farming (JSOF) in Jordan; the Consortium, Donko (Douentza) in Mali; and the Forests National Corporation (FNC) in Sudan. The project is implemented in diverse dryland areas. The project started in December 2009 and ran for five years, with a final evaluation from Jan 2014 to Dec 2014.

The evaluation focuses on the four objectives of the program:

Dryland landscapes sustainably and equitably managed, including the restoration of degraded areas based on strengthened institutional arrangements.

Security of access rights to private and common ecosystem services strengthened, with special attention to those important to women and vulnerable groups

Economic and income generating options for rural communities explored and supported based on natural resource commodities and on valuations of ecosystem services.

Policies informed and influenced at local, national, regional and global levels

The project was initially developed in advance of any global strategy to rangelands by IUCN. However, recognising the importance of protecting rangelands, particularly in terms of linking secure land rights to livelihoods, the project has provided the foundations for IUCN to develop a global strategy. As a result, the project is strongly aligned with IUCN's global approach and continues to be used as a global program.

The midterm review of the project in 2012 found that in general, project implementation had been slow. This was due to various challenges, the most striking being the remote management of the project in the absence of a project field officer, leading to difficulties with fostering strong relationships between government focal persons and community members. Despite challenges, the project in Botswana has made significant strides to engage the community and government through a Prosopis trial, as a result has stimulated the development of district plans to eradicate the invasive alien Prosopis. In Jordan, while there was initially slow development of securing access rights, the model developed has been widely recognised as extremely successful due to the ongoing community engagement and acceptance of the Hima approach. More generally, the confidence and high levels of engagement from the local community is also a positive outcome of the project so far, as well as the influence on other projects in promoting a more participatory approach.

While much has clearly happened since the midterm review, this evaluation takes a more holistic perspective on the project and assesses the relevance,

Methodology

A terms of reference for the evaluation was developed as part of the response to the request for submission as part of the inception process (see Annex 5). The objectives of the evaluation were:

Botswana

General Overview

The Boravast communities are located in Western Botswana on the border with South Africa and Nam

The Garden at Struizendam

The garden at Rappelspan

The camp site on the border of the trans-frontier park which the community have applied to manage. Community focus group in Struizendam as part of the project evaluation.

Result 1: Dryland landscapes sustainably and equitably managed through strengthened institutional arrangements

Activity 1.1. Local institutions supported to implement CEMP

At District and Community level, TAC received training and support from IUCN on the control of Prosopis, which resulted in the development of an integrated management plan for the Boravast Trust. The plan addresses the negative impacts of Prosopis and describes the control methods available. A chemical clearance method has since been successfully tested in a small area at Struizendam with grasses and Acacia visibly returning to the area. The large-scale clearance of Prosopis will likely take place after the Strategy is passed. Work will be done by another agency (already identified) after a full Environmental Impact Assessment has been completed.

The evaluator saw evidence of bush encroachment throughout the area due to over-grazing and it is important that these issues are dealt with in the future. Community representatives did visit Dune Farm—an example of holistic management—in November 2014 to learn about good rangeland management. IUCN also held a Rangeland Conference in May 2014 to initiate discussion on better management of communal land. It is important that IUCN build on the impetus created by this and organise a second workshop that this time also involves private land owners.

Activity 1.3. Field assessment of impact

Field assessment of the impact of the project is available. There was no evidence of monitoring at field-level; this was identified by all as a significant weakness. There are signs that this is changing though: the government are apparently conducting a baseline survey of Prosopis in early 2015 and IUCN had just completed the first baseline livelihoods/socio-economic survey of the sites. The Economic Valuation Study also identified the lack of baseline mapping and data collection. Cadastral mapping of community buildings and the surrounding land cover is recommended to assist decision-making.

Result 2: Security of access rights to ecosystem services

Activity 2.1. Community understand land rights through baseline study and workshops

A land tenure study analysed the national tenure system and presented to the Government Land Board. Because of the sensitivity of the topic the study has since been re-packaged as a research paper by IUCN and published as a book chapter. There has been resistance on this issue from some stakeholders and IUCN did not want to push the issue until the time is right. As a result, the focus of the work shifted to Sustainable Rangeland Management. In particular, 12 members of the Boravast Trust and 11 members of TAC visited Ghanzi

Camp Site on the Borders of Trans-Frontier Park

In 2014 the community wrote to the District Commissioner to ask if they can manage a camp on the border of Transfrontier park, in an area called Two Rivers. The site is currently run by the Wildlife Department. An evaluator was shown the site by the manager of the park. It is currently the only camp on the Botswana side of the park so could offer significant economic potential. The community want to joint-manage the site with the Wildlife Department to begin with; if proceeding well they would later like to take on full ownership and possibly build a guesthouse on the site which could create jobs and diversify livelihoods significantly for the community. The current charge at the site is 20 pula per person for entrance plus 4 pula per vehicle. The site currently contains 3 camp plots, alongside a toilet block. As the community are neighbouring the park, they are entitled to benefit from it as written in the Wildlife legislation. TAC has been fundamental in supporting dialogue with the government on this issue. The community and the TAC met with the Park Manager after a site visit and he was impressed with their professional approach and the method in which they had addressed the issue. The community are now waiting for a response from the District Commissioner on the issue. If successful thorough market research will be required (e.g. what are the costs involved? How many people are likely to visit the site?).

Result 4: Policy development at local, national, regional and global levels

Activity 4.1. Community capacity strengthened to participate in policy processes, and to identify successful strategies and risks

As discussed, CEAPs were successfully used to highlight relevant issues in the communities including the spread of Prosopis and the mis-management of communal lands. These results were later communicated back to the communities to the district government and then to national level.

The capacity of the community has been built to successfully engage with TAC and to provide input into policy processes that affect them. In particular, community institutions – including the Boravast Trust and the Village Development Committee (VDC) – have been strengthened so they may communicate relevant issues to appropriate stakeholders. This has been achieved through continued dialogue with TAC and through the communities' involvement in national stakeholder meetings and forums on the Prosopis Strategy and Sustainable Rangeland Management.

The community also produced a movie which was presented at the 11th Conference of Parties for the United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) to successfully communicate the challenges of invasive species. This was followed by a high-level panel discussion involving representatives from the Government of Botswana, Government of South Africa and the Southern African Development Community (SADC) Secretariat.

Government representatives feel that one of the most significant

Activity 4.2. Forums to link communities with local and district governments – to discuss findings and support integration into policy

The TAC provides the main linkage between the communities and district government. The TAC themselves have been strengthened by the project through their involvement in community pilot projects, district-level workshops and exchange visits. For example, 12 members of the Boravast Trust and 11 members of TAC visited Ghanzi and Ngamiland Districts in November 2014 to learn more about the institutional arrangement and working relationship between the Ngamiland TAC and various community trusts (IUCN-Botswana, 2014). TAC members claimed to have been very motivated and inspired by this trip and the success of the TACs there.

The TAC-Boravast relationship appears to be strong, with evidence that both parties were very much aware of each other's roles. This is despite the absence of a project Field Officer, which for much of the project duration has led to difficulties fostering relationships between the community and government focal persons. The sustainability of this relationship is currently questionable though for a number of reasons: 1) TAC lack staff resources to continue committing the necessary time and resources on Boravast communities and 2) Boravast Trust still requires significant institutional support (see sustainability section).

Activity 4.3. National Parliamentary Committees and media supported to communicate and demonstrate success stories

A media tour is planned at the beginning of 2015 to attend to activities needed in Boravast communities. The media (Botswana radio and newspapers) also reported on the Prosopis case study widely at the time. Throughout the project, a number of regional and national meetings with high visibility hosted results of community identifying and communicating the Prosopis issue to international, regional and national stakeholders.

Activity 4.4. Through the networks of IUCN and its Implementing Partners, successful approaches, practical lessons learnt and policy implications brought to Regional Economic Councils and international fora (MEAs).

In order to ensure that the successful approaches, practical lessons and policy implications are brought to Regional Economic Councils and international fora, the Kalahari Namib project which is co-financing this project established a Regional Steering Committee (includes UN and the governments of Botswana, South Africa and Namibia). The Committee comprises government representatives from the three riparian countries, UN Environment Programme (UNEP), IUCN, SADC, and Orange-Senqu River Basin Commission (OSASECOM). The EC project activities complement the Kalahari Namib Project in Botswana creating the space for successful approaches, practical lessons and policy implications to be shared with OSASECOM and SADC through the Regional Steering Committee.

Impact of Project

Undoubtedly one of the most significant effects of the project has been its influence on national policy, specifically the drafting and review of a strategy on the control of Prosopis. This invasive species is having a detrimental effect on land and water availability and the passing of the strategy and the subsequent control of Prosopis would have a significant impact on the lives

Finally, further support for TAC is likely to be required to ensure the sustainability of the project. TAC report under-resourced especially in terms of staff and transportation. The TAC can't always be available to support Borvast – one possible solution raised at the TAC meeting was that TAC employ somebody to represent with the Trust.

There is still a lot to be done in the communities and with and as such, the sustainability of the project is reliant on further work which is likely to be completed of the co-financed Kalahari-Namib Project (KNP) which ends at the end of March 2015 (but may be extended by twelve months to 2016). IUCN are also to ar

Furthermore, the MoA was strengthened throughout the project through training, capacity building, field visits and more. This involved a range of technical advisors and partners, including ICARDA (including CGIAR Research Program on Climate Change), Global Environment Fund, Fair Trade Jordan, Royal Society for the Conservation and Nature, AECOM (links with their USAID Water Reuse and Environmental Conservation project) and Mercy Corps. Moreover, IUCN provided support on the development of the revisions of the Rangeland Strategy, which is part of the National Agriculture Strategy, and included direct reference to the participatory approach.

Moreover there is significant support by the local institutions, including community / tribal structures, district offices, and others. The reason for this is that the community would prefer to have the community to manage the land due to the costs associated with it; while the community would prefer access to sites that had previously been inaccessible. Therefore, there is widespread support for the CEMP and the participatory approach. This increases the relevance of the project more broadly.

Activity 1.3. Field assessment of impact

Zarqa River Basin was selected as the pilot site based on it being an ecological hotspot. Four sites within the basin were selected based on the ability to have a tangible impact in a short period of time considering the community as well as ecological benefits. However, it is clear from the evaluation that all four sites would not meet those criteria initially set out. Furthermore, there was significant direction from the MoA on which communities and sites should be selected, which meant there was also a change in one of the sites which had not been the most effective pilot. .

There is recognition by all stakeholders that there is a lack of monitoring and impact assessments. NCARE did environmental monitoring in Bani Hashem

Result 2: Security of access rights to ecosystem services

Activity 2.1. Community understand land rights through baseline study and workshops

As AWO, MoA and many others noted, the strength of this the participatory approach. While it is recognised this was the cause of much of the initial delays, potentially taking two years to kick off in two of four case studies, the result is a much greater engagement in the shared visions, problem trees, assessments, scenarios, and thus creating more buy-in for the process and outcomes. The emphasis on gender, environment and land rights has been well understood by the community, who seek community acceptance to Hima land approaches rather than using fences or other methods. The reliance on the rangers is still high for protection.

"The project has shifted the opinion of accountability – not just Government being held accountable by communities, but seeing it as a shared and mutual accountability by stakeholders", AWO

Activity 2.2. Stakeholder dialogues supported

Participatory methodology to work with government and communities is one of the strengths, highlighting the roles and responsibilities of partners. Empowerment of local actors is part of the decision making process facilitated through stakeholder dialogues supported by AWO and their local partners. The result was clearly a high level of stakeholder dialogues at the national and local level across all four Himas.

With the partnership of AWO, there has been strengthened engagement in the project. In particular through their 80 local NGOs, some of which are active as part of this project, there has been a strong emphasis by AWO and IUCN on awareness raising and

groups (e.g. Western Halabat Association, Fatima Duleil Womens Society for Handicaps, AWO, and oth

Activity 4.4. Through the networks of IUCN and its Implementing Partners, successful approaches, practical lessons learnt and policy implications brought to Regional Economic Councils and international fora (MEAs).

The MoA is extremely interested in seeing the Hima approach, as part of its revised Rangelands Strategy (2014) replicated in new areas. As the Rangelands Strategy was updated from 2000 to 2014 to include the Hima approach, this has been one of the greatest successes of the project. By having it in the Rangelands Strategy, it will then filter up to various other strategies and plans of the Government of Jordan, and will be able to attract support from external donors and others. This success is due to the high level Government and community buy-in.

The result is that funding requests from the central Government by the Ministry of Agriculture and Rangelands Department have now been made. Unfortunately, one of the barriers at this point for the Hima approach to be expanded is the cost for the MoA to implement it, particularly at this point, while the Government reels from the financial burden of hosting Syrian refugees. As part of the sector strategies for the MoA however, and this means that in time it could be funded through the central budget. In the meantime, funding from external donors is being sought to expand the pilot projects.

Impact of Project

The project selected four sites to develop pilots on the Hima approach to rangeland management. The impact therefor is quite limited to those four sites, while the more relevant point is related to the ongoing support for replicability and scalability. When considering the objectives of the project, across all four results, these have largely been met. However, insufficient monitoring from a technical side has meant that it can be difficult to fully comprehend the localised impact of the project.

NCARE undertook an assessment after one season in the Bani Hashem site, showing that there has been reduced feed costs (supposedly by up to 75-80%, but this could not be confirmed within the field as it was only over short periods of feed in the Hima), improved biomass (clearly visible when comparing the Hima to other neighbouring sites), increased fauna and returns of species. This is echoed in the economic valuation done, showing that there is potential to scale up the project sites. However, the limitation is that this study ought to be repeated regularly over the next 5-10 years to understand the sustainable impact of the project.

The impact of the Hima is positive for those with 10-15 sheep; however those with large herds of up to 100 are unable to travel extensively and are unable to adequately manage their herds within a Hima. Therefore while the impact has been positive, the scale of the environmental challenges are beyond which the Hima can support. When considering how many rangelands there is in Jordan, the scale of Hima and its ability to be replicated is limited in scope.

It was mentioned previously that there has also been some small scale income generating opportunities (medicinal herbs, bee keeping, economics etc) but these have not adequately been assessed and

with communities. This increases the sustainability of initiatives that have been engaged with, as they are less dependent on ongoing support from IUCN. As the local communities are benefiting from it, there is quite a lot of support to ensure that the access rights remain with the community for them to manage these resources appropriately. The risk is the difficulties involved in not from the local community to abuse the Himas through overstocking.

In terms of expanding the role of the pilot, the future seems quite bright. Karak, Ma'an and Tefeila starting Hima, supported by cross visits of communities arranged by IUCN and the Ministry of Agriculture. Some communities identified to set up plans already. Moreover, as part of the Rangelands Strategy, it is likely that support and funding in the future may arise. Finally, IUCN has been showing the success of the Bani Haseem Hima to students from around the region, possibly leading to international cross-fertilisation of ideas.

Conclusion

The project has been well implemented in Jordan, garnering high level of support. The strengths have been a high level of community engagement, and the media / communications surrounding the project to create buy-in from a wide range of stakeholders. The approach itself of using a form of securing land rights, via Hima, and then linking this with livelihood opportunities is clearly a key part of the project. Moreover, the strong sense of gender engagement through an excellent partner of AWO has clearly improved the project in terms of meeting its objectives.

However, the project did suffer delays at the onset. These were largely exogenous, including changes in Government and the Syrian crisis that diverted resources away from the issue. The delays with a long community engagement approach means it has been

Mali

General Overview

Forest management was decentralised in Mali 10 years ago which allowed communities across the country to use and manage the local forests themselves. The capacity to implement policies regionally though was apparently weak (according to IUCN) – as a result, the project focussed on empowering community groups to utilise the powers entailed to them. The project provided support to the Kelka communities in the Mopti Region, Central Mali. Following decentralisation, 13 village associations were created in Kelka, which were later aggregated into a larger association called Kelka Collective. The Collective are very influential; apparently 90% of households in their catchment area are now members and according to the Mid-Term Review the target population for the project in the area is 59,720 inhabitants.

According to IUCN-Mali most of the proposed activities were completed appropriately. Visual observation by IUCN Programme Officer also suggests that most of the outcomes have been reached. Several of the activities were apparently dropped though – this includes the baseline study on land tenure, which might have affected subsequent understanding of land rights. IUCN-Mali claim that between September 2013 and September 2014 their focus was on strengthening the capacity of the areas of land and natural resources governance, the restoration of degraded lands and the development of vegetable production and marketing. In particular, the project focussed heavily on ensuring access to land for women, which is a central issue in Sahelian countries. The theory of change was based on the assumption that Non-Timber Forest Products (NTFP) provides an incentive to protect and manage the forest of Kelka – an assumption which appears to have held true.

The IUCN Programme Officer felt that the participatory nature of the project design was very appropriate for the context. And assumptions that the government and communities would recognise the importance of Natural Resource Management appear to have held throughout the duration of the work. The overall relevance of

The Mid-Term Review reported that restoration activities in the first two years were conducted by communities at three different villages on 10 ha each. The land restoration component of the project focussed on ploughing furrows on barren land to improve the conservation in water and the regeneration of woody species by direct seeding. In December 2014, IUCN-Mali reported that 97 ha of land had been restored across 14 sites². The Programme Officer also confirmed that this had been finalised during the three month extension period of the project. A movie taken for the project apparently shows a visible positive impact on the land.

Finally, the project responded to criticisms raised in the Mid-Term Review which claimed that monitoring progress and outcomes was a weakness. Since 2013, 10 members of the Kelka Collective (5 women and 5 men) were trained to strengthen their capacity for assessing impacts/effects of interventions according to the theory of change. According to IUCN-Mali, an assessment in November 2013 showed promising results (unfortunately the results of this assessment were not provided to evaluators).

Result 2: Security of access rights to ecosystem services

The project concentrated on the issue of access to land by women in the local communities through dialogue and a workshop bringing together all the relevant stakeholders. A workshop was held on 20 November 2013 on the theme *Advocacy for Women's Access to Land* – participants discussed extensively on social and cultural factors

based on: 1) Firewood, 2) Nitrogen fixation, 3) Soil Moisture improvement and 4) Carbon sequestration. study was completed as part of the Economics of Land Degradation (ELD) project due to limited EU funds available. Unfortunately this report was not published in the final year of the project. If the results were made

reported in 2014 that there had undoubtedly been a change in the attitudes of stakeholders towards the pro

another useful next step; though the costs of large-scale plantation are predicted to be high (1.6. million USD) and so may discourage engagement.

IUCN-Mali suggest that drought is also to consider and that a future intervention should also include a water management component. This was also identified in the economic report, noting that water availability raised as a major constraint to the plantation. Moreover, it was noted that any new project in the region should also include a grassland/pastoralism section. It is believed by the researchers that integrating this would improve the efficacy of future programming.

Sudan

General Overview

The target population was estimated by IUCN to comprise 1.1 million people. This includes both refugee and host community members in two states of Sudan. UNHCR estimate there are approximately 150,000 refugees and asylum seekers in Sudan. Most of those residing in the project area arrived from Eritrea. Refugees have been living in the region for 40 years after fleeing the Eritrean war of Independence, which began in 1961. IUCN supported four Sudanese project sites in total: two in Kassala State (Kilo 26 and Shagarb) and two in Gedaref State (Mafaza and Hawata). All of the sites are located on the eastern side of Sudan, bordering Ethiopia and Eritrea.

Natural vegetation has been classified as semi-desert. The communities in these regions are comprised mostly of small-scale farmers, most of whom have limited numbers of animals. Agriculture is the main occupation. Work includes rain-fed cultivation of Sorghum and Sesame and the irrigated growing of cotton and groundnuts. Cash crops and wheat and sorghum as staple crops. Right to land is insecure since most small-scale farmers access land through cash-rented share-cropping systems.

The baseline study found that the main causes of environmental degradation are wholesale clearance of plant cover by large-scale mechanised farming, over-grazing and deforestation (Eltayeb, 2011). This degradation reportedly had a negative effect on livelihoods by crop yield and income. The authors of the baseline report felt that influencing federal law would be difficult and greater emphasis (UN 5 (c) level 5 (e) +) on environmental protection is needed.

Result 1: Dryland landscapes sustainably and equitably managed through strengthened institutional arrangements

According to progress reports, at least four CEMPs were designed and implemented to identify priority environmental interventions in the communities. Workshops were also used to strengthen local institutions and relations between the communities and government. IUCN believe CEMPs are still being updated by all communities; FNC independently stated that this is done annually. During the project, FNC have provided technical support to implement the actions identified in the CEMPs. These activities include the purchase of nursery tools/equipment and the production of 64,800 tree seedlings. Outcomes as a result of this process include the rehabilitation of tree nurseries and the planting of indigenous tree species in public areas to raise awareness of the value of trees and agro-forestry.

Following the CEMPs, there have been attempts to extend and implement a collaborative rain-fed agro-forestry system known as Taungya at the sites. This had traditionally been used in the region. To begin the process,

resources, natural resource processing and marketing. During this workshop community members were reportedly trained on participatory video techniques.

Impact of Project

During the project, IUCN's application to open a country office was rejected and as a consequence technical support was provided from Nairobi only. The project was therefore constrained by the lack of IUCN presence in the field. It could be argued that some of the more technical activities were not implemented because of this constraint – including the business training and impact assessment. Despite this, the overall outcomes and potential impacts of the project are significant. This is almost-part due to FNC's technical capacity and political will to support the project. The work in Sudan was built upon a long-running partnership with FNC. During the project, FNC put in resources and their staff facilitated engagement with the community far beyond the scope of the project. FNC also provided important technical support and leveraged assets and resources from other projects e.g. UNHCR vehicles were sometimes used. IUCN subsequently reported that the project was easier to implement compared to other countries.

The IUCN Programme Officer tended to underestimate the impact of the project due to the lack of field access and subsequent evidence. In contrast, FNC was very confident the project had had a significant impact on ecology, human well-being and on policy. The lack of data to prove and further explore the impact of this project appears to have been an issue in each of the four countries and something that needs to be addressed in future initiatives.

The CEMPS formed a significant part of the project in the first two years and allowed communities to identify their own priorities and actions. FNC and IUCN claim that this process, plus the communities' attendance at workshops has ultimately strengthened institutions and built their capacity so they may present their own views to policy-makers and other stakeholders.

Following the CEMPs, FNC provided technical support to implement the activities that were raised. Undoubtedly one of the key tangible outcomes of this work was the allocation of 650 ha of land to communities for agroforestry. In 2014 IUCN-Sudan reported that these sites had reached maturity and crops were doing well. According to FNC, providing access to this land has provided several modes of income and a subsequent reduction in food security. FNC also claim that the project has resulted in the promotion of peaceful co-existence between community and refugee groups and given more vulnerable members of the communities access to land for cultivation.

"Because of the improved income and access to land, there is less conflict". FNC

Without direct evidence of attribution IUCN-Sudan hesitate to claim that such an impact has been made. Furthermore, they point out that there is an assumption that livelihood improvement leads to poverty reduction but in this case it is not possible yet to prove this has in-fact taken place, as there was no monitoring for poverty reduction.

FNC were already technically strong - in agroforestry particularly, but they did receive training in participatory approaches. FNC has apparently since shown increased awareness of the higher level goals of the project especially those around strengthening participatory governance. IUCN report that the government are now increasingly seeing the value in community participation. Before the project FNC had a very top-down approach to policy but now they very much acknowledge the value of community engagement in policy development. They have expressed intention to uphold these principles through the New Forest Policy. Passing of the New Forest Policy should help institutionalise community participation and land restoration across the country.

Sustainability of Project

Due to the nature of the project, the continuation of certain activities is very dependent upon FNC and their involvement – for example, the acquisition of more land for restoration and technical support to manage existing land.

the project seeks to build on the knowledge gained throughout the project, and intends to use these project demonstrations for others to learn from. The intention would be to replicate and increase the scale of the successes to have broader impact on the social, economic and environmental improvements being identified.

Challenges

The project has faced two significant shortcomings throughout the four case studies. Firstly, delays in the initial implementation, due to a range of factors exogenous and endogenous to the project, have reduced the impact and possibly the sustainability of the project. In Jordan, there were long lead times to secure access rights; in Botswana, the project faced challenges due to the remoteness of the sites and the lack of a field officer; in Mali, the project had a significant impact upon the ability to implement; and finally in Sudan, delays were due to poor relationships with Government and local partners, and difficulties faced in setting up an office.

Much of this is likely to be mitigated by IUCN moving forward with the ongoing support of the drylands project at a global level. The second shortcoming has been the lack of monitoring data. In many of the sites, baseline studies have not been undertaken. Where baseline studies have been undertaken, the ongoing data collection to monitor social, economic and environmental indicators has not taken place. This has made it somewhat difficult for the evaluators to effectively assess all the indicators, particularly in terms of effectiveness and efficiency.

effective in communicating specific messages to inform policy or actions. However, some documents produced (e.g. technical guidance briefs, policy notes) placed a stronger emphasis on the approach wider dry landscape issues and gathered large interest, particularly when shared with TV and radio media. This type of communication was much more effective at raising the level of knowledge on issues being considered, while also garnering support for policy and implementation.

7. Ensure timeliness in the programme. The approach of CEMPs relies on a strong level of community engagement and buy-in that creates shared and mutual accountability across the project stakeholders. While this is clearly positive in terms of the sustainability and impact of the project, it is also a timely process. More time should be factored in to the start-up of the project, as well as the ongoing support. It is however recognised that project timeframes can restrict the first best solutions.

Bibliography

An integrated management plan for Acacia and Prosopis in the BORAVAST Trusts: A model for management of dryland areas of Botswana invaded by Prosopis species (and their hybrids).

DFRR (2014). Botswana 2014 Workplan and Progress from 2010 – December 2014

Autlwetse, B. (2014). Proceedings of the Botswana Rangeland Forum Conference. 26 June 2014.

Buskham-Walsh, L. and Chipso Mutambirwa, C. (2014). Strengthening Communal Rangelands Management

Annexes

					<p>give appropriate legal status if they are to continue activities themselves.</p> <p>Better monitoring systems are required to measure the impact of interventions.</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	---	--

Expected Result 2

Security of access rights to private and common pool ecosystem services strengthened, with special attention to those important to women and vulnerable groups.

Expected Result 3

Economic and income
generating options for
rural communities
explored and
supported based on
natural resource

National Parliamentary Committees and media supported to communicate and demonstrate success stories

Through the networks of IUCN and its Implementing Partners, successful approaches, practical lessons learnt and policy implications brought to Regional Economic Councils and international fora (MEAs).

	<p>United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification (UNCCD) event and through participatory video methods.</p> <p>DFRR and other stakeholders attended UNCCD and held side-event on Prosopis species.</p> <p>In order to ensure that successful approaches, practical lessons and policy implications are brought to Regional Economic Councils and international fora, the Kalahari</p>
--	---

Annex 3: Mali Progress Matrix

Intervention	Proposed Activities	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Sustainability	Impact
Expected Result 1	Dryland landscapes sustainably and equitably managed, including the restoration of degraded areas, based on strengthened institutional arrangements.	<p>The project is relevant as forest management was decentralised 10 years ago.</p> <p>The project provides training on how communities may manage the forests sustainably.</p> <p>The overall relevance is high as the area faces high poverty and</p>				

Annex 1: Sudan Progress Matrix

Intervention	Proposed Activities	Relevance	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Sustainability	Impact
Expected Result 1 Dryland landscapes sustainably & equitably managed, including the restoration of degraded areas, based on strengthened institutional arrangements.	Local institutions supported to implement CEMP (includes plans and community initiatives) Institutions strengthened to manage ecosystems sustainably (include land restoration) Final assessment of impact	<p>FNC reported that the objectives appear to have been appropriately set from the beginning and that they relate to national strategies and plans.</p> <p>There was substantial FNC involvement and buy-in through the project, which further suggests high relevance in-country.</p> <p>The institutionalization of the participatory approach by FNC also suggests high relevance in-country.</p> <p>The results align closely with the theory of change.</p>	<p>Most of the activities were conducted (despite limited access to the field by IUCN, local Proun national strategies</p>			

	<p><i>Committees and media supported to communicate and demonstrate success stories</i></p> <p><i>Through the networks of IUCN and its Implementing Partners, successful approaches, practical lessons learnt and policy implications brought to Regional Economic Councils and international fora (MEAs).</i></p>		<p>based on the literature study.</p> <p>There is no evidence of support for National Parliamentary Committees and media to communicate and demonstrate success stories.</p>		<p>demonstrate success stories,</p>	
--	--	--	--	--	-------------------------------------	--

Annex 5: Terms of Reference

Final Project Evaluation of Securing Rights and Restoring Lands for Improved Livelihoods: Submission by IMPACT Initiatives & ACTED

A. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sector (s)	NRM and Agriculture	Working Group Lead (s)	N/a
Donor	International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)		
Country	Global (Jordan, Mali, Botswana, Sudan and Kenya/Nairobi)		

B. CONTEXT OF EVALUATION

The IUCN designed the Securing Rights and Restoring Lands for Improved Livelihoods project in response to Millennium Ecosystem Assessment highlighting the concern related to land degradation. The project uses conservation, restoration and sustainable management of ecosystems services as the basis for improved livelihoods. This is achieved through more secure land rights, better management, and enhanced income generation opportunities. The project is implemented in four diverse dryland areas of Botswana, Jordan, and Sudan. The project started in December 2009 and ran for five years with extension from Jan 2014 to Dec 2014. The evaluation requested focuses on the four objectives:

Dryland landscapes sustainably and equitably managed, including the restoration of degraded areas, based on strengthened institutional arrangements.

Security of access rights to private and common ecosystems strengthened, with special attention to those important to women and vulnerable groups. (NB: During project implementation it became apparent that access rights was part of the challenge to sustainable managing the natural resources and it became important to secure rights at a higher level of community to allow appropriate management and control.)

Economic and income generating options for rural communities explored

Moreover, the evaluation will rate each of the outputs, activities and inputs based on their implementation. That is, a table of rankings will be developed to reflect the level of implementation and quality of implementation

Ministry of Agriculture (MOA), Arab Women's Organisation (AWO) and Jordanian Society for Organic Farming (JSOF), the Consortium, Donko Walia (Douentza) in Mali, and the Forests National Corporation (FNC) in Sudan.

Structured interviews will be undertaken with a purposive sample of key stakeholders. Specifically:

The IUCN staff and internal partners. Semi structured and structured interviews would be undertaken across the staff and internal partners.

The external partners aforementioned in each of the interventions (VPR&D, MoA, AWO, JSOF, Douentza and FNC). Semi structured and structured interviews would be undertaken across the partners. The communities in Botswana, Jordan, Mali and Sudan (30 in total). A selection may be undertaken here including some field visits and some remote structured interviews.

Other stakeholders include local authorities, community based organizations, non-governmental organizations, and international organizations that may have a vested interest in the communities or the project. These would be captured through the field visits, and possibly if required through remote structured interviews.

A list of stakeholders and data collection methods will be developed, including an itinerary of interviews as part of the field visits. This will be undertaken with guidance of the IUCN project team.

C.5. Desktop Review

A desktop review will be undertaken. The basis for the review will be to identify project documents of relevance to inform the analysis surrounding the theory of change and program logic. This will include a summary of key documents to facilitate the comparison chart of the four countries of implementation. Furthermore, it will include references to advocacy points and policy developments that are recommended in the existing literature of reviews, evaluations and assessments where possible. Documents will include:

Key project documents including the initial project theory of change, results frameworks, and the like

used in the project.

A suggested list of preliminary indicators to inform the analysis has been developed. This will be refined throughout the inception process, including in the first top review and the project steering committee.

- x Title page including project identification details
- x Executive Summary (including at a minimum the methodology, findings and recommendations)
- x Table of Contents
- x List of Abbreviations and Acronyms
- x A short introduction to program – context and description
- x Purpose of the Evaluation
- x Evaluation Issues and Questions
- x Methodology (including approach to data analysis)
- x

D.3. Budget

Task	Principal (500Euro, days)	Senior Consultant (400Euro, days)	Consultant (300 Euro, days)	Grand Amount (Euro)
Signing of Agreement				0
Draft Evaluation Plan (2 Days)	1.5	0.5		950
Desk / Lit Review (5 days)	1	1	3	1,800
Inception Meeting (2 days)	1	1		900
Finalise Inception Report (2 days)	1	1		900
Key Informant Interviews (15 days)	5	10		6,500
Field Visits x2 (10 days)	5	5		4,500

Annex 6: Key Stakeholder Questionnaire

Final Project Evaluation of 'Securing Rights and Restoring Lands for Improved Livelihoods' Questionnaire

Introduction

Hello, my name is Byron Pakula / Daniel Brown.

Your details have been provided to us from _____.

IMPACT Initiatives is undertaking a final project evaluation of the project 'Securing Rights and Restoring Lands for Improved Livelihoods'. The general purpose of the evaluation is to assess the achievement of project results and to draw lessons that can both improve the sustainability of benefits from this project and inform future project design. The evaluation, and questionnaire, are both based around the evaluation criteria of relevance, effectiveness, efficiency, sustainability, and impact.

This interview is expected to take no more than 1 hour. It is a semi-structured interview (some structured questions, but plenty of scope to go into more detail on relevant areas). Are you in agreement to proceed? ()

Name of Interviewer:

Name of Respondent:

Position of Respondent:

Organization

of

Respondent:

Date and time of Interview: _____

Questions

If there are any questions you do not feel comfortable responding to, or do not feel in a position that you are well enough informed to respond, feel free to note this and we can proceed to the next question.

Relevance

1. To what extent do you believe the design of the project was appropriate?

1 (Objectives were set incorrectly and or activities not going to meet the objectives)

2

3 (Objectives largely correct, and some of the activities were appropriately related)

4

⁵ IMPACT Initiatives is a non-governmental organisation based in Geneva that focuses on information management, including assessments, monitoring, and evaluation for the benefit of more effective humanitarian action.

⁶ International Union for Conservation of Nature (IUCN)

5 (Appropriate objectives and activities set in the theory of change)

Please elaborate, highlighting the objectives and activities to local or national strategies and plans, the activities linking the project to the objectives, and the theory of change.

What do you think is the key objective or rationale of the project?

Do you think the project design including activities and outputs was adequate to meet the objectives?

Effectiveness

2. To what extent have all activities been implemented?

1 (Many activities were not completed or done appropriately)

2

3 (Most of the activities were completed in an appropriate manner)

4

5 (All of the activities were completed in an appropriate manner)

Please elaborate, highlight which activities have or have not been implemented – where possible, include reference to any obstacles that may have prevented some activities from being implemented. Remember to include activities relevant to all 4 objectives: restoration and management of drylands, access of rights, livelihood generation and policy influence.

3. To what extent have the outcomes been achieved?

1 (None of the outcomes (0%) have or are likely to be achieved in the next 5 years)

2

3 (Approximately half of the outcomes (50%) have or are likely to be achieved in the next 5 years)

4

5 (All of the outcomes (100%) have or are likely to be achieved in the next 5 years)

Please elaborate, highlight which outcomes have or have not been achieved *why* and *what* were not (or are not likely to be) achieved – where possible, provide reference to the activities mentioned in question 1 and to any relevant projects and outcomes. Also make reference to any assumptions that were not realistic.

4. Were the technical designs and technologies the most appropriate to deliver the outcomes?

1 (Not appropriate at all)

- 2
- 3 (Appropriate, but with room to improve)
- 4
- 5 (Very appropriate)

Please elaborate, describe how the technical designs and technologies may be adapted in future program to increase the likelihood that outcomes will be achieved.

5. How were women and minority groups affected differently in the project? Could this be improved? Explain.

Impact

6. Please list the three most significant direct and/or indirect changes that have occurred as a result of the project. Interviewee should consider potential impacts to livelihoods, access to land, natural resource management and policy change.

1.

2.

3.

7. Are there conditions in place as a result of this project to reduce environmental stress and/or improve ecological status?

- 1 (No, environmental stress/ecological status has worsened and is likely to continue getting worse)
- 2
- 3 (Maybe, environmental stress/ecological status has not noticeably changed and is not likely to change significantly)
- 4
- 5 (Yes, environmental stress/ecological status has improved and is likely to improve further)

Please elaborate, what have been the positive and negative impacts so far and what are the positive or negative impacts you envision for the next 5 years.

8. Are there conditions in place as a result of this project to reduce poverty and/or improve human well-being?

1 (No, poverty/human well-being has worsened and is likely to continue getting worse)

2

3 (Some resources such as time provided by communities)

4

5 (Significant time and resources provided by communities)

Please elaborate, what resources were secured and from whom? What were they used for? If resources not secured from local stakeholders, why not?

Sustainability

12. Was the capacity building component adequately implemented for stakeholders to continue?

1 (Capacity building did not work well, no stakeholders are likely to continue)

2

3 (Capacity building worked well, some stakeholders are likely to continue)

4

5 (Capacity building worked very well, most stakeholders are likely to continue)

Please elaborate by describing how capacity building for stakeholders did or did not work well. For those stakeholders likely to continue, what capacity is this likely to be?

13. Is there evidence of change in knowledge, attitudes and practices of government in terms of engaging and having dialogue with communities for developing plans, strategies and implementing activities?

1 (Some knowledge increase, but no change in attitude or practice)

2

3 (Knowledge increased, some change in attitude, but limited change in government dialogue practices)

4

5 (Knowledge and attitude increased, with significant change in government dialogue practice)

Please elaborate, describe types of change and reasoning behind those changes of government-community interactions.

14. Is there evidence of change in knowledge, attitudes and practices of (your) communities in relation to project objectives?

1 (Some knowledge increase, but no change in attitude or practice)

2

3 (Knowledge increased, some change in attitude, but limited change in practice)

4

5 (Knowledge and attitude increased, wi

project (e.g. change in approaches, change in strategy, etc)?

- 1.
- 2.
- 3.

Thank you for your time, it is much appreciated.

For any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact:

IMPACT Initiatives: Byron Pakula, byron.pakula@acted.org

IUCN:

